ITEM NO 9B: SPECIAL USE PERMIT; FAMILY FUN CENTER; W 24th Place and Inverness Drive (SLD/TLH)

SUP-13-00486: Consider a Special Use Permit for Participant Sports & Recreation, Outdoor uses as part of a Family Fun Center, located at 4300 W 24th Place. The development includes a 20,000 square foot clubhouse and outdoor tot lot, batting cages, electric go-kart tracks and an 18-hole miniature golf course. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for Corporate Holdings II LLC, property owner of record. Deferred by the Planning commission on 2/24/14.

Updates to the zoning report from the February version are shown in bold green.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of the Special Use Permit (SUP-13-00486) Family Fun Center, located on 10.49 acres and forwarding the recommendation to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall provide a revised **Photometric Plan** to include the following notes:
   a. “No flickering or flashing lights are permitted”; **Note Added to Plan.**
   b. “Outdoor activity area lights may not be illuminated after 10:30 pm, Sunday – Thursday and 11:30 pm, Friday- Saturday; and [Revised plan shows proposed hours of operation]
   c. “As-built lighting and photometric plans are required prior to occupancy.”

2. Provision of a **revised Special Use Permit** to include the following changes:
   a. Revise parking lot layout to include an additional 5’ setback from W 24th Place to accommodate the installation of street trees along the perimeter;
   b. List hours of operation; [Revised plan shows proposed hours of operation]
   c. List shut-off times for outdoor activity area lights; [Revised plan shows proposed hours of operation]
   d. Indicate known pipe material and pipe diameters on all storm sewer pipe runs; [Specifically, label the existing storm sewer pipes include the length of pipe run, pipe diameter, material, and slope (i.e. 90 L.F. 15” HDPE @ 0.5%). Label the existing storm sewer structures, include structure dimensions, structure type and elevations (i.e. 4’x4’ Curb Inlet, FL Out (S): 900.49 T/Inlet: 902.75) and Show and label 5. Junction boxes will need to be installed at all pipe bends and junctions per the approval of the City Stormwater Engineer.]
   e. Show placement of rip rap on the downstream side of the curb cut leading into the drainage swale on the east side of the property per the approval of the City Stormwater Engineer;
   f. A note on the face of the plan that states
      i. “Land designated in Phase II of construction must be maintained as a natural turf area until completed”; **Note Added to Plan.**
      ii. “A Right of Way Permit will be required for the connection to the public
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storm sewer system.”; Note Added to Plan.

iii. “Amplified sound system may only be used in outdoor activity areas between 9am – 9pm;” [Revised plan shows proposed hours of operation]

iv. “The electric go-kart operations shall be restricted to 9pm, Sunday – Thursday and 10:30 pm, Thursday – Saturday;” and [Revised plan shows proposed hours of operation]

v. “Alcohol cannot be consumed in the outdoor activity areas.” Added to Plan.

vi. Provide a note that states the trash enclosure shall meet or exceed City Standards. [Revised plan shows proposed hours of operation]

vii. Provide note regarding the extent of the western drive to be constructed with the initial phase of the development to indicated the width and length of the drive to be constructed with the initial phase of the development.

viii. Revise trash enclosure location, per City Staff approval, such as relocating trash enclosure to the north along the west side of the newly placed clubhouse.

ix. Provide design of miniature golf and batting cages for review and approval, prior to issuance of a building permit.

3. Submission and approval of Public Improvement Plan prior to release of the site plan for issuance of building permits.

4. Provision of a revised Special Use Permit Per the approval of the City Stormwater Engineer to include the following changes:
   a. Per City Code Chapter IX Article 9-903(B), a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWP3) must be provided for this project. This project will not be released for building permits until an approved SWP3 has been obtained. Construction activity, including soil disturbance or removal of vegetation shall not commence until an approved SWP3 has been obtained. All SWP3’s should include property owner’s name, address (state & zip code), phone number and email address. A copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) needs to be supplied with SWP3.
   b. Show and label the curb cut on the east side of the parking lot. Show riprap on the downstream end of the curb cut.

5. Provision of a revised Special Use Permit Per the approval of the City Fire Prevention staff to include the following changes:
   a. The required fire flow for the development at this time requires 6 hydrants. The existing three on 24th place will be allowed to be included in total. Provide water supply loop and 3 additional hydrants throughout development.
   b. Provision of an auto-turn analysis based upon a 49’ fire apparatus.
   c. Additional access within the interior of the development may be required to comply with Section 503 for access within 150’ of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls on the fist floor of the buildings.

6. Provision of a revised Special Use Permit Per the approval of the City Utility Engineer to include the following changes:
   a. Conditions related to water service:
i. Label the sizes of the proposed waterlines, water services, and fire lines.

ii. Show where the proposed waterline crosses West 24th Place west of the access road. Show the tee with a plug at the existing crossing of West 24th Place at the southeast corner of the property. [Extending the public waterline south of the clubhouse, playground, and Go-Kart storage and connecting to the tee south of the batting cages would loop the waterline to provide two feed sources per Design Criteria Section 5902.3 and may be required for placement of fire hydrants. Coordinate the number of fire hydrants and location with Fire Prevention.]

iii. Show and label required 10’ easements for final waterline location [Per Design Criteria Section 5902.6, a minimum of 10 feet in width when adjacent to right-of-way or access easements. Easements shall be a minimum of 15 feet in width if not adjacent to right-of-way or access easements.

iv. Show waterlines located a minimum of 15’ from building structure and 8’ form all other structures Per Design Criteria Section 5905.1.3.

b. Conditions related to Sanitary Sewer Service:
   i. Show and label the sanitary sewer service line to the clubhouse.
   ii. Confirm that the storage building will now have a connection to the sanitary sewer

Applicant’s Reason for Request:
"An indoor/outdoor participant sports and recreation center."

FACTORS TO CONSIDER
- Procedural requirements of Section 20-1306; Special Use Permits

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A: Special Use Permit Plan from February 2014
Attachment B: Applicant’s Project Summary
Attachment C: Applicant’s letter dated 4.2.14 summarizing changes
Attachment D: Revised Site Plan dated 4.2.14
Attachment E: Neighborhood Meeting Letter

ASSOCIATED CASES/OTHER ACTION REQUIRED
Associated Cases:
- TA-13-00488; Special Use in CN2 District
- Z-13-00483; RSO to CN2
- SUP-13-00486; Family Fun Center
- SUP-14-00026; Inverness Corner Retail Development

Other Action Required Prior to Development:
- City Commission approval and publication of an ordinance.
- Submittal and approval of building plans prior to release of building permits for development.
- A stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWP3) must be provided and approved prior to any construction activity occurring on site.
PLANS AND STUDIES REQUIRED

- **Downstream Sanitary Sewer Analysis** – The 2012 Wastewater Utilities Plan did not indicate any potential issues with the sanitary sewers immediately downstream of this site. Since the site is proposed to be rezoned from RSO to CN2, design flows may be even less than those used in the 2012 Plan. The downstream sanitary sewer analysis and cover letter provided by BG Consultants has been reviewed and is accepted for this project to satisfy the criteria required for the DSSA as outlined in Administrative Policy 76.

- **Drainage Study** – Accepted by City Staff.

- **Traffic Impact Study** – Traffic Impact Study concluded that no improvements were required for the surrounding street network. This study was accepted by staff.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Attached to this staff report

GENERAL INFORMATION

Current Zoning and Land Use: RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential-Office District), undeveloped

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:

To the southwest:
- RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential District) a subdivision of single family residences located west of Inverness Drive.

To the south:
- PRD-[The Grove] and PRD-[Legends at KU]; multi-dwelling residences.
- GPI (General and Public Institutional Use District); Southwest Middle School and Sunflower Elementary School.

To the north:
- RM12 (Multi-Dwelling Residential District); Bishop Seabury Academy.
- PRD-[Wimbledon Terraces] multi-dwelling residences
- RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential-Office District): Clinton Parkway Animal Hospital

To the northwest/west:
- RM12 (Multi-Dwelling Residential District); a church and duplexes

To the east:
- RM12 (Multi-Dwelling Residential District); multi-dwelling residence

---

**Figure 1a.** Map of zoning of area.  
**Figure 1b.** Aerial of land use in area.
### Site Summary completion with all phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>February 2014</th>
<th>April 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Area:</td>
<td>342,698 sq. ft./7.867 acres</td>
<td>342,698 sq. ft./7.867 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Building Coverage Existing:</td>
<td>0 sq. ft.</td>
<td>0 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Building Coverage Proposed:</td>
<td>20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>0 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pavement Existing:</td>
<td>0 sq. ft.</td>
<td>20,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pavement Proposed:</td>
<td>123,683 sq. ft.</td>
<td>0 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Impervious Existing:</td>
<td>0 sq. ft.</td>
<td>129,383 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Impervious Proposed:</td>
<td>147,683 sq. ft.</td>
<td>0 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY OF SPECIAL USE

The property will be developed in phases, thus certain uses are shown conceptually and as future on the site plan. The project has been divided into two individual Special Use Permits to allow separate discussion regarding the proposed uses on the property. This Special Use Permit (SUP-13-00486) focuses solely on the uses in the Family Fun Center, which is located in the eastern 2/3 of the property. Another Special Use Permit (SUP-14-00026: Inverness Corner) has been submitted to address proposed pad sites with drive-thru businesses on the western 1/3 of the property. Review through the Special Use Permit process will need be completed, which includes a public hearing before the Planning Commission, action by the City Commission and recording of SUP plans, if approved.

The proposed Family Fun Center features activities located both indoors and outdoors. The project is separated into two phases. The exact timeline of implementation of the second phase is unknown.

**Phase 1:**

The first phase contains a large majority of structures and spaces built on the property. The site will be anchored by a two-story clubhouse, located in the center of the property, directly north of the 139-space parking lot, which lies parallel to W 24th Place. **The clubhouse location has been revised and moved to the west side of the property.**

The clubhouse will feature a total of 28,000 square feet: 20,000 on the first floor; 8,000 on the second floor. First floor clubhouse activities will include club rental for miniature golf, private party rooms, arcade games, and a snack area. On the second floor, the clubhouse will feature a bar with a 3.2 liquor license, a NASCAR driving experience arcade, along with miniature bowling. **The applicant is proposing to exclude seeking a liquor license in the initial phase of this development. A liquor license must be approved by the City Commission as a separate action. There is no specific notice requirement to property owners regarding acquisition of a liquor license.**

Six batting cages containing 9,700 square feet (3,000 customer area) will be located on the east side of the property directly west of the clubhouse, adjacent to the parking lot. An 18-hole miniature golf course containing 70,933 square feet (20,000 customer area) will be located in the northwest portion of the site. A patio space and 6,400 SF play ground area will be located east of the clubhouse with picnic tables for customers and patrons. A tot lot, containing 6,800 square feet will be located directly east of the patio, for children of younger ages.

**Phase 2:**
The second phase of the project will add an electric go-kart track on the eastern side of the site, along with an accessory structure used to store the electric go-karts. The electric go-kart track will take up 33,595 square feet (18,100 customer area) of space directly east of the clubhouse. Per the manufacturer, the electric go-karts will make noise comparable to an automobile travelling 20-30mph down a street. Thirty-eight parking spaces will be added to the site in Phase 2, increasing the number of parking spaces on the property from 111 spaces to 149 spaces.

The proposed hours are anticipated for the proposed Family Fun Center:
- Monday through Wednesday: 11am to 10pm
- Thursday and Friday: 11am to 12am
- Saturday: 10am to 12am
- Sunday: 12pm to 9pm

The development proposes a Family Fun Center, which under the Lawrence Development Code, is categorized under the “Participant Sports & Recreation, Outdoor” use, which is currently not permitted. A text amendment: (TA-13-00488: Special Use in CN2 District) is proposed concurrently with this Special Use Permit, to accommodate the proposed development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT</th>
<th>USE PROPOSED</th>
<th>USE CLASSIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Fun Center Lot</td>
<td>Two-story Clubhouse Accessory snack bar (including alcohol sales)</td>
<td>Participant Sports &amp; Recreation, Indoor Accessory use - Eating and drinking establishment/accessory bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batting Cages</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Sports &amp; Recreation, Outdoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miniature Golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Go Karts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessory Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These use classifications are defined in Article 17 of the Development Code as:

**Sports and Recreation, Participant:** Provision of sports or recreation primarily by and for participants. (Spectators would be incidental and on a nonrecurring basis). The following are participant sports and recreation use types (for either general or personal use):

- **Indoor:** Those uses conducted within an enclosed building. Typical uses include bowling alleys, billiard parlors, swimming pools, and physical fitness centers.
- **Outdoor:** Those uses conducted in open facilities. Typical uses include driving ranges, miniature golf courses and swimming pools.

**SITE PLAN REVIEW**

While the site plan being considered by the Planning Commission reflects the locations of the primary structure and parking lots, many elements are conceptual and should be considered to be in design phase – details of parking lot landscaping, fencing, stormwater system, lighting, etc. Much of this report identifies/discusses technical code standards that need further clarification on the site plan to verify that the items meet the Development Code, but, in any event, will be
completed prior to the issuance of building permits and based on the direction of the Planning and City Commissions.

The physical arrangement of the proposed uses are revised per the attached site plan. The golf course use occupies the north portion of the site. The Clubhouse is located on the west end and the go-kart and batting cages are located on the east side of the property. This project is still proposed as a phased development.

The site plan shows the proposed location of the Clubhouse to be located in the central portion of the site, directly north of the parking lot, which parallels W 24th Place. All outdoor recreation use facilities are located to the north of the parking lot, on the west, north, and east sides of the clubhouse. Facilities intended to be completed in the initial construction phase include:

- Miniature golf (18 holes)
- Batting cages (6 total)
- Tot Lot Playground
- Patio
- Open space in northeast corner of parcel
- Detention pond

Future facilities to be completed after the initial construction phase include:

- Electric Go-Kart Track
  - Go-Kart storage building (accessory use)

Pedestrian pathways are shown throughout the area on the site plan. These will connect the clubhouse and parking lot with the various recreational facilities located on the site. Additionally the sidewalk is designed to be extended to the west to the retail commercial in SUP-14-00026.

Restroom locations are not identified on the SUP plan. Building Codes have specific requirements pertaining to the proximity of restrooms to spectator or activity areas. If additional restrooms are required, an administrative amendment to the site plan would be necessary.

Review and Decision-Making Criteria (20-1306(i))

1. WHETHER THE PROPOSED USE COMPLIES WITH ALL APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THIS DEVELOPMENT CODE

Property Owner’s Response: “A text amendment has been submitted to allow CN2 to have Outdoor Participant Sports and Recreation. Should the amendment be approved, the proposed used will comply with the Development Code.”

Some of the proposed uses are currently not permitted in the CN2 zoning. TA-13-00488 has been submitted concurrently with this Special Use Permit to allow the Participant Sports & Recreation, Outdoor use under this zoning classification.

Parking
Parking for the proposed uses associated with the immediate development is summarized in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Required Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Fun Center Lot – February Version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Sports &amp; Recreation, Indoor and Outdoor</td>
<td>1 per 500 square feet of customer/activity area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111 Spaces Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38 Spaces Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149 Spaces Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Fun Center Lot – April Version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Sports &amp; Recreation, Indoor and Outdoor</td>
<td>1 per 500 square feet of customer/activity area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107 Spaces Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38 Spaces Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145 Spaces Provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bike parking required is 1 per 10 spaces for participant sports uses, whether indoor or outdoor. Given that **145 parking spaces** are required, **16 bike spaces** are required on the site.

**LANDSCAPING:**

**Street Trees**
This project requires the provision of street trees along Clinton Parkway and W 24th Place. The plan shows the required street trees along Clinton Parkway within the right of way. Street trees for W 24th Place are shown within a series of islands projected into the parking lot along W 24th Place. These street trees would normally be dispersed uniformly along the property line, however, conflicting utility locations require trees to be located further inside the property, which led the applicant to place these trees within parking lot islands.

The applicant has asked for alternative compliance regarding street trees and parking lot perimeter landscaping due to the proximity of utilities located parallel to the parking lot and W 24th Place.

**Staff recommended the site be redesigned to provide an additional 5’ along W. 24th Place to establish an area for the placement of the required street trees. The property is sufficiently large enough to accommodate this requirement and meet the subdivision and site plan requirements. This project represents greenfield development in that it is vacant unimproved land. There are no encumbrances to moving land uses to the north and providing a green space area along W 24th Street. The hardship to the applicant is the design time and effort that has implemented thus a with no regard to this comment provided during the review of the project.**

A Type 1 Bufferyard is required along Clinton Parkway, W 24th Place, and between the proposed development and the existing multi-family development to the east. The applicant has requested a waiver from this standard as it applies to both W 24th Place and Clinton Parkway.

**Bufferyard on the South (adjacent to W 24th Place)**
A waiver has been requested due to the 15’ utility easement at the front of the site. Shrubs have been provided in the parking lot islands to meet shrub requirements; however there is no room for the additional five trees not provided via street trees, per the applicant.

A type one bufferyard is required along the south and east property lines for this development. The bufferyard as shown is 15’ wide (accounting for the existing utility easement). The Family Fun Center includes approximately 651.34’ along W 24th Place. Based on a Type 1, 15’ wide buffer yard a total of 20 trees and 52 shrubs would be required along the south side of the property adjacent to W 24th Place.

This bufferyard is adjacent to a multi-dwelling residential planned development to the south, across W 24th Place. As an alternative to this request, staff has recommended a condition to move the parking lot at least five feet north to accommodate the necessary street trees.

Bufferyard on the North (adjacent to Clinton Parkway)
A waiver has been requested due to the site frontage being buffered by a 10’ +/- hill south of Clinton Parkway, which the applicant considers to serve as an adequate buffer from the arterial.

After a visit to the site, along Clinton Parkway, staff noted topographical buffering, in addition to existing trees along Clinton Parkway that serve as adequate buffering, despite not being located within the property.

Bufferyard on the East (adjacent to neighboring apartments)
The proposed plan complies with bufferyard requirements needed as they apply to the adjacent development. A mixture of shrubs and trees has been proposed in order to serve as an adequate buffer between these two spaces.

Interior Parking Lot landscaping
This plan exceeds the code requirements for trees and shrubs, as well as the area requirements for interior parking lot landscaping.

Figure 2a. Family Fun Center parking lot- February Version
Perimeter Parking Lot Landscaping
Landscaping is required around the perimeter of parking lots to screen view of parking lots from streets and roads. This landscaping is required in addition to 1 tree per 25 linear feet of parking frontage. The current design and layout of the parking lot does not allow for adequate street trees due to existing utility lines located beneath the provided green space. As a condition of approval, a revised site plan should include a revised parking lot layout to include an additional 5’ setback from W 24th Place to accommodate the installation of street trees along the perimeter.

Mechanical Screening
Trash receptacle locations should be shown on the plan for review by the City Solid Waste Division. Trash receptacles and mechanical equipment must be screened per the requirements in Section 20-1006. The plan shows the location of the trash receptacles/dumpsters. **An additional note regarding screening of the trash enclosure should be added to state that the enclosure shall comply with minimum City design specifications.** In addition the following note should be added to the plan: "Exterior ground-mounted or building-mounted equipment including, but not limited to, mechanical equipment, utilities boxes and meters, shall be fully screened from view of adjacent properties and from street rights-of-way (as measured 6 ft above ground level). Screening shall be in the form of landscape plantings or an architectural treatment compatible with the architecture of the principal building."

This revised plan shows the proposed trash receptacle located along W 24th Place east of the shared entrance to the Family Fun Center and the future retail development. Staff recommend the trash receptacle be relocated to the north adjacent to the clubhouse. This will place the use closer to the clubhouse and provide a larger area to screen the trash receptacle within the site rather than along the public right-of-way.
The location of the access drives meets the separation requirements from the intersection with Inverness Drive and W 24th Place.

**Lighting**

Section 20-1103(d) contains lighting standards for outdoor lighting. These standards would apply to parking lot lights and exterior lights except for those associated with outdoor recreational uses. Standards for outdoor recreational uses provided in Section 20-1103(e) include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lights at outdoor recreation uses may not exceed a maximum permitted post height of 60 feet.</td>
<td>Maximum pole height proposed: 25 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No flickering or flashing lights are permitted</td>
<td>Recommended as a note on the face of the site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights may not be illuminated after 11:30pm</td>
<td>Shut-off times recommended as a note on the face of the site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-built lighting and photometric plans are required</td>
<td>Recommended as a note on the face of the site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting shall be designed, to the maximum extent feasible, to minimize adverse impacts on traffic safety and nuisance impacts on R-zoned property. Mitigation can be required via extra landscaping, earlier shut-off times for the lights, cutoff fixtures (where feasible) and other techniques.</td>
<td>Project appears to apply with this standard. The Planning Commission may, as part of their actions, recommend an earlier shutoff time, or other technique aimed at eliminating adverse impacts on neighboring properties, or motorists on Clinton Parkway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Finding** – With the approved administrative waivers, and as conditioned, the site plan complies with the requirements set out in the Development Code.
2. WHETHER THE PROPOSED USE IS COMPATIBLE WITH ADJACENT USES IN TERMS OF SCALE, SITE DESIGN, AND OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS, INCLUDING HOURS OF OPERATION, TRAFFIC GENERATION, LIGHTING, NOISE, ODOR, DUST AND OTHER EXTERNAL IMPACTS

Property Owner’s Response: “The proposed use has been designed to limit noise near residential areas, and provide sufficient screening for lights and site activity.”

To the West
The proposed development will be bordered on the west by the proposed Inverness Corner pad sites. These proposed sites, as laid out in SUP-14-00026, are intended to further provide neighborhood-oriented commercial uses, along with the Family Fun Center, to further enhance the goals set out in the Inverness Park District Plan.

To the North
This property is bordered on the north by a steep embankment before reaching Clinton Parkway.

To the East
This property is bordered on the east by an apartment complex; on the south (across W 24th Place) by another apartment complex. (Figure 3) Property to the west is currently developed with residential homes and duplexes. Property to the north of the property (beyond Clinton Parkway) currently includes duplexes, private recreation facilities, a private school, and commercial offices.

Use
The participant sport uses on the property include batting practice, miniature golfing, and electric go-kart racing, along with uses inside the clubhouse. The clubhouse will feature concessions, in addition to group assembly space for gatherings, such as birthday parties.

Potential Impacts
Artificial noise and light will be created from the proposed use. Prior to approval, staff recommends that a determination be made by the commission regarding amplified noise and lighting on the site.

Public address systems or speakers may create a nuisance for neighboring properties. The planning staff recommends that the commission determine whether speakers or other public-address systems are allowed, and to the degree in which they are used. If these types of systems are allowed by the commission, the extent of use (whether announcements or music), the hours of
usage, and the placement of these devices should be addressed and clarified. Staff has provided a recommendation, but the commission may wish to modify these or add additional conditions. As noted, the items to be considered include:

a. Whether loudspeaker or intercom system permitted;
b. Whether music be allowed or only announcements be allowed;
c. Whether loudspeakers can only be used between certain hours on weeknights; weekends;
d. How potential loudspeakers or intercoms may be positioned in terms of noise projection;
e. Whether go-kart usage should be limited to similar conditions as public address systems or loudspeakers in regards to noise.

The Land Development Code does not allow outdoor activity lights to be used after 11:30pm. Given the hours submitted by the applicant, it should be noted that although lights must be off by 11:30pm, activities may still occur inside the clubhouse. The commission may also consider additional lighting standards, regarding weeknight usage specifically.

In addition to lighting and noise concerns and impacts, precautionary safety measures should be considered in regards to alcohol consumption and usage of electric go-karts.

**Staff Finding** – The property is surrounded by existing developments and is in close proximity to Clinton Parkway, a principal arterial. Residential developments are located on all sides of the development, but have been screened adequately to diminish negative effects that could result from lighting or noise. As conditioned, this plan is compatible with adjacent uses.

**3. WHETHER THE PROPOSED USE WILL CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL DIMINUTION IN VALUE OF OTHER PROPERTY IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD IN WHICH IT IS TO BE LOCATED**

Property Owner’s Response: “The proposed use will not cause neighboring property to decline in value, but instead will provide great amenities to the neighborhood that would increase property value.”

The proposed use will be an amenity to the neighborhood and community. The Inverness Park District Plan intends this property to be used as a neighborhood commercial center, which can be accessed by neighbors via car, bus, bike or walking.

Staff has received numerous communications from residential and non-residential property owners and residents in the area indicating a perceived concern that the proposed use will diminish property value resulting from traffic, noise, lights, general activity, vandalism, and on site alcohol consumption. The applicant has revised the plan to remove the alcohol consumption use in the initial phase of the project. Staff has recommended limitations on hours of operation and lighting to mitigate these concerns. Additionally, staff recommends the Planning Commission consider adding a restriction regarding amplified sound.

**Staff Finding** – There is no evidence to support a finding that the proposed use would cause a diminution in value of other property in the area. **Proposed conditions are intended to mitigate expressed concerns by the public for this use.**
4. **WHETHER PUBLIC SAFETY, TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES WILL BE AVAILABLE TO SERVE THE SUBJECT PROPERTY WHILE MAINTAINING SUFFICIENT LEVELS OF SERVICE FOR EXISTING DEVELOPMENT**

The traffic study was reviewed and accepted by staff. No changes to the surrounding street network are necessary.

Public transit (KU Route 29) currently provides access to this property along W 24th Street, with access to the University of Kansas.

This property can generally be served by water and sewer service. Some additional revisions to the site plan for specific service lines and utility elements should be revised and are reflected as a condition of approval.

**Staff Finding** – Safety, transportation and utility facilities will be available to serve the subject property.

5. **WHETHER ADEQUATE ASSURANCES OF CONTINUING MAINTENANCE HAVE BEEN PROVIDED**

**Staff Finding** – The associated documents (special use permit; photometric plan; building elevation) are the tools used to enforce property maintenance and uses.

All spaces noted in phase two must be maintained as natural turf until constructed.

6. **WHETHER THE USE WILL CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**

Property Owner’s Response: "*The natural environment will be improved with substantial landscaping and eco-friendly development standards to make this site an asset to the natural environment.*

Drainage from the site will be controlled through stormwater management measures approved by the City Stormwater Engineer as part of the drainage study. A detention pond is located in the southeast corner of the property to minimize drainage from the large parking area. The Stormwater Engineer noted several revisions needed to the plan which are reflected as conditions of approval.

**Staff Finding** – The proposed use will not cause significant adverse impacts on the natural environment.

7. **WHETHER IT IS APPROPRIATE TO PLACE A TIME LIMIT ON THE PERIOD OF TIME THE PROPOSED USE IS TO BE ALLOWED BY SPECIAL USE PERMIT AND, IF SO WHAT THAT TIME PERIOD SHOULD BE.**

Time limits are established on Special Use Permits to permit a periodic review to determine if the use remains compliant with the area or if a rezoning would be appropriate. The proposed use is intended to provide an ongoing *Participant Sports & Recreation, Outdoor* use for the community. It would not be appropriate to place a time limit on this Special Use Permit.
Staff Finding – The project provides necessary infrastructure for development; therefore, it would not be appropriate to place a time limit on this use.

SUMMARY
Other than the changes to the physical location of the uses within the subject property the only significant change to the application is a statement from the applicant regarding the voluntary limitation on alcohol sales. As discussed above this use is considered to be accessory in the context of an accessory snack bar to the facility. Consumption of alcohol on premises requires the approval of both a state and local liquor license. Staff recommends that the addition of the “accessory bar” use to the “accessory eating and drinking establishment” within the clubhouse be subject to approval by the City Commission as a future use. Staff further recommends that such use be subject to the public notice provisions of Section 20-1305(q) of the Land Development Code. This will allow for public notice regarding the proposed addition of the specific use rather than the more simplified processing of a liquor license through standard procedures.

The proposed re-arrangement of uses on this site moves the batting cages further from the low-density residential uses located on the west side of Inverness Park.

Staff recommends that details of the batting cages, golf course and go-karts be subject to review and approval of final designs to assure compliance with the commercial design standards, lighting, and landscaping provisions of the City Code.

Additional conditions of approval address details of the plan as well as specific infrastructure and utility requirements applicable to development. Public Improvement Plans will be required for this project.

Conclusion
The proposed Family Fun Center will serve as an amenity and asset to the community. The use is compatible with and appropriate, as conditioned, for this location and staff recommends approval of the Special Use Permit with the conditions noted, if approval of TA-13-00488 and Z-13-00483 has been completed.
November 26, 2013

Sheila Stogsdill  
Planning and Development Services  
6 East 6th St.  
Lawrence, KS 66044

Dear Sheila,

The Family Fun Center is a project that meets a missing niche in the Lawrence entertainment market. The developer is excited about the project potential and is eager to move forward.

The Family Fun Center will provide outdoor uses which will include miniature golf, batting cages and electric go-karts. The go-kart manufacturer has indicated the go-karts will make as little noise as a car would driving down the road at 20 - 30 MPH.

The clubhouse activities will include:
1st Floor - Club rental for miniature golf, birthday party rooms, arcade games and snack area
2nd Floor - Bar with 3.2 liquor license, Nascar driving experience arcade games and miniature bowling

Operating hours are anticipated to be:
Monday - Wednesday, 11AM - 10PM
Thursday and Friday, 11AM - 12AM
Saturday, 10AM - 12AM
Sunday, 12PM - 9PM

Once the Thanksgiving Holiday is over we hope to get together with the neighbors to discuss the above details. If you have additional questions please don't hesitate to ask as we move forward.

Sincerely,

Joy Rhea, RLA
April 2, 2014

Sandra Day  
Planning and Development Services  
6 East 6th St.  
Lawrence, KS 66044

RE: Inverness Corner SP

Sandra:
Attended is the Family Fun Center Site Plan. We believe positive changes have been made to the site plan based on concerns the neighbors voiced. Those changes include:

- The 3.2 Cereal Malt Beverage license will be removed from the proposal for the time being.
- The Clubhouse was moved to the west side of the site.
- The batting cages were moved to the east side of the site to reduce impact to single family residences. In addition, a berm will be placed around the batting cages to further lighten this potential impact.
- The Go-Kart Storage building was relocated slightly.

With the above mentioned changes the notes on Sheet 1 have been revised to reflect accurate information regarding the site summary, parking and landscaping.

Sincerely,

Joy Rhea, RLA

CC:  
Sheila Stogsdl  
Travis Halm  
Paul Werner
April 4, 2014

Re: Proposed Family Fun Center

To Interested Parties,

We will be hosting a meeting on April 14, 2014 at 7:00pm, to discuss the proposed Family Fun Center Project located at Inverness and Clinton Parkway. The meeting will be held at Eldridge Extended, 201 W. 8th Street, Lawrence, Kansas.

On behalf of our client, Kansas Fun Center, LLC, we are pleased to present the following revisions to the proposed project mentioned above.

First, and probably most importantly, the developer will not be seeking a cereal malt beverage license until at least the second season of operation, if at all. To begin with, the sales of 3.2 beer was a minimal component of the project.

Also, we have moved the batting cages as far to the east side of the property as possible to distance them from the single family residences. In addition, a berm will be placed around the batting cages to further lighten the potential impact to the neighboring properties.

We are still analyzing all of the information from various traffic studies for the surrounding schools, apartment buildings, and this project. We hope to be able to present more information at the meeting, as well as at the Planning Commission Meeting.

All of the parking lot lights will be operated by motion detectors. We are hoping that this will discourage anyone from lingering/loitering in the parking lot.

We have had many requests to give more detail about what will be taking place in the clubhouse. The clubhouse will have birthday party rooms, with a KU theme, which will include a hostess to help out parents and will have the option to purchase cake and ice cream. There will also be redemption games such as, basketball shoot-out, whack-a-mole, and skee-ball.. There will also be non-redemption games such as air hockey and race car driving arcade style games. The clubhouse will have a snack area with food and drink options available for purchase.

The upstairs portion of the clubhouse will be an area for parents, that will include games such as miniature bowling arcade games such as Nascar Racing and Golden Tee. The upstairs will also have tables, chairs and a lounge area that will overlook the first floor so that parents can keep an eye on their children who are playing below.

Developers are still exploring other activities, such as laser tag, and would love to hear feedback about other ideas/interests for the facility.
The outdoor area will include a 36 hole miniature golf course. The developer is pursuing miniature golf course layouts, which could include an 18 hold putt-putt style course and an 18 hole theme style course.

The main change that we have made to the west side of the property includes widening the bufferyard along the south end of Inverness drive from 50' to 68'. We have also added a berm to the bufferyard.

We have been contacted by the owner of a local coffee shop that has expressed interest in opening another location on this site. Hopefully this helps to express our desire to have a quality, local business on the site, and not a McDonalds.

We look forward to seeing everyone at the meeting on the 14th.

Sincerely,

Paul Werner
Z-13-00483: Rezone 10.97 acres from RSO District to CN2 District
SUP-13-00486: Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center &
SUP-14-00026: Special Use Permit for Fast Order Food with Drive-thru
Located at 4300 West 24th Place

Lawrence-Douglas County Planning Office
February 2014
Dear Mr. Halm,
Please see the letter below being sent on behalf of the 23 townhome owners at 4301 Wimbledon Terrace. As noted in the letter, we have some serious concerns about the proposed Family Fun Center project under consideration for the vacant land near Clinton Parkway and Inverness. Thank you for forwarding our letter to the Commissioners.
Molly Mulloy
February 14, 2014

Lawrence-Douglas County Planning Commission
Planning & Development Services
PO Box 708
Lawrence KS 66044

Dear Commissioners,

Members of the Wimbledon Terrace Townhomes Association, comprised of the 23 townhome owners at 4301 Wimbledon Terrace, strongly object to the proposed rezoning and special use permit for the large property at 4300 W. 24th Place (southeast corner of Inverness and Clinton Parkway). We are referring to the following items, Z-13-00483, SUP-13-00486, and SUP-14-00026, scheduled for discussion at your meeting on Monday, February 24, 2014. Our townhome development is directly across Clinton Parkway from the proposed project. We believe it will have a seriously negative effect on our neighborhood and the safety of the many children in this area.

We are concerned that the proposed “Family Fun Center” and its go-cart track will result in high levels of noise pollution and toxic emissions, that the miniature golf course and batting cages will require excessively bright lights at night, and that the huge increase in traffic at the already-busy intersection of Inverness & Clinton Parkway will be problematic and even dangerous for the school children crossing that intersection. There are four schools located within a few blocks of the proposed project (Bishop Seabury, Raintree Montessori, Sunflower Elementary, and Southwest Middle School), with hundreds of little children who might be intimidated by the large numbers of teenagers and young adults who would frequent the project. Rather than being built in the midst of this residential area, it would seem more appropriate for the massive “Family Fun Center” project to be built in a more commercial or rural area at the edge of the city such as was done with the youth soccer complex south of town and the new recreation center to the west.

Several homeowners from the Wimbledon Terrace Townhomes Association will be present at the meeting on February 24th and would be happy to explain our concerns at the meeting, if appropriate.

Thank you for considering our objections to this rezoning request.

Respectfully,

Wimbledon Terrace Townhomes Assn.
Molly Mulloy, Executive Committee (mmulloy@ku.edu)
Ruth Hiss, Executive Committee (mrsdeltachi@yahoo.com)
Jane Tedder, Executive Committee (jtedder@sunflower.com)
Debbie Saiz
Alice Holtz
Ann Eversole
Kathy Rauckman
Letty Seidl
Sarah Williamson
I am the property owner of Clinton Parkway Animal Hospital, 4340 Clinton Parkway and a rental house at 4334 Clinton Parkway. We have strived to maintain and improve the outside appearance of those two properties, including a major investment in new landscaping in 2013.

I definitely oppose the rezoning request # Z-13-00483 for 4300 W 24th Place. The noise will be a major issue; it will detract from surrounding properties, and overall is a poor idea for the location, in my opinion.

Respectfully

Gary Olson, DVM
Clinton Parkway Animal Hospital
4340 Clinton Parkway
Lawrence, KS 66047
785-841-3131
February 23, 2014

To Mr. Bryan Culver, Chairman, and Planning Commissioners
Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission

ITEM NO. 4 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE; PARTICIPANT SPORTS & RECREATION,
OUTDOOR USES WITH SUP IN CN2
ITEM NO. 5B: SPECIAL USE PERMIT; FAMILY FUN CENTER; W. 24TH PLACE AND
INVERNESS DRIVE
ITEM NO. 5C: SPECIAL USE PERMIT; FAST ORDER FOOD WITH DRIVE-THRU; 4300 W 24TH
PLACE

Dear Chairman Culver and Planning Commissioners:

For many reasons, we request that you not approve Items No. 4, 5B and 5C.

The CN districts are neighborhood commercial districts and were designed to provide goods and services for the immediate neighborhoods where they are located. The recreational uses that will be permitted, if the Text Amendment, Item No. 4 is approved, permit the type of commercial outdoor recreational uses that have multiple environmental and planning ramifications. We believe that the likely negative impacts of these proposals have not been adequately reviewed in the Staff Report, and when carefully considered, would lead to the conclusion that because of these possible outcomes, they should not be included as permitted uses in the CN districts, even with a SUP.

1. The applicant has indicated the proposed uses in his report to the Staff. The noise levels of the outdoor uses, specifically the batting cages, Go-Karts, and shouting customers, cannot be buffered.
2. The lights will not be able to be properly screened. Although the lights may shine down, the reflections cannot be shielded.
3. The intensity of the traffic can be predicted to be worse at times than would be the case for normal shopping areas.
4. In terms of the planning considerations, the recreational use and the drive-ins will absorb all of the available commercial space so that the uses really needed by a neighborhood such as a drug store, grocery store, sit-down restaurant, and the other uses for which the CN2 District was intended, will not be possible. The Comprehensive Plan severely limits the amount of recreational space for the Neighborhood Centers and the CC200 Centers for this reason (please see Chapter 6 of Horizon 2020, page 6-12, paragraph 2 under the Section, “Recreational Uses.”)
5. The type of outdoor commercial recreation proposed to be permitted here with the SUP we believe belongs in more regionally based commercial districts; that is, the CC4 or CC6 Districts. The more logical location for this type of use would be in the larger shopping center or centers close to the Rock Chalk Park, or for that matter, in the Rock Chalk Park itself.
For the same reasons, we ask that you not approve the SUP for Item No. 5B.

We also ask that you not approve Item No. 5C, the SUP for the Fast Order Food With Drive-Thru use. The Fast Order Food With Drive-Thru use would be much more intense than under normal circumstances because the clientele of the recreation center would add to the customer base. The use itself, was not anticipated for CN districts under normal circumstances because of the increase in traffic and clutter that it would bring, and the combination of fast food drive-thru plus the outdoor commercial recreation center here could do real damage to the neighborhood.

Again, we appeal to the Planning Commission to deny Items 4, 5B, and 5C.

Sincerely yours,

Cille King, President

Alan Black, Chairman
Land Use Committee
Dear Planning Commissioners –

This email is to voice my opposition to the proposed Family Fun Center development project at the corner of Inverness and Clinton Parkway in west Lawrence. I am not opposed to such a center as I believe in general it could be a nice leisure alternative, however think that the placement of such a facility within two blocks of four schools is NOT a wise idea. In addition to the proposal that would allow alcohol be served, the increased traffic in the area would be a hazard. Moreover, I have never seen a development such as this placed squarely in the middle of a residential neighborhood.

I am unable to attend the planning meeting tonight due to previous commitment that cannot be changed so thank you for providing a vehicle to voice opposition to the plan.

Debbie Galbraith
4205 Nicklaus Drive
Dear Planning Commissioners,

We are writing you with concern and opposition to several items to be discussed at your meeting on Monday, February 24th. We are opposed to Item 4, Item 5A, Item 5B, and Item 5C.

We are a family with three small children, so we are not opposed to a "Family Fun Center"; in fact, we believe Lawrence could use a place like this. But we strongly disagree with it being built in the middle of a residential area. We own a house at 4424 Gretchen Ct and enjoy the quiet, family and school focused neighborhood that this area provides. But we believe with the addition of this proposed "Family Fun Center", it would dramatically change our neighborhood. We are opposed to the noise, traffic, alcohol near schools, lights, and late night hours that this place would promote. This is not the right location for this type of facility.

Please understand our concerns.

Thank you.
Dustin & Katie Huff
4424 Gretchen Ct
Dear City Planning Commissioners,

This letter is in regards to the Family Fun Center that is being considered for W 24th Place between Crossgate and Inverness Drives. As I was reading through the article regarding this project I was struck by a number of issues. First, why there? We have land further away from all of the apartments, houses and schools in the area to build this. Why create more noise, lights and traffic in an area that is not empty by any means? That area has plenty of housing and people who prefer it the way it is. I agree that we do need a Family Center - there is no question that we are lacking places for pre-teens and teens to go and hang out that is safe and fun, but to crush it into a development of houses and apartments where the average family is going to be subjected to the loud and often obnoxious teenage behavior that comes with a place like this seems counterproductive. Moreover, this is a college town which means this will not cater to just the elementary, middle school and high school kids, but also the college population. This means that although the place may close at ten or midnight – the noise will continue well into the late night/early morning hours especially if alcohol is going to be served.

Second, I do not understand the need for a BAR at a Family Fun Center. If a person cannot have fun with their children without alcohol, then maybe help is necessary, but certainly not a bar. Alcohol and places like this should NOT exist together. We have plenty of bars in this town and no matter what little alcohol is in the beer – it’s still beer and people can still get drunk and drive. Of course lighting is a huge issue and I can’t imagine how any form of boundary is going to block the lighting of a batting cage area (unless it is indoors). I grew up with batting cages and miniature golf near my house in NJ and I can assure you that the lighting required for the batting cages and miniature golf (if it is an outdoor venue) is incredibly bright (almost like daylight) - imagine that at 10:00 p.m. when you are trying to put a child or yourself to bed. The noise is another factor, the Go-Karts are only a part of it - usually a place like this will have music blaring and people talking over the music and shouting at one another (profanity and all). I recommend that the City Planning Commissioners visit a place like this in a larger city where it is close to housing and see what the effects are. I remember hanging out at our batting cages until midnight or later and the music blaring across the fields while the lights lit up the whole area - you could see the lights from the highway - three miles away. However, we were lucky - our Fun Center was out in the woods nowhere near homes or apartments. This might be something you could consider when picking a spot for this type of venue. If it is there - people will come - and they will drive ten minutes to get there - it is not necessary to put this in the center of family living, you’ll decrease the value of homes and most of the apartments will be empty or rent below average because no one will pay to live by a venue such as this. At first it may seem a great idea to live by such a place, but it won’t take long before people realize the mistake they’ve made and move to get away from the traffic, noise and constant activity that lasts into the late hours.

A third concern has to do with security. I remember the old Putt-Putt from 20 years ago and the roller rink (which is now Kohls) and a big problem was security or lack thereof. When you open a place like this in a college town, you MUST have very good security - not rent-a-cops, but security. A security group that can keep people in line and behaving in crowds that can get a bit rowdy especially if alcohol is involved. Underage drinking is a huge problem in Lawrence and this place serving alcohol will not help the issue. But the right security can help. In NJ our places used off duty police officers or trained bouncers - Lawrence is no longer a small town - it is no longer a small community. Guns, knives, and drugs are growing and a place like this can attract that type of element and security is where it stops. So, please if you vote this project in - please take into consideration that a place like this is great when it is open and doing what it is supposed to do, it's no good to anyone if it's shut down due to violence, drugs or gang activity - it just becomes another empty building on another piece of land which this town cannot afford to have.

Thank you for taking the time to read this e-mail and considering the points. I live near this piece of land and I am very opposed to this project being built so close to us and our extended family. We enjoy the quiet.

Sincerely,
Michele Vignola-Rogers
Planning Commissioners,
I write you with concerns about agenda items 4, 5A, 5B, and 5C regarding the proposed development at 4300 W. 24th Place. My family and I live at 4305 W. 26th Terrace and my daughter attends preschool at Raintree Montessori at 4601 Clinton Parkway. When she begins kindergarten she will attend Sunflower Elementary School at 2521 Inverness Drive. My main concern with the proposed development is the increase in traffic on Inverness and surrounding streets. It appears to me that the one lane traffic circle at 24th Place and Inverness is already close to full capacity. My understanding is that the proposed development may include fast food restaurants. When I see the constant flow of traffic into the McDonalds at 6th and Wakarusa it convinces me that multiple fast food restaurants at 4300 W. 24th Place would create traffic gridlock. At peak hours my guess is that the roads and traffic circle could not handle the traffic from the apartments, the schools, and two fast food restaurants. Also, I do not think that the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed development seems more appropriate for an area that is not right next to residential areas. I have doubts about how much meaningful noise and light mitigation is possible given the extremely close proximity to residences.

Thank you for taking my concerns into account and for your service on the Planning Commission. I sincerely appreciate the time and effort you put into the consideration of this and other important issues for our community.

Respectfully,
Mark Simpson
Dear Planning Commissioners:

My wife (Lori Sinclair) and I are the own and live at 4400 W. 24th Pl., which is directly across Inverness from the potential family fun center and fast-food drive-thru restaurant development. Items 4, 5A, 5B, and 5C on the Commission’s agenda for the February 24th meeting are geared toward enabling this development. We write to oppose it all.

We purchased our home in 2008 because we loved the property and we were attracted to the quiet, appealing nature of the neighborhood, the proximity to neighborhood schools, and the ease of access to outdoor recreation. We take pride in our home and have invested capital to maintain and improve both the inside and outside appearance of our house and property, and we take advantage as much as we can of the benefits of living where we do. We believe the proposed development will interfere with, disrupt, and degrade our quality of life and the value of our property, as well as our neighbors'.

To be clear, we have strong doubts as to the long-term viability of a go-kart, mini-golf entertainment center in Lawrence, but we are not generally opposed to it. But we all have to be smart about it and take into consideration the adjoining properties and owners. We think this proposed development at this particular location is ill-advised for several reasons. First, it will not provide any additional meaningful benefit to our area. This development is being proposed – and the text amendment, rezoning request, and special use permits are being sought – primarily on the basis that the development will provide services to us and our neighbors that are otherwise lacking in our area. This is simply untrue. Our neighborhood enjoys some of the best access in Lawrence to outdoor recreation. Walking trails, bike trails, tennis courts, playgrounds, a running track, soccer fields, softball and baseball fields, batting cages, Clinton Lake, the Pat Dawson Billings Nature Area, the Rotary Arboretum, and more, are all within a short walk/run/bike ride and even shorter drive of our neighborhood. Access to and use of most of these is free. Paid access to go-karts and mini-golf provides absolutely no additional outdoor recreational benefit to us.

Second, the development isn’t suited for our quiet, school-centered residential area. We’ve never seen an outdoor family fun center or fast-food drive-thru restaurants in the middle of a residential area, and there’s reason for that. It doesn’t make sense. The development will bring increased traffic, in this case potentially by people who have been enjoying 3.2 beers, which we fear will increase the risk to the children that walk and play on our sidewalks and streets. Additionally, the streets can’t take additional traffic, especially the roundabout outside our house on Inverness and 24th Place. The development will drastically increase the amount of noise and light pollution, given the nature of the activities and the hours of operation the developer envisions. With groups of people engaging in competitive activities and potentially drinking alcohol, it’s reasonable to believe there will be late-night, disruptive rowdiness. Additionally, we don’t think it’s a good idea to have a bar in such close proximity to four schools and multiple day-cares. Finally, we can’t say enough that there is no reason that we or our neighbors should have to breathe the noxious smells that would emanate from a fast-food restaurant and its garbage dumpsters. It’s unreasonable to assert that a small land buffer would adequately address any of these issues. We understand that it’s easy for the planning staff to assert, without any real analysis or study, that a drive-thru restaurant would not result in “substantial diminution” of our property value, but we’d invite them to tell us if they know of anyone that would be
truthfully interested in buying a house in a residential neighborhood directly across the street from a drive-thru fast food restaurant.

More generally, we have concerns about the long-term viability of the fun center. Can Lawrence truly sustain it? Who is the target group? If it’s college kids, they’re gone for the summers. Is it school students? Having been students in a metropolitan area with access to mini-golf and go-karts, we can both personally attest to the fact that these activities just don’t have permanent appeal. Once or twice is enough. The problem Lori and I have is that if the fun center fails, we would be the ones left with a view from our front porch, living areas, and second-story bedrooms of an abandoned, run-down family fun ghost town.

Finally, without limiting our general opposition to this development and all four agenda items above, we’d like to specifically address the requested text amendment. It’s being proposed as one of four steps in the process of putting the family fun center in our neighborhood. A text amendment to the Development Code to generally allow for outdoor recreation through an SUP in all CN2 areas in Lawrence is a drastic step that ought to be weighed against the relative importance or benefits of the fun center and the costs and effects on adjoining landowners. We don’t think it does, and it certainly doesn’t appear that the text amendment satisfies the factors in Section 20-1302(f).

First, we don’t believe the text amendment is consistent with Horizon 2020 and the Development Code, at least with respect to our neighborhood and the other adjoining landowners. The Development Code is intended to implement Horizon 2020 in a way that “protects, enhances and promotes the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of Lawrence.” As currently drafted the Development Code doesn’t allow for outdoor participant recreational use in either RSO or CN2, even with an SUP. It doesn’t appear anyone believes this was a mistake, and we ought to assume the Development Code was adopted the way it was for good reason. In our situation it certainly makes sense because, for the reasons laid out above, a commercial fun center does not fit in our residential area. We don’t believe changing the rules to allow this particular fun center across the street from our house is in the spirit of protecting, enhancing, or promoting the health, safety, and general welfare of us or our neighbors.

As to the other factor, the text amendment doesn’t purport to fix an inconsistency or error in the development code. Rather, it’s said to meet the challenge of a changing condition; specifically, an increased emphasis on creating a healthy environment for residents. We question how mini-golf, go-karts, arcade games, and a bar create a healthy environment. However, to the extent they do, the development would be better suited in an area that doesn’t already have spectacular pedestrian/bike access to trails, parks, and other outdoor recreation. Perhaps in that case it could be said that a challenge was being met by the text amendment, but that’s just not true as it pertains to our area.

Thank you,
Luke and Lori Sinclair
4400 W. 24th Pl.
Lawrence, KS  66047
From: Kenna Heim [mailto:kennahome1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2014 6:35 AM
To: Bryan C. Culver; bruce@kansascitysailing.com; amalia.graham@gmail.com; montanastan62@gmail.com; jonjosserand@gmail.com; pkelly@usd497.org; denny1@sunflower.com; squampva@aol.com; dcbritt@yahoo.com; eric.c.struckhoff@gmail.com
Subject: Proposed Family Fun Center and Fast Food restaurants

The designated zoning for the area in question is the correct one--Single-Dwelling-Residential-Office. These are the types of buildings that would suit this area so close to Sunflower Elementary and Southwest Middle School. I live on Larkspur Circle off from 27th Street and was concerned to hear new proposals for this property that involve changing the zoning.

On children's football nights, I can already barely get through on 27th due to the parking along the street. Inverness was designed to be a quiet residential and school street. Children may be much more in danger of being run over. Traffic on Wakarusa and all these local streets can become very tight and slow as citizens come and go to the ball park on the south side of the SLT. Please drive down into this area during ball games and see what congestion is present.

Also, the ball fields already have very bright lighting all summer long. I am happy for Lawrence to have a wonderful ball park and deal with the bright lighting because I know how important those sports programs are. Landscaping cannot cover up the bright lights that would come with the proposed "fun" center.

People do need their rest. Noises and light coming from the park would make it uncomfortable for people, especially those with children, who need to be rested to go to work or school in the morning.

Now, as a schoolteacher for USD 497, comes my biggest concern of all. The proposal is to place a fun center within a block or so of schools. When I drive home and these schools are letting out, I see students walking most probably to their homes. These children aren't old enough to drive but they could definitely begin stopping by the "fun" center after school. And what types of people might take advantage of the fact that there was a school close by? Not to be alarmist, but it is a perfect setup for pedophiles to lure children. I think of the little girl in Springfield who so recently was kidnapped and killed near her home. I doubt there was a fun center there, but why would we want to endanger our children any further than what they already are?

The fun center might be a fine idea, but PLEASE find an area further out or one that is zoned for commercial use. Keep the zoning as it currently stands.

Respectfully,

Kenna Heim
4741 Larkspur Circle
Dear Planning Commissioners,

Regarding 4300 W. 24th Place:

- I am in support of conditional rezoning from Residential Office (RSO) to Commercial Neighborhood 2 (CN2), IF the rezoning is tied to this specific project. If the project doesn't get developed, then the zoning would revert back to RSO, and...
  - IF the public process remains in place in perpetuity for the lot for any future lot splits or changes in use, and...
  - IF there is a landscaping buffer along the west side of the property, and...
  - IF multi-family is disallowed for any future development (if at some point 20 years from now a buyer wants to level the Family Fun Center and build apartments)

Neighbors have participated in the development process of the area between Clinton Pkwy/Inverness/W. 27th Street/Crossgate since it was annexed into the city limits. Neighbors supported the initial plan, and prior re-zonings (upzonings) for other lots along W. 24th tied to a senior housing development, including support of more dense development of The Legends as part of the entire project, because the senior housing was planned to be between The Legends apartments and Inverness where students walked and rode bikes. Neighbors asked if there could be conditional rezoning and were told no by city staff. Neighbors trusted that the senior development would be built and supported the entire re-zoning. The Legends were built immediately. The senior housing developer pulled out, and dense apartments catering to partying college students were built instead - The Grove.

Since there isn't currently a buyer for the west lot: regarding a potential future lot split as shown on the proposed plan - either require that the lot split happens now and keep zoning on west lot as RSO until there is a buyer, or if lot split doesn't happen now, keep public comment as part of the process for further development.

- The corner of Inverness and Clinton Parkway is the entrance to three schools, and across the street from a fourth school.
- Traffic is already challenging from that intersection to Inverness and W. 27th St.
- The west corner lot should ideally remain Residential Office (RSO) until there is an actual developer/buyer, so the neighbors can participate in the process.
- A development plan for that corner is irrelevant when there is no buyer or tenant, because it will be scrapped and redrawn when there is a buyer/tenant.
- Rezoning now to CN2 would allow any project that conforms to be processed through with no public input, which would probably eliminate any landscaping buffer, and probably result in a more 'commercial' high use.
- Many children and community members use the sidewalks along that corner, so public input about the best use and plan is significantly important.
- Neighbors are not in support of drive-thru restaurants at this location because of already congested traffic.
- Neighbors are still interested in finding a way to purchase that corner and make it a public park, and possibly a membership swimming pool, through a special tax or Homeowner's Association. If anyone has suggestions and guidance on how to accomplish that, please let me know.
I am in support of the text amendment allowing outdoor use for this specific project, but not for all CN2 zoned properties.

I am NOT in support of alcohol sales at a Family Fun Park. There should not be alcohol sales in such close proximity to four schools, and across the street from a church. Alcohol will increase the possibility of fights, the potential for underage alcohol sales/drinking, and increase the potential for adults to drink and drive in parking lots and streets with children, and with children in their vehicles.

I am in support of open hours until 10:00 pm Sunday-Thursday, and 11:00 pm on Friday and Saturday, which is a reduction from the plan.

The area between Clinton Parkway/Inverness/Crossgate/W. 27th Street has been a development in progress for a number of years. Neighbors want a development plan that will benefit the neighborhood, the schools, and the Lawrence community. Lawrence will benefit from having a place where families and kids can enjoy outdoor activities.

Sincerely,

Jamie Hulse
4403 Gretchen Ct.
Lawrence KS 66047
We understand that there is a proposed development including a go kart track close to our home in Alvamar.

Nothing could drive down home values faster not to mention disrupt sleep of we and our neighbors than this project.

We ask that you please not approve this.

Thank you,
Bob & Jennifer Grabill
2027 Hogan Ct.
(Masters Subdivision)
Dear Planning Commissioners,

Regarding 4300 W. 24th Place and the rezoning request – my husband and I are writing in opposition. I could list a multitude of reasons, but the main one is right there in the request – rezoning from Residential Office to Commercial Neighborhood. The word commercial changes the nature of the entire landscape. It’s going to wreck the entire feel and value of our neighborhood – much like when we allowed the property to be rezoned to allow for a senior housing development that never panned out. We were stuck instead with dense apartment buildings with partying college students and an increase in all the disruptions that come with them. I’m not going to trust that if we change the zoning the Fun Center actually gets built in the way the developer states it will. I also don’t like the idea of drive-thru fast food restaurants being built that close to my home. Again, it changes an area from a neighborhood to a commercial area – no thank you.

We have three schools in the immediate area and while I can appreciate the idea of building something to attract that demographic, I also really don’t like the idea of increased traffic on Inverness – a road that hasn’t been built for commercial use, but residential use.

Thank you for your time!

Leann & Andrew Cooper
4408 Gretchen Ct.
Lawrence, KS 66047
Planning Commission Members,

Our neighbors Luke and Lori Sinclair have summed up our feelings on this matter almost perfectly. But to add our own thoughts...

We are certainly in support of small locally owned businesses having the opportunity to start, thrive and grow. This however is a bad idea doomed to fail almost immediately. Not only is it a bad idea, but it is a bad location for a business of this sort period. Factor in everything the Sinclairs have said about why it's bad for our neighborhood, but it's just a stupid location for a business of this sort.

What would make anyone think a go-cart track in Lawrence Kansas is going to thrive? Take a drive through Branson MO, the capital of family tourism in this part of the country and umpteen of these are sitting idle and deteriorating. How do I know? I've only been traveling there on business monthly for the past 27 years! We do not have the tourism to even try to support this type of business, let alone off the beaten path in a residential neighborhood.

The Clinton Parkway and Inverness intersection as well as the 24th Place and Inverness Roundabout on down to the Crossgate and 24th Place roundabout have far too much traffic with all of the "student" apartments, school traffic and access to the Wakarusa and K10 entrance. Having said this, this a residential neighborhood and not an entertainment district. Our neighborhood does not need any more traffic, let alone late night traffic or the light pollution that would come with this.

Please find a more suitable location for this type of business like near the K10 and 6th Street interchange. We welcome reasonable development on this plot such as light commercial office space which operates with a minimum of traffic during normal business hours.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Steve and Tami Clark
4425 W 24th Pl
From: Angela Jacobson [mailto:angelamk@swbell.net]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 10:54 AM
To: amalia.graham@gmail.com; montanastan62@gmail.com; ionjossierand@gmail.com; pkelly@usd497.org; Bryan C. Culver; denney1@sunflower.com; squampva@aol.com; clay.britton@yahoo.com; bruce@kansascitysailing.com; eric.c.struckhoff@gmail.com
Subject: Feedback regarding proposed family fun center (Clinton Parkway and Inverness)

Commissioners:

My husband and I live at 4416 Gretchen Ct. and have concerns about the proposed family fun center. In a perfect world, I think it is fair to say that the neighborhood would love for the space to be used as a green space or park. However, as it appears that that is not an option, the family fun center is more attractive than apartments.

In regard to the proposed plan, we have two main concerns:

First, we strongly oppose the sale of alcohol at the proposed family fun center because of its location being so near to several schools and the certain issues that will arise from having alcohol available at a facility like this with motorized vehicles surrounded by apartments filled with college students.

Second, because of the proximity to so many neighborhoods with families, we are opposed to the hours of operation running so late into the evening, particularly on Thursday night. Why not 8 or 9 p.m. during the week and 10 p.m. on weekends? The proposed go carts may be quieter than others but when you have 5 or 10 of them running at the same time, that is sure to cause trouble with noise pollution, particularly when the weather permits families to have windows open.

We also believe that whatever zoning needs to happen to ensure that neighbors have a voice as this process continues, including the development of the land nearest Inverness is critical. This area began as a residential area filled with families and schools. It is important that the area (homes, property values, kids, schools, safety) be protected.

Thank you

Angela & Thomas Jacobson
4416 Gretchen Ct.

Angela Jacobson
angelamk@swbell.net
(785)841-0376
Sheila

"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: Bryan C. Culver [mailto:BCulver@bankingunusual.com]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 10:57 AM
To: Scott McCullough; Sheila Stogsdill
Subject: FW: Feedback regarding proposed family fun center (Clinton Parkway and Inverness)

Bryan C. Culver
Vice President
Wealth Management Officer
4831 West 6th Street
Lawrence, KS 66049
785-842-4300 Office
785-830-4623 Fax
785-760-2820 Mobile
NMLS# 861527

From: Angela Jacobson [mailto:angelamk@swbell.net]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 10:54 AM
To: amalia.graham@gmail.com; montanastan62@gmail.com; jonjosserand@gmail.com; pkelley@usd497.org; Bryan C. Culver; denney1@sunflower.com; squampva@aol.com; clay.britton@yahoo.com; bruce@kansascitysailing.com; eric.c.struckhoff@gmail.com
Subject: Feedback regarding proposed family fun center (Clinton Parkway and Inverness)

Commissioners:

My husband and I live at 4416 Gretchen Ct. and have concerns about the proposed family fun center. In a perfect world, I think it is fair to say that the neighborhood would love for the space to be used as a green space or park. However, as it appears that that is not an option, the family fun center is more attractive than apartments.

In regard to the proposed plan, we have two main concerns:

First, we strongly oppose the sale of alcohol at the proposed family fun center because of its
location being so near to several schools and the certain issues that will arise from having alcohol available at a facility like this with motorized vehicles surrounded by apartments filled with college students.

Second, because of the proximity to so many neighborhoods with families, we are opposed to the hours of operation running so late into the evening, particularly on Thursday night. Why not 8 or 9 p.m. during the week and 10 p.m. on weekends? The proposed go carts may be quieter than others but when you have 5 or 10 of them running at the same time, that is sure to cause trouble with noise pollution, particularly when the weather permits families to have windows open.

We also believe that whatever zoning needs to happen to ensure that neighbors have a voice as this process continues, including the development of the land nearest Inverness is critical. This area began as a residential area filled with families and schools. It is important that the area (homes, property values, kids, schools, safety) be protected.

Thank you

Angela & Thomas Jacobson
4416 Gretchen Ct.

Angela Jacobson
angelamk@swbell.net
(785)841-0376
March 7, 2014

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As Head of School at Bishop Seabury Academy (4120 Clinton Parkway), I have been following with interest and concern the proposed rezoning (Z-13-00483) of the lot at 4300 W. 24th Place from a Residential area to a Neighborhood Shopping Center (CN2). I attended the meeting at Raintree Elementary School, and I appreciated Mr. Werner’s appearing to explain the project. I would not be opposed to such a development were it appearing (logically) on the outskirts of town and in an area zoned deliberately for this sort of development. However, I think this rezoning is inherently and obviously very bad news for everyone who lives or attends school in the area. Homeowners in the area have very good reason to be anxious, and they voiced their concerns at the meeting. I will focus on my own concerns.

I feel certain that this sort of an entertainment park will attract a lot of middle school, high school, and college students at all times of the day, but especially at night. (I have to think that developers conceived of this project with a captive afternoon audience in mind: the students at Bishop Seabury Academy, Southwest Middle School, and perhaps Raintree and Sunflower Elementary Schools.) The presence of alcohol in this park is unwise. It would be naïve to think that underage high school and college students who find a way to drink in other Lawrence bars will not find a way to drink at the bar in this park. And when they leave the facility at 10 pm or midnight—bedtime for adults, perhaps, but not for park guests aged 14-25—they will look around and wonder what they should do next. And they will have two schools nearby with football fields, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, and a closed, unsupervised pool with a gate that is easily climbed. They will have the secluded spaces behind Raintree. As I noted at the Raintree meeting, I am an advocate for young people and believe in their better nature, but they also make bad choices at times. If this park is allowed to be developed in this residential area, it will not be the developer, architect, management, or the city planning committee who will have to deal with this situation. It will be the people who live in this area.

I was asked by Mr. Werner if I would feel more comfortable about the situation should alcohol be taken off the table. I admit that the presence of alcohol is one of the most bewilderingly inappropriate aspects of this proposal and raises the stakes, especially when neighbors have no certainty about the future usage of this area (Family Fun Center or other entertainment feature). But focusing on this one proposed entertainment park project, the absence of liquor would not stop drinking or the potential late night behavior. The sort of features offered by the park will lend themselves to students showing up intoxicated and/or keeping liquor in their cars or on their persons. Perhaps I am excessively cynical here, but my job as Head of School is to think of worst-case scenarios, and in my experience, what I am suggesting hardly requires a dark imagination.

Also at the Raintree meeting yesterday, there was much discussion about neighborhood concerns regarding lighting, noise, security, the quality of judgment demonstrated by young seasonal park employees, and even the uncertainty of what project will inhabit this lot (again, in the center of a residential area of town) not only next year but in 5, 10, and 20 years. Despite the helpful speculations
by the architect on all of these issues—assurances which are the lubricant to get this motion passed—there is no guarantee on any of them. And if you allow this rezoning to occur, the neighbors and schools will be at the mercy of whatever development occurs in this area.

I want the planning committee members to understand that I do not envy their job, and I do not think it is for me to dictate what sort of construction occurs in the neighborhood surrounding my school. However, I think it is very reasonable to see that rezoning and special use permits are difficult hurdles for developers in a situation like this because restrictions are in place for a reason. There is logic and a reason for consistency with these decisions. There is a reason that the present zoning exists.

With respect, I strongly encourage you to oppose this rezoning. And as a final test to this decision making, I would ask you to consider if you would be willing to move into a residence alongside the Family Fun Center if it is built. If you would not, then you will understand how we feel.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

Dr. Don M. Schawang

Head of School
Bishop Seabury Academy
In my spam

Scott McCullough, Director
Planning and Development Services – www.lawrenceks.org
City Hall, 6 E. 6th 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: Bryan C. Culver [mailto:BCulver@bankingunusual.com]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 10:25 AM
To: Scott McCullough; Sheila Stogsdill
Subject: FW: Proposed development

We understand that there is a proposed development including a go kart track close to our home in Alvamar.

Nothing could drive down home values faster not to mention disrupt sleep of we and our neighbors than this project.
We ask that you please not approve this.

Thank you,
Bob & Jennifer Grabill
2027 Hogan Ct.
(Masters Subdivision)
I just received a phone message from a Larry G. (25th & Inverness) about the project. He stated he was opposed to the rezoning and attended the meeting at Raintree along with approximately 80 others and lots of students. It was unanimous that residents were opposed to the request other than the presenters. He is a former junior high teachers and agrees that there is a need for after school activities but that this location is inappropriate. He will forward his concerns in a future email. He did not leave a phone number.
From: Scott McCullough
To: Denny Ewert; Sandra Day
Cc: Sheila Stogsdill
Subject: FW: OPPOSITION to Proposed Development for corner of Inverness and Clinton Parkway
Date: Monday, February 24, 2014 9:50:24 AM

For PC and applicant.

Scott McCullough, Director
Planning and Development Services – www.lawrenceks.org
City Hall, 6 E. 6th 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: Bryan C. Culver [mailto:BCulver@bankingunusual.com]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 9:50 AM
To: Scott McCullough; Sheila Stogsdill
Subject: FW: OPPOSITION to Proposed Development for corner of Inverness and Clinton Parkway

Bryan C. Culver
Vice President
Wealth Management Officer
4831 West 6th Street
Lawrence, KS 66049
785-842-4300 Office
785-830-4623 Fax
785-760-2820 Mobile
NMLS# 861527

From: Deborah M. Galbraith [mailto:dgalbraith@waverly-partners.com]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 9:49 AM
To: 'amalia.graham@gmail.com'; 'montanastan62@gmail.com'; 'jonjoserand@gmail.com'; 'pkelly@usd497.org'; 'bculver@bankingunusual.com'; 'denney1@sunflower.com'; 'squampva@aol.com'; 'clay.brifton@yahoo.com'; 'bruce@kansascitysailing.com'; 'eric.c.struckhoff@gmail.com'
Subject: OPPOSITION to Proposed Development for corner of Inverness and Clinton Parkway

Dear Planning Commissioners – This email is to voice my opposition to the proposed Family Fun Center development project at the corner of Inverness and Clinton Parkway in west Lawrence. I am not opposed to such a center as I believe in general it could be a nice leisure alternative, however I think that the placement of such a facility within two blocks of four schools is NOT a wise idea. In addition to the proposal that would allow alcohol be served, the increased traffic in the
area would be a hazard. Moreover, I have never seen a development such as this placed squarely in the middle of a residential neighborhood.

I am unable to attend the planning meeting tonight due to previous commitment that cannot be changed so thank you for providing a vehicle to voice opposition to the plan.

Debbie Galbraith
4205 Nicklaus Drive
Scott McCullough, Director
Planning and Development Services – www.lawrenceks.org
City Hall, 6 E. 6th 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: Bryan C. Culver [mailto:BCulver@bankingunusual.com]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 9:42 AM
To: Scott McCullough; Sheila Stogsdill
Subject: FW: Planning Commission Meeting

Dear Planning Commissioners,

We are writing you with concern and opposition to several items to be discussed at your meeting on Monday, February 24th. We are opposed to Item 4, Item 5A, Item 5B, and Item 5C.
We are a family with three small children, so we are not opposed to a "Family Fun Center"; in fact, we believe Lawrence could use a place like this. But we strongly disagree with it being built in the middle of a residential area. We own a house at 4424 Gretchen Ct and enjoy the quiet, family and school focused neighborhood that this area provides. But we believe with the addition of this proposed "Family Fun Center", it would dramatically change our neighborhood. We are opposed to the noise, traffic, alcohol near schools, lights, and late night hours that this place would promote. This is not the right location for this type of facility.

Please understand our concerns.

Thank you.
Dustin & Katie Huff
4424 Gretchen Ct
Bryan C. Culver  
Vice President  
Wealth Management Officer  
4831 West 6th Street  
Lawrence, KS 66049  
785-842-4300 Office  
785-830-4623 Fax  
785-760-2820 Mobile  
NMLS# 861527

-----Original Message-----
From: Eileen Jones [mailto:eejones@ku.edu]
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 9:43 AM
To: Bryan C. Culver
Subject: location of proposed "family fun center"

Dear Mr. Culver,

As a KU employee and a resident of Lawrence for 10 years (Fox Chase neighborhood in west Lawrence), I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed location at the intersection of Clinton Parkway and Inverness.

As a parent of three children who attended Southwest Junior High and the grandparent of a first-grader at Raintree Montessori School, I am familiar with the traffic patterns at that intersection. That intersection serves traffic for two public and two private schools and an entire neighborhood which does not have other avenues onto Clinton Parkway. Traffic is very heavy in the morning and afternoon - pickup and dropoff at Raintree is very busy - and I do not believe that intersection can safely handle any more traffic.

The effect of the "family fun center" on the residents of that neighborhood and on the families attending those four schools would be devastating. The safety issues created by increased traffic are obvious, and I believe there are other safety issues of a cultural nature with a rec center being so close to schools. I think it would encourage truancy and also the influence of elements outside the schools (including drug sales).

In addition to the inconvenience and danger that additional traffic would pose for neighborhood residents and student families traveling there, home values in that fairly new neighborhood will be negatively impacted. My husband and I are looking for a starter home for our daughter and her young family, and already we have eliminated that neighborhood from our real estate search, and only because of the proposed “family fun center”.

I am not opposed to a new recreational center, but in my opinion this location is a very poor one. Please stay away from schools and established, quiet family neighborhoods. A location close to the new Rock Chalk park would make more sense, and the 6th-and-Folks to downtown bus could extend its route westward to go to the new rec center.

Thank you for allowing me to express my view.
Eileen Jones  
1124 Summerfield Way  
Lawrence, KS 66049  
(785) 979-2129
From: Jonathan Flanner [mailto:jonflanner@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 10:29 AM
To: Bryan C. Culver; scott.mccullough@lawrence.edu; amy.graham@gmail.com; montana@sunflower.com; jon@sunflower.com; pkelly@usd497.org; denny1@sunflower.com; squampva@aol.com; dcbritt@yahoo.com; eric.c.struckhoff@gmail.com
Cc: Lowell Flanner
Subject: Proposed Re-Zoning for Family Fun Center

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I'm Jonathan Flanner, a 30-year Douglas County resident, Lawrence worker, Raintree parent, and number one fan of Lawrence. I'm reaching out to you to voice concerns about the proposed re-zoning of the Inverness & Clinton Parkway area marketed as a Family Fun Center.

There are several factors about this proposed rezoning which give me pause.

1) The location of a large commercial property serving alcohol, and fast food restaurants in close proximity to a quiet residential and four-school neighborhood. Traffic, noise, vandalism, drunk driving will surely increase in what is currently a beautiful, peaceful, quiet neighborhood that despite being developed still retains the character of the rural land it was not long ago - a peaceful ambiance that the original Horizon 2020 plan intended to preserve on Clinton Parkway.

2) A "Family Fun Center" which serves alcohol, presumably to parents and young adults, where children are playing. To me, this does not compute. I am not a prude, but let me give you an example - have you been to a Chiefs game? Adults + alcohol + rowdy 'fun' atmosphere = cursing galore and an environment that isn't conducive to family fun. Are the parents drinking while the kids engage in the fun activities? Is the alcohol a draw for young adults in our community...and if so how does that jive with the stated target audience of having a space for young kids to play and have fun? If Kansas liquor laws continue to relax as the trend has gone, will we see the 3.2 beer standard disappear and full bar possible at this site?

3) The developers. Why don't we know who they are? Is this a group of folks who respect the effects of underage drinking in our community, or are they current liquor license-holders who consider a citation from the ABC simply the cost of doing business in a college town? There is a level of trust
involved when the city decides to deviate from a long-term strategic plan (Horizon 2020) to allow commercial development ("trust us - it won't be loud, trust us - it won't affect traffic, trust us - the alcohol will not increase crime in the neighborhood") - do these developers have a history of violating our city's trust?

4) The framing of this project by the spokesperson at the community meeting. The architect indicated that there just isn't enough for kids to do in Lawrence, as though this proposal is a community service. First, that is patently false. Find me a parent in Lawrence who can't find things for their children to do and I will show you someone who isn't looking. Second, where is the evidence that this is true? Are the current facilities at capacity?

These were my initial concerns after attending the community meeting last night at Raintree and listening to the proposal from the developers. The room was packed with local residents of all ages and parents of children at the four schools adjacent to the site and I didn't hear one word of enthusiasm or support for this idea at this location.

Thank you for your time in reviewing these concerns. I fervently hope you and the other commissioners will listen to the community and hear that this rezoning is not what is best for the people who live and educate their children at Inverness & Clinton. It is a beautiful part of our city and we would like to keep it that way.

I look forward to the Planning Commission meeting on March 24th.

Sincerely,

Kelli Flanner
I am the property owner of Clinton Parkway Animal Hospital, 4340 Clinton Parkway and a rental house at 4334 Clinton Parkway. We have strived to maintain and improve the outside appearance of those two properties, including a major investment in new landscaping in 2013.

I definitely oppose the rezoning request # Z-13-00483 for 4300 W 24th Place. The noise will be a major issue; it will detract from surrounding properties, and overall is a poor idea for the location, in my opinion.

Respectfully

[Signature]

Gary Olson, DVM
Clinton Parkway Animal Hospital
4340 Clinton Parkway
Lawrence, KS 66047
785-841-3131

RECEIVED

JAN 10 2014

City County Planning Office
Lawrence, Kansas
Scott McCullough, Director
Planning and Development Services – www.lawrenceks.org
City Hall, 6 E. 6th 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/adc/survey/satisfaction"

From: Bryan C. Culver [mailto:BCulver@bankingunusual.com]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 9:42 AM

Subject: Rezoning of 4300 W. 24th Place

To: Scott McCullough; Sheila Stogo#1

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Regarding 4300 W. 24th Place:

- I am in support of conditional rezoning from Residential Office (RSO) to Commercial Neighborhood 2 (CN2).
  - the rezoning is tied to this specific project. If the project doesn’t get developed, then the zoning would revert back to RSO, and...
  - If the public process remains in place in perpetuity for the lot for any future lot splits or changes in use, and...
  - If there is a landscaping buffer along the west side of the property, and...
  - If multi-family is disallowed for any future development (if at some point 20 years from now a buyer wants to level the Family Fun Center and build apartments).

Neighbors have participated in the development process of the area between Clinton Pkwy/Inverness/W. 27th Street/Crossgate since it was annexed into the city limits. Neighbors supported the initial plan, and prior re-zonings (upzonings) for other lots along W. 24th tied to a senior housing development, including support of more dense development of The Legends were built immediately. The senior housing developer pulled out, and dense apartments catering to partying college students were built instead - The Grove.

The west corner lot should ideally remain Residential Office (RSO) until there is an actual developer/buyer, so the neighbors can participate in the process. Traffic is already challenging from that intersection to Inverness and W. 27th St.

Since there isn’t currently a buyer for the west lot: regarding a potential future lot split as shown on the proposed plan - either require that the lot split happens now and keep zoning on west lot as RSO until there is a buyer, or if lot split doesn’t happen now, keep public comment as part of the process for further development:

- The corner of Inverness and Clinton Parkway is the entrance to three schools, and across the street from a fourth school.
- Traffic is already challenging from that intersection to Inverness and W. 27th St.
- The west corner lot should ideally remain Residential Office (RSO) until there is an actual developer/buyer, so the neighbors can participate in the process.
- A development plan for that corner is irrelevant when there is no buyer or tenant, because it will be scrapped and redrawn when there is a buyer/tenant.
- Rezoning now to CN2 would allow any project that conforms to be processed through with no public input, which would probably eliminate any landscaping buffer, and probably result in a more ‘commercial’ high use.
- Many children and community members use the sidewalks along that corner, so public input about the best use and plan is significantly important.
- Neighbors are not in support of drive-thru restaurants at this location because of already congested traffic.
- Neighbors are still interested in finding a way to purchase that corner and make it a public park, and possibly a membership swimming pool, through a special tax or Homeowner’s Association. If anyone has suggestions and guidance on how to accomplish that, please let me know.

- I am in support of the text amendment allowing outdoor use for this specific project, but not for all CN2 zoned properties.
- I am NOT in support of alcohol sales at a Family Fun Park. There should not be alcohol sales in such close proximity to four schools, and across the street from a church. Alcohol will increase the possibility of fights, the potential for underage alcohol sales/drinking, and increase the potential for adults to drink and drive in parking lots and streets with children, and with children in their vehicles.
- I am in support of open hours until 10:00 pm Sunday-Thursday, and 11:00 pm on Friday and Saturday, which is a reduction from the plan.

The area between Clinton Parkway/Inverness/Crossgate/W. 27th Street has been a development in progress for a number of years. Neighbors want a development plan that will benefit...
the neighborhood, the schools, and the Lawrence community. Lawrence will benefit from having a place where families and kids can enjoy outdoor activities.

Sincerely,

Jamie Hulse
4403 Gretchen Ct.
Lawrence KS 66047
Not much to this one but still a communication received none the less.

---

From: Janet Graybill [mailto:janetgraybill@live.com]
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 4:57 PM
To: bruce@kansascitysailing.com; amalia.graham@gmail.com; montanastan62@gmail.com; jonjosserand@gmail.com; pkelly@usd497.org; denny1@sunflower.com; squampva@aol.com; clay.britton@yahoo.com; eric.cstruckhoff@gmail.com; Bryan C. Culver
Subject: Opposition to proposed development for corner of Inverness and Clinton Parkway

Dear City Planning Commissioners,

Please add our voices to all those opposing the Family Fun Center.

Janet and Bill Graybill
4119 Wimbledon Circle
Dear Planning Commissioners,

I'm Kelli Flanner, a 30-year Douglas County resident, Lawrence worker, Raintree parent, and number one fan of Lawrence. I'm reaching out to you to voice concerns about the proposed re-zoning of the Inverness & Clinton Parkway area marketed as a Family Fun Center.

There are several factors about this proposed rezoning which give me pause.

1) The location of a large commercial property serving alcohol, and fast food restaurants in close proximity to a quiet residential and four-school neighborhood. Traffic, noise, vandalism, drunk driving will surely increase in what is currently a beautiful, peaceful, quiet neighborhood that despite being developed still retains the character of the rural land it was not long ago - a peaceful ambiance that the original Horizon 2020 plan intended to preserve on Clinton Parkway.

2) A "Family Fun Center" which serves alcohol, presumably to parents and young adults, where children are playing. To me, this does not compute. I am not a prude, but let me give you an example - have you been to a Chiefs game? Adults + alcohol + rowdy 'fun' atmosphere = cursing galore and an environment that isn't conducive to family fun. Are the parents drinking while the kids engage in the fun activities? Is the alcohol a draw for young adults in our community...and if so how does that jive with the stated target audience of having a space for young kids to play and have fun? If Kansas liquor laws continue to relax as the trend has gone, will we see the 3.2 beer standard disappear and full bar possible at this site?

3) The developers. Why don't we know who they are? Is this a group of folks who respect the effects of underage drinking in our community, or are they current liquor license-holders who consider a citation from the ABC simply the cost of doing business in a college town? There is a level of trust
involved when the city decides to deviate from a long-term strategic plan (Horizon 2020) to allow commercial development ("trust us - it won't be loud, trust us - it won't affect traffic, trust us - the alcohol will not increase crime in the neighborhood") - do these developers have a history of violating our city's trust?

4) The framing of this project by the spokesperson at the community meeting. The architect indicated that there just isn't enough for kids to do in Lawrence, as though this proposal is a community service. First, that is patently false. Find me a parent in Lawrence who can't find things for their children to do and I will show you someone who isn't looking. Second, where is the evidence that this is true? Are the current facilities at capacity?

These were my initial concerns after attending the community meeting last night at Raintree and listening to the proposal from the developers. The room was packed with local residents of all ages and parents of children at the four schools adjacent to the site and I didn't hear one word of enthusiasm or support for this idea at this location.

Thank you for your time in reviewing these concerns. I fervently hope you and the other commissioners will listen to the community and hear that this rezoning is not what is best for the people who live and educate their children at Inverness & Clinton. It is a beautiful part of our city and we would like to keep it that way.

I look forward to the Planning Commission meeting on March 24th.

Sincerely,

Kelli Flanner
Scott McCullough, Director
Planning and Development Services – www.lawrenceks.org
City Hall, 6 E. 6th 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."

Bryan C. Culver
Vice President
Wealth Management Officer
4831 West 6th Street
Lawrence, KS 66049
785-842-4300 Office
785-830-4623 Fax
785-760-2820 Mobile
NMLS# 861527

Kenna Heim
Proposed Family Fun Center and Fast Food restaurants

The designated zoning for the area in question is the correct one—Single-Dwelling-Residential-Office. These are the types of buildings that would suit this area so close to Sunflower Elementary and Southwest Middle School. I live on Larkspur Circle off from 27th Street and was concerned to hear new proposals for this property that involve changing the zoning.
On children's football nights, I can already barely get through on 27th due to the parking along the street. Inverness was designed to be a quiet residential and school street. Children may be much more in danger of being run over. Traffic on Wakarusa and all these local streets can become very tight and slow as citizens come and go to the ball park on the south side of the SLT. Please drive down into this area during ball games and see what congestion is present.

Also, the ball fields already have very bright lighting all summer long. I am happy for Lawrence to have a wonderful ball park and deal with the bright lighting because I know how important those sports programs are. Landscaping cannot cover up the bright lights that would come with the proposed "fun" center.

People do need their rest. Noises and light coming from the park would make it uncomfortable for people, especially those with children, who need to be rested to go to work or school in the morning.

Now, as a schoolteacher for USD 497, comes my biggest concern of all. The proposal is to place a fun center within a block or so of schools. When I drive home and these schools are letting out, I see students walking most probably to their homes. These children aren't old enough to drive but they could definitely begin stopping by the "fun" center after school. And what types of people might take advantage of the fact that there was a school close by? Not to be alarmist, but it is a perfect setup for pedophiles to lure children. I think of the little girl in Springfield who so recently was kidnapped and killed near her home. I doubt there was a fun center there, but why would we want to endanger our children any further than what they already are?

The fun center might be a fine idea, but PLEASE find an area further out or one that is zoned for commercial use. Keep the zoning as it currently stands.

Respectfully,

Kenna Heim
4741 Larkspur Circle
This one was in my spam.

Scott McCullough, Director  
Planning and Development Services – www.lawrenceks.org  
City Hall, 6 E. 6th 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: Bryan C. Culver [mailto:BCulver@bankingunusual.com]  
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 9:43 AM  
To: Scott McCullough; Sheila Stogsdill  
Subject: FW: Rezoning of 4300 W. 24th Place

Leann Cooper [mailto:lcooper@gcsaa.org]  
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 9:35 AM  
To: amalia.graham@gmail.com; montanastan62@gmail.com; jonjosserand@gmail.com; pkelley@usd497.org; Bryan C. Culver; denney1@sunflower.com; squampya@aol.com; clay.britton@yahoo.com; bruce@kansascitysailing.com; eric.c.struckhoff@gmail.com  
Subject: Rezoning of 4300 W. 24th Place

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Regarding 4300 W. 24th place and the rezoning request – my husband and I are writing in opposition. I could list a multitude of reasons, but the main one is right there in the request – rezoning from Residential Office to Commercial Neighborhood. The word commercial changes the
nature of the entire landscape. It’s going to wreck the entire feel and value of our neighborhood – much like when we allowed the property to be rezoned to allow for a senior housing development that never panned out. We were stuck instead with dense apartment buildings with partying college students and an increase in all the disruptions that come with them. I’m not going to trust that if we change the zoning the Fun Center actually gets built in the way the developer states it will. I also don’t like the idea of drive-thru fast food restaurants being built that close to my home. Again, it changes an area from a neighborhood to a commercial area – no thank you.

We have three schools in the immediate area and while I can appreciate the idea of building something to attract that demographic, I also really don’t like the idea of increased traffic on Inverness – a road that hasn’t been built for commercial use, but residential use.

Thank you for your time!

Leann & Andrew Cooper
4408 Gretchen Ct.
Lawrence, KS 66047
February 23, 2014

To Mr. Bryan Culver, Chairman, and Planning Commissioners
Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission

ITEM NO. 4 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE; PARTICIPANT SPORTS & RECREATION, OUTDOOR USES WITH SUP IN CN2
ITEM NO. 5B: SPECIAL USE PERMIT; FAMILY FUN CENTER; W. 24TH PLACE AND INVERNESS DRIVE
ITEM NO. 5C: SPECIAL USE PERMIT; FAST ORDER FOOD WITH DRIVE-THRU; 4300 W 24TH PLACE

Dear Chairman Culver and Planning Commissioners:

For many reasons, we request that you not approve Items No. 4, 5B and 5C.

The CN districts are neighborhood commercial districts and were designed to provide goods and services for the immediate neighborhoods where they are located. The recreational uses that will be permitted, if the Text Amendment, Item No. 4 is approved, permit the type of commercial outdoor recreational uses that have multiple environmental and planning ramifications. We believe that the likely negative impacts of these proposals have not been adequately reviewed in the Staff Report, and when carefully considered, would lead to the conclusion that because of these possible outcomes, they should not be included as permitted uses in the CN districts, even with a SUP.

1. The applicant has indicated the proposed uses in his report to the Staff. The noise levels of the outdoor uses, specifically the batting cages, Go-Karts, and shouting customers, cannot be buffered.
2. The lights will not be able to be properly screened. Although the lights may shine down, the reflections cannot be shielded.
3. The intensity of the traffic can be predicted to be worse at times than would be the case for normal shopping areas.
4. In terms of the planning considerations, the recreational use and the drive-ins will absorb all of the available commercial space so that the uses really needed by a neighborhood such as a drug store, grocery store, sit-down restaurant, and the other uses for which the CN2 District was intended, will not be possible. The Comprehensive Plan severely limits the amount of recreational space for the Neighborhood Centers and the CC200 Centers for this reason (please see Chapter 6 of Horizon 2020, page 6-12, paragraph 2 under the Section, “Recreational Uses.”)
5. The type of outdoor commercial recreation proposed to be permitted here with the SUP we believe belongs in more regionally based commercial districts; that is, the CC4 or CC6 Districts. The more logical location for this type of use would be in the larger shopping center or centers close to the Rock Chalk Park, or for that matter, in the Rock Chalk Park itself.
For the same reasons, we ask that you not approve the SUP for Item No. 5B.

We also ask that you not approve Item No. 5C, the SUP for the Fast Order Food With Drive-Thru use. The Fast Order Food With Drive-Thru use would be much more intense than under normal circumstances because the clientele of the recreation center would add to the customer base. The use, itself, was not anticipated for CN districts under normal circumstances because of the increase in traffic and clutter that it would bring, and the combination of fast food drive-thru plus the outdoor commercial recreation center here could do real damage to the neighborhood.

Again, we appeal to the Planning Commission to deny Items 4, 5B, and 5C.

Sincerely yours,

Cille King, President

Alan Black, Chairman
Land Use Committee
For PC packet

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4GLTE smartphone

----- Forwarded message -----
From: "Bryan C. Culver" <BCulver@bankingunusual.com>
To: "Scott McCullough" <smccullough@lawrenceks.org>
Subject: Opposition to Agenda Items 4, 5A, 5B, 5C for 2/24 PC Meeting
Date: Fri, Feb 21, 2014 4:49 pm

FYI....

From: Luke Sinclair [mailto:sincluke@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2014 11:20 AM
To: Bryan C. Culver; bruce@kansascitysailing.com; amalia.graham@gmail.com; montanastan62@gmail.com; jonjosserand@gmail.com; pkelly@usd497.org; denny1@sunflower.com; squampva@aol.com; Clay Britton; eric.c.struckhoff@gmail.com
Cc: Lori Sinclair
Subject: Opposition to Agenda Items 4, 5A, 5B, 5C for 2/24 PC Meeting

Dear Planning Commissioners:

My wife (Lori Sinclair) and I are the own and live at 4400 W. 24th Pl., which is directly across Inverness from the potential family fun center and fast-food drive-thru restaurant development. Items 4, 5A, 5B, and 5C on the Commission’s agenda for the February 24th meeting are geared toward enabling this development. We write to oppose it all.

We purchased our home in 2008 because we loved the property and we were attracted to the quiet, appealing nature of the neighborhood, the proximity to neighborhood schools, and the ease of access to outdoor recreation. We take pride in our home and have invested capital to maintain and improve both the inside and
outside appearance of our house and property, and we take advantage as much as we can of the benefits of living where we do. We believe the proposed development will interfere with, disrupt, and degrade our quality of life and the value of our property, as well as our neighbors’.

To be clear, we have strong doubts as to the long-term viability of a go-kart, mini-golf entertainment center in Lawrence, but we are not generally opposed to it. But we all have to be smart about it and take into consideration the adjoining properties and owners. We think this proposed development at this particular location is ill-advised for several reasons. First, it will not provide any additional meaningful benefit to our area. This development is being proposed – and the text amendment, rezoning request, and special use permits are being sought – primarily on the basis that the development will provide services to us and our neighbors that are otherwise lacking in our area. This is simply untrue. Our neighborhood enjoys some of the best access in Lawrence to outdoor recreation. Walking trails, bike trails, tennis courts, playgrounds, a running track, soccer fields, softball and baseball fields, batting cages, Clinton Lake, the Pat Dawson Billings Nature Area, the Rotary Arboretum, and more, are all within a short walk/run/bike ride and even shorter drive of our neighborhood. Access to and use of most of these is free. Paid access to go-karts and mini-golf provides absolutely no additional outdoor recreational benefit to us.

Second, the development isn’t suited for our quiet, school-centered residential area. We’ve never seen an outdoor family fun center or fast-food drive-thru restaurants in the middle of a residential area, and there’s reason for that. It doesn’t make sense. The development will bring increased traffic, in this case potentially by people who have been enjoying 3.2 beers, which we fear will increase the risk to the children that walk and play on our sidewalks and streets. Additionally, the streets can’t take additional traffic, especially the roundabout outside our house on Inverness and 24th Place. The development will drastically increase the amount of noise and light pollution, given the nature of the activities and the hours of operation the developer envisions. With groups of people engaging in competitive activities and potentially drinking alcohol, it’s reasonable to believe there will be late-night, disruptive rowdiness. Additionally, we don’t think it’s a good idea to have a bar in such close proximity to four schools and multiple day-cares. Finally, we can’t say enough that there is no reason that we or our neighbors should have to breathe the noxious smells that would emanate from a fast-food restaurant and its garbage dumpsters. It’s unreasonable to assert that a small land buffer would adequately address any of these issues. We understand that it’s easy for the planning staff to assert, without any real analysis or study, that a drive-thru restaurant would not result in “substantial diminution” of our property value, but we’d invite them to tell us if they know of anyone that would be truthfully interested in buying a house in a residential neighborhood directly across the street from a drive-thru fast food restaurant.

More generally, we have concerns about the long-term viability of the fun center. Can Lawrence truly sustain it? Who is the target group? If it’s college kids, they’re gone for the summers. Is it school students? Having been students in a metropolitan area with access to mini-golf and go-karts, we can both personally attest to the fact
that these activities just don’t have permanent appeal. Once or twice is enough. The problem Lori and I have is that if the fun center fails, we would be the ones left with a view from our front porch, living areas, and second-story bedrooms of an abandoned, run-down family fun ghost town.

Finally, without limiting our general opposition to this development and all four agenda items above, we’d like to specifically address the requested text amendment. It’s being proposed as one of four steps in the process of putting the family fun center in our neighborhood. A text amendment to the Development Code to generally allow for outdoor recreation through an SUP in all CN2 areas in Lawrence is a drastic step that ought to be weighed against the relative importance or benefits of the fun center and the costs and effects on adjoining landowners. We don’t think it does, and it certainly doesn’t appear that the text amendment satisfies the factors in Section 20-1302(f).

First, we don’t believe the text amendment is consistent with Horizon 2020 and the Development Code, at least with respect to our neighborhood and the other adjoining landowners. The Development Code is intended to implement Horizon 2020 in a way that “protects, enhances and promotes the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of Lawrence.” As currently drafted the Development Code doesn’t allow for outdoor participant recreational use in either RSO or CN2, even with an SUP. It doesn’t appear anyone believes this was a mistake, and we ought to assume the Development Code was adopted the way it was for good reason. In our situation it certainly makes sense because, for the reasons laid out above, a commercial fun center does not fit in our residential area. We don’t believe changing the rules to allow this particular fun center across the street from our house is in the spirit of protecting, enhancing, or promoting the health, safety, and general welfare of us or our neighbors.

As to the other factor, the text amendment doesn’t purport to fix an inconsistency or error in the development code. Rather, it’s said to meet the challenge of a changing condition; specifically, an increased emphasis on creating a healthy environment for residents. We question how mini-golf, go-karts, arcade games, and a bar create a healthy environment. However, to the extent they do, the development would be better suited in an area that doesn’t already have spectacular pedestrian/bike access to trails, parks, and other outdoor recreation. Perhaps in that case it could be said that a challenge was being met by the text amendment, but that’s just not true as it pertains to our area.

Thank you,

Luke and Lori Sinclair
4400 W. 24th Pl.
Lawrence, KS  66047
Another one from Mr. Simpson.

Ms. Denny Ewert, Administrative Support
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/

"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."

Planning Commissioners,

I write you with concerns about agenda items 4, 5A, 5B, and 5C regarding the proposed development at 4300 W. 24th Place. My family and I live at 4305 W. 26th Terrace and my daughter attends preschool at Raintree Montessori at 4601 Clinton Parkway. When she begins kindergarten she will attend Sunflower Elementary School at 2521 Inverness Drive.

My main concern with the proposed development is the increase in traffic on Inverness and surrounding streets. It appears to me that the one lane traffic circle at 24th Place and Inverness is already close to full capacity. My understanding is that the proposed development may include fast food restaurants. When I see the constant flow of traffic into the McDonalds at 6th and Wakarusa it convinces me that multiple fast food restaurants at 4300 W. 24th Place would create traffic gridlock. At peak hours my guess is that the roads and traffic circle could not handle the traffic from the apartments, the schools, and two fast food restaurants.

Also, I do not think that the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding
neighborhood. The proposed development seems more appropriate for an area that is not right next to residential areas. I have doubts about how much meaningful noise and light mitigation is possible given the extremely close proximity to residences.

Thank you for taking my concerns into account and for your service on the Planning Commission. I sincerely appreciate the time and effort you put into the consideration of this and other important issues for our community.

Respectfully,

Mark Simpson
From: Scott McCullough
To: Denny Ewert; Sandra Day
Cc: Sheila Stogsdill
Subject: FW: Family Fun Center
Date: Monday, February 24, 2014 9:51:34 AM

Sorry if I am duplicating these with Sheila.

Scott McCullough, Director
Planning and Development Services – www.lawrenceks.org
City Hall, 6 E. 6th 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: Bryan C. Culver [mailto:BCulver@bankingunusual.com]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 9:42 AM
To: Scott McCullough; Sheila Stogsdill
Subject: FW: Family Fun Center

From: Michele Vignola-Rogers [mailto:mvr@sunflower.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2014 7:28 PM
To: montanastan62@gmail.com; amalia.graham@gmail.com; joniosserand@gmail.com; pkelly@usd497.org; Bryan C. Culver; denney1@sunflower.com; squampva@aol.com; clay.britton@yahoo.com; bruce@kansascitysailing.com; eric.c.struckhoff@gmail.com
Subject: Family Fun Center

Dear City Planning Commissioners,

This letter is in regards to the Family Fun Center that is being considered for W 24th Place between Crossgate and Inverness Drives. As I was reading through the article regarding this project I was struck by a number of issues. First, why there? We have land further away from all of the
apartments, houses and schools in the area to build this. Why create more noise, lights and traffic in an area that is not empty by any means? That area has plenty of housing and people who prefer it the way it is. I agree that we do need a Family Center - there is no question that we are lacking places for pre-teens and teens to go and hang out that is safe and fun, but to crush it into a development of houses and apartments where the average family is going to be subjected to the loud and often obnoxious teenage behavior that comes with a place like this seems counterproductive. Moreover, this is a college town which means this will not cater to just the elementary, middle school and high school kids, but also the college population. This means that although the place may close at ten or midnight – the noise will continue well into the late night/early morning hours especially if alcohol is going to be served.

Second, I do not understand the need for a BAR at a Family Fun Center. If a person cannot have fun with their children without alcohol, then maybe help is necessary, but certainly not a bar. Alcohol and places like this should NOT exist together. We have plenty of bars in this town and no matter what little alcohol is in the beer – it’s still beer and people can still get drunk and drive. Of course lighting is a huge issue and I can’t imagine how any form of boundary is going to block the lighting of a batting cage area (unless it is indoors). I grew up with batting cages and miniature golf near my house in NJ and I can assure you that the lighting required for the batting cages and miniature golf (if it is an outdoor venue) is incredibly bright (almost like daylight) – imagine that at 10:00 p.m. when you are trying to put a child or yourself to bed. The noise is another factor, the Go-Karts are only a part of it – usually a place like this will have music blaring and people talking over the music and shouting at one another (profanity and all). I recommend that the City Planning Commissioners visit a place like this in a larger city where it is close to housing and see what the effects are. I remember hanging out at our batting cages until midnight or later and the music blaring across the fields while the lights lit up the whole area – you could see the lights from the highway – three miles away. However, we were lucky – our Fun Center was out in the woods nowhere near homes or apartments. This might be something you could consider when picking a spot for this type of venue. If it is there - people will come - and they will drive ten minutes to get there – it is not necessary to put this in the center of family living, you’ll decrease the value of homes and most of the apartments will be empty or rent below average because no one will pay to live by a venue such as this. At first it may seem a great idea to live by such a place, but it won’t take long before people realize the mistake they’ve made and move to get away from the traffic, noise and constant activity that lasts into the late hours.

A third concern has to do with security. I remember the old Putt-Putt from 20 years ago and the roller rink (which is now Kohls) and a big problem was security or lack thereof. When you open a place like this in a college town, you MUST have very good security – not rent-a-cops, but security. A security group that can keep people in line and behaving in crowds that can get a bit rowdy especially if alcohol is involved. Underage drinking is a huge problem in Lawrence and this place serving alcohol will not help the issue. But the right security can help. In NJ our places used off duty police officers or trained bouncers – Lawrence is no longer a small town – it is no longer a small community. Guns, knives, and drugs are growing and a place like this can attract that type of element and security is where it stops. So, please if you vote this project in – please take into consideration that a place like this is great when it is open and doing what it is supposed to do, it’s no good to anyone if it’s shut down due to violence, drugs or gang activity – it just becomes
another empty building on another piece of land which this town cannot afford to have.

Thank you for taking the time to read this e-mail and considering the points. I live near this piece of land and I am very opposed to this project being built so close to us and our extended family. We enjoy the quiet.

Sincerely,

Michele Vignola-Rogers
Hello.

My name is Michelle Bruce and I am a Raintree parent. I do NOT agree with the Family Fun Park being in the proposed location. My biggest concern is the traffic, both foot and car. Putting in a large commercial development in this area would ruin the current safety we feel and value in this area. This development would greatly change the atmosphere in this residential area. While I see the need for such entertainment, I do not feel this location is ideal.

Please, please reconsider the location and find a more suitable location somewhere else.

Let's keep our neighborhood schools in a neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Michelle Bruce
Greetings Planning Commission Members,

I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed development at Inverness and 24th Street. There are so many reasons this isn't a good idea, but I would like to specifically site excess noise, lights, traffic congestion, and available alcohol near several schools.

I live on W. 25th Place and the traffic before and after school is very busy it is, sometimes I can't even turn onto my own street because of the volume and drivers blocking the intersection. The increased traffic activity during the week and weekends if this proposal is accepted would be unimaginable. I am also concerned about crime, as it has already increased in our neighborhood in the last few years.

I enjoy family activities as much as the next person, but I think this is the wrong location, and not just because it's my neighborhood. I don't think any family neighborhood with schools would be appropriate for this type of entertainment. There are so many other choices that
would be better - one option would be the area closer to Rock Chalk park, or even better, the area toward the end of south Iowa, close to where the by-pass will be completed would be ideal, and attract more out of town visitors.

I plan on attending the meeting on March 24.

Thank you for your time,

Nancy Stump
4417 W. 25th Place
Lawrence
Dear Planning Commissioners,

I, Bryce Erickson, feel like what you are doing is good but if you people do it by my school it will be very very very very very hard to concentrate. I do think it's a good idea just I think it would be better if you do it somewhere else! And I mean it. I think it would be best if you turn it into a garden or a park.

Yours truly,

Bryce Erickson, aged 9
Dear Planning Commissioners,

cI greatly appreciate that you are to build a family fun center in our Community.

However, I think the Outskirts of Lawrence would be a better place for one. If we were to build anything in that area, a community garden would be absolutely wonderful. A park area would be nice, but only if it was the outside kind with slides. The other reason I don't approve of your idea is the noise. A park full of screaming children could distract me from my school work.

Sincerely,

Madison Kühle (5th Grade)
Dear Planning Commissioners

My name is Sophia and I'm from Rain Tree Montessori School.

I feel very strongly about having a Family Fun Center on this side of Lawrence. We don't have a lot of fun things to do on this side, but when you get farther into town there is all sorts of stuff to do. I think the place you're wanting to put it, might not be the best place. I'm afraid if you decide you don't want it there you'll move it.
way into town (and he explained why I don't want that). I found lots of farm lands East of Iowa Street and South of thirty first Street. The land is already being interrupted for the new K-10 bypass. I hope you can take my idea under consideration. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sophia

P.S. I hope this doesn't sound like a complaint letter, I love your idea.
Dear Planning Commissioners,

I love your idea of having a Family Fun Center in Lawrence. I am sure many other people love the idea too. But really, my school, Raintree Montessori School, has been vandalized many times, and I am afraid this will increase those numbers.

I also think it would be much reasonable to have a community garden and park in that space, so I kindly ask and pray you do not close this area. Thank you.

Love, Alyssa (5th grade)
March 8, 2014

Dear Planning Commission:

On behalf of the Board of Trustees of Bishop Seabury Academy and taxpayers to the City of Lawrence, we must express deep concern and firm opposition over the proposed change to the zoning proposed for the Family Fun Center (Z-13-00483).

Bishop Seabury selected its new location a number of years ago based on the existing zoning for the area. We selected the school’s location in a residential area that would offer little risk to the school’s physical structure during non-school hours and outside of school activities. Surely, our neighbors of Raintree and the City owned schools of Southwest Junior High and Sunflower Elementary also considered this criteria in their decision process.

We are positive our decision to locate Bishop Seabury and the decision of the City for its schools would have been different if a “Family Fun Center” were originally located adjacent to a proposed school purchase or construction. Yet, the Planning Commission is entertaining the idea that we accommodate the opposite. The approval of a center that will be a congregation point for young people, after school hours, and outside of school activities, presents inherent risks to our school property, just by the very nature of creating a congregation point. The immediate adjacency of such a center invites the potential for unwanted visits and destruction of property. This is a risk we—as City taxpayers and board members who have been entrusted to ensure the safety of our school—cannot afford to undertake.

This Board of Trustees is not necessarily against such centers when located in a properly zoned (not re-zoned) location and in an area that has been more deliberately chosen to accommodate noise, lighting, security and adjacent business activity. Locating a “family fun center” in a residential area with four schools less than 1/2 mile from the proposed location, is not, in our mind, such an ideal location.

We are a volunteer Board tasked with protecting a school with a mission promising a safe environment for our students. Our Board is unified in opposing this rezoning as a threat to our mandate, and we encourage the Planning Commission to protect our property, mitigate the risk of damage to our City-owned properties, and ensure the continuation of a great neighborhood in the City of Lawrence.

Please reject this proposal.

Most Sincerely,

The Board of Trustees, Bishop Seabury Academy

Dennis Depenbusch, President
Ken Albrecht            Kara Tan Bhala            Stephen Hill          Lynn Segebrecht
Kay Almanza            Reed Dillon               Kathleen Hodge        Beth Wigen
Lori Arnold            Megan Edwards            Shane Mathis           The Right Rev. Dean Wolfe
Patti Bartley          Trip Frizell              Mark Mitchell        
While necessary to the file, this one missed the cutoff to even Bryan so let’s stick to our by-laws.

Scott McCullough, Director
Planning and Development Services – www.lawrenceks.org
City Hall, 6 E. 6th 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."

Planning Commission Members,

Our neighbors Luke and Lori Sinclair have summed up our feelings on this matter almost perfectly. But to add our own thoughts...
We are certainly in support of small locally owned businesses having the opportunity to start, thrive and grow. This however is a bad idea doomed to fail almost immediately. Not only is it a bad idea, but it is a bad location for a business of this sort period. Factor in everything the Sinclairs have said about why it's bad for our neighborhood, but it's just a stupid location for a business of this sort.

What would make anyone think a go-cart track in Lawrence Kansas is going to thrive? Take a drive through Branson MO, the capital of family tourism in this part of the country and umpteen of these are sitting idle and deteriorating. How do I know? I've only been traveling there on business monthly for the past 27 years! We do not have the tourism to even try to support this type of business, let alone off the beaten path in a residential neighborhood.

The Clinton Parkway and Inverness intersection as well as the 24th Place and Inverness Roundabout on down to the Crossgate and 24th Place roundabout have far too much traffic with all of the "student" apartments, school traffic and access to the Wakarusa and K10 entrance. Having said this, this a residential neighborhood and not an entertainment district. Our neighborhood does not need any more traffic, let alone late night traffic or the light pollution that would come with this.

Please find a more suitable location for this type of business like near the K10 and 6th Street interchange. We welcome reasonable development on this plot such as light commercial office space which operates with a minimum of traffic during normal business hours.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Steve and Tami Clark
4425 W 24th Pl
Davis Loupe  
2205 Riviera Drive  
Lawrence, KS 66047

March 7, 2014

To the Lawrence Planning Commission:

I am writing in favor of the proposed Family Fun Center at 4300 West 24th Place but on the condition that the proposal to allow a bar at the facility be removed. This development is in the close vicinity of four schools and is not appropriate for a bar. Otherwise I support the proposal.

My wife and I own three properties (our current home on Riviera Drive, and two rental homes on West 24th Place and Prairie Elm Drive) all in the vicinity of the proposed Family Fun Center.

**Apartments are a problem:** I was strongly opposed and spoke against previous proposals for additional dense apartments on this site as I feel that these additional apartments would cause a decline in the safety and desirability of the area. I feel that in the long run development of more dense apartments in this area is a very bad idea. In the past few months a fatal stabbing occurred at the one of the current apartment complexes and the long-term deterioration of these apartments concerns me greatly. The density of apartments in this area is excessive and further apartment development will compounding the problem. I see commercial development of this corner to be a much better use in the long term.

**Crime:** I do not believe that Mini Golf, Go-Karts and other similar family activities will cause any significant increase in crime. There has been concern expressed that gangs of unsupervised teenagers and young adults will run wild there and cause problems. I have more faith in the teenagers in Lawrence. When I was growing up my first cousin lived in a neighborhood within walking distance of a Putt-Putt golf course and we spent many happy Saturdays and weekday afternoons there. I don’t recall there ever being a problem. I mostly remember playing Putt-Putt and having fun. We probably did drink a few too many Coca Colas.

**Security and Supervision:** I would think that the Fun Center operator would have it in their best interest to have security guards and employees available to maintain a safe environment. Parents today don’t generally let their kids go outside to play unsupervised so I feel that many parents will be in attendance with their children and this will help to keep other patrons in order. I think that the type of kids who are interested in illegal drinking and drug use will not want to hang out there. Too many parents and little kids around. On the contrary it will give good kids and others a legal, fun, wholesome activity to fill their time.

**Traffic:** Much has been discussed about the traffic problems the new development will create. I agree that Inverness does have a lot of traffic at the opening time for the schools: 8:00-9:00 am and again when they let out 3:00 - 4:30 pm. First let me say that any development on that corner will cause additional traffic. Second, the Family Fun Center will likely not see its peak traffic coincide with school opening and closing hours and its busiest season will likely be the Summer months when school is not in session.
Noise: I agree that this facility will cause some additional noise. I have lived in this neighborhood since 2001. There are four schools with about 1600 students total in the immediate vicinity. The kids attending these schools all make noise almost every weekday. The cars on Clinton Parkway make noise. The Alvamar swimming pool makes noise in the Summer. The large numbers of residents in the Apartment complexes make noise too. It is a family neighborhood and this neighborhood has never been a completely silent neighborhood. I think the horse is out of the barn regarding neighborhood tranquility.

Unless we force everyone inside at all hours of the day there will be some noise in this area. It is just the sound of a normal family neighborhood. I just don’t think that electric go-karts and people playing mini-golf will cause excessive amounts of additional noise especially if the facility closes at a reasonable hour. There should be decibel limitations on the P.A. System. My biggest noise concern would be the batting cages. Perhaps some requirements such as wood bats instead of aluminum, dimpled rubber balls and having mesh nets instead of chain link would quiet them. Overall reasonable closing hours might be no later than 9 pm on a school night Sunday - Thursday and perhaps 10:30 on weekends.

Lighting:
I think that the lighting required for this type of facility is less than say a baseball diamond or soccer field. I also think that the lighting can be designed to not shine in adjacent homeowners properties. The limited hours of the facility will ensure that neighbors will not be kept awake by the lights. Perhaps a plan could be also be developed so that the lights could be dimmed after 9 pm.

I think that crime in an area is more likely when there are few people outdoors and when lighting is poor. I think a lighted area with people outdoors and having limited operating hours could actually help deter some crimes.

Landscaping Buffering / Architectural Standards:
The Inverness Park Plan has a required significant landscaping buffering for the single family homes to the West. I think that if the complex is well buffered and has sprinkler systems for the maintenance of the landscaping that the facility as proposed will not be an eyesore. Buffering could also help to block noise and light. I think that having architectural standards for the buildings and having a well designed landscape plan will be a key to maintaining this property as a desirable one.

Restaurants and other commercial establishments nearby improve walkability:
Many city residents like to live within walking or short driving distance of restaurants and other stores. I think that having a restaurant to walk to (fast food or otherwise) might add services to the neighborhood. I really like having the Hyvee gas station and convenience store nearby. Car-centric development is not the wave of the future, it is a relic of post WW2 suburbanization. I believe that most modern development looks towards making neighborhoods more walkable for quality of life and environmental reasons. One of the big attractions of the adjacent neighborhoods in this area is that kids can walk to school. Having additional commercial facilities will only add more services available by foot or by bike.

Yes it is Family Fun:
I am completely puzzled by people opposed to the Family Fun Center on the basis that they feel it won't attract "Families". My family has had discussions about the proposed center. My 75 year old father-in-law who lives with us says he would go. My wife and I (I'm 51) would go, our 13 year old would go, my 19 year college age son would go and I'm pretty sure that most 7 or 8 year olds would love it. My
wife remarked that she remembers going with Church groups to play mini golf when she was young. It sounds like a place that truly the whole family could go.

I believe that a vibrant city requires outdoor places for people to gather and enjoy themselves. There aren't enough of these places in Lawrence. I like the idea that I could walk there on a nice evening with my family and we might have something to do close by that's better than watching TV or surfing the internet.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Davis Loupe
Dear Mr. Halm,

Please see the letter below being sent on behalf of the 23 townhome owners at 4301 Wimbledon Terrace. As noted in the letter, we have some serious concerns about the proposed Family Fun Center project under consideration for the vacant land near Clinton Parkway and Inverness. Thank you for forwarding our letter to the Commissioners.

Molly Mulloy

February 14, 2014

Lawrence-Douglas County Planning Commission
Planning & Development Services
PO Box 708
Lawrence KS 66044

Dear Commissioners,

Members of the Wimbledon Terrace Townhomes Association, comprised of the 23 townhome owners at 4301 Wimbledon Terrace, strongly object to the proposed rezoning and special use permit for the large property at 4300 W. 24th Place (southeast corner of Inverness and Clinton Parkway). We are referring to the following items, Z-13-00483, SUP-13-00486, and SUP-14-00026, scheduled for discussion at your meeting on Monday, February 24, 2014. Our townhome development is directly across Clinton Parkway from the proposed project. We believe it will have a seriously negative effect on our neighborhood and the safety of the many children in this area.

We are concerned that the proposed “Family Fun Center” and its go-cart track will result in high levels of noise pollution and toxic emissions, that the miniature golf course and batting cages will require excessively bright lights at night, and that the huge increase in traffic at the already-busy intersection of Inverness & Clinton Parkway will be problematic and even dangerous for the school children crossing that intersection. There are four schools located within a few blocks of the proposed project (Bishop Seabury, Raintree Montessori, Sunflower Elementary, and Southwest Middle School), with hundreds of little children who might be intimidated by the large numbers of teenagers and young adults who would frequent the project. Rather than being built in the midst of this residential area, it would seem more appropriate for the massive “Family Fun Center” project to be built in a more commercial or rural area at the edge of the city such as was done with the youth soccer complex south of town and the new recreation center to the west.

Several homeowners from the Wimbledon Terrace Townhomes Association will be present at the meeting on February 24th and would be happy to explain our concerns at the meeting, if appropriate.

Thank you for considering our objections to this rezoning request.

Respectfully,

Wimbledon Terrace Townhomes Assn.
Molly Mulloy, Executive Committee (mmulloy@ku.edu)
Ruth Hiss, Executive Committee (mrsdeltachi@yahoo.com)
Jane Tedder, Executive Committee (jtedder@sunflower.com)
Debbie Saiz
Alice Holtz
Ann Eversole
Kathy Rauckman
Letty Seidl
Sarah Williamson
Lenora Barker
Dear Commissioner Culver,

My name is Tom Cotte'; I live at 4215 Wimbledon Dr., in direct sight of the proposed Family Fun Center. Several other townhouses (35 total) in two thirty-year association-developments are located even closer to the proposed site than my town-home.

I am opposed to the development of the proposed project for the following reasons  Please Consider:

- The Center is flanked on four sides by residential living, not commercial businesses -- but home living. Our patios directly face the proposed site; upstairs bedrooms are also in clear view. One consequence from developing this project will be that we can no longer keep our windows open during the spring and fall, and will need thick shades to ward off the glare from lighting emanating from the Center. Moreover, increased noise and traffic activity will interfere with our comfortable use of the patios. Noise from braking go-carts, pinging sounds of aluminum bats on balls hit in the batting cages. . . and so on are of concern. Additional traffic, air pollution, illumination from the lighting, increased noise will violate our reasonable, collective right to peaceable enjoyment of this neighborhood.

- Assuming the Center will operate much of the day and night, traffic most assuredly will increase, thereby posing substantial risk to children in general, and my young grandkids in particular, who also live nearby. Case in point: About 200 feet north on Inverness from Clinton Parkway is a hill from which the traffic is not immediately noticeable from cars exiting Wimbledon Drive -- a blindspot. I understand that a recent accident at this point resulted in a fatality.

- College housing is abundant to the south and east of the proposed Fun Thing. Recalling my frolicking days in college, I suspect the Center will be a magnet to purchase attractions, including beer, and all the noise and hoopla associated therewith. Recently, my wife visited the apartment complex directly south of the subject site and spoke with the receptionist and a dozen or so students, all of whom were excited about the prospects of beer and go-carts. She also mentioned
that the Developers had visited their on-site office and spoke with the owners and manager. One wonders what proportion of college students to “families” will be attracted to the Center.

- When you realize the drastic zoning changes and variances under application, isn’t it reasonable to realize the city fathers apparently intended present zoning to conform to a residential venue, not a carnival environment. When this project becomes operable one wonders if construction of a Ferris Wheel or thrill ride could be far ahead. In other words under the changed zoning and variance what other annoying attractions will be later constructed?

- Consider: The potential blight factor: If this entertainment center goes bust, is abandoned and allowed to deteriorate, like some have in other Kansas communities, what will replace this unique site without substantial capital investment? How long will it remain empty to grow unsightly? How easily could it be adapted to another purpose?

- Beer sales: The sale of beer is worrisome, not only in itself but as Dr. Don Schawang, headmaster of Seabury Academy has stated, may draw an un-family type of crowd. An additional thought: Will off-site beer consumption, loitering and vandalism to surrounding residences increase?

- Visualize the paradox between the Family Fun Center location on Clinton Parkway and the window to north Inverness Drive through an uncommonly beautiful neighborhood in Alvamar as one travels toward Bob Billings Parkway.

- Finally, I won’t dwell on the effect the proposed site might have on our property values.

Commissioner, I implore you to properly serve your constituents, not a developer, who most likely doesn’t live in the immediate area. Please, thoroughly tour the neighborhood and see the RESIDENTIAL character surrounding Clinton Parkway and Inverness Dr. Then, you may understand our concerns.

Frankly, I would not have purchased our town-home a year ago if I had reason to suspect the prospect of a Family Fun Center in my back yard.

In conclusion, please... put yourself in our shoes. Honestly, aren’t there better sites in Lawrence for this kind of project?

Thank You for your consideration.

Respectfully,

[Signature]
March 7, 2014

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As Head of School at Bishop Seabury Academy (4120 Clinton Parkway), I have been following with interest and concern the proposed rezoning (Z-13-00483) of the lot at 4300 W. 24th Place from a Residential area to a Neighborhood Shopping Center (CN2). I attended the meeting at Raintree Elementary School, and I appreciated Mr. Werner’s appearing to explain the project. I would not be opposed to such a development were it appearing (logically) on the outskirts of town and in an area zoned deliberately for this sort of development. However, I think this rezoning is inherently and obviously very bad news for everyone who lives or attends school in the area. Homeowners in the area have very good reason to be anxious, and they voiced their concerns at the meeting. I will focus on my own concerns.

I feel certain that this sort of an entertainment park will attract a lot of middle school, high school, and college students at all times of the day, but especially at night. (I have to think that developers conceived of this project with a captive afternoon audience in mind: the students at Bishop Seabury Academy, Southwest Middle School, and perhaps Raintree and Sunflower Elementary Schools.) The presence of alcohol in this park is unwise. It would be naive to think that underage high school and college students who find a way to drink in other Lawrence bars will not find a way to drink at the bar in this park. And when they leave the facility at 10 pm or midnight—bedtime for adults, perhaps, but not for park guests aged 14-25—they will look around and wonder what they should do next. And they will have two schools nearby with football fields, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, and a closed, unsupervised pool with a gate that is easily climbed. They will have the secluded spaces behind Raintree. As I noted at the Raintree meeting, I am an advocate for young people and believe in their better nature, but they also make bad choices at times. If this park is allowed to be developed in this residential area, it will not be the developer, architect, management, or the city planning committee who will have to deal with this situation. It will be the people who live in this area.

I was asked by Mr. Werner if I would feel more comfortable about the situation should alcohol be taken off the table. I admit that the presence of alcohol is one of the most bewilderingly inappropriate aspects of this proposal and raises the stakes, especially when neighbors have no certainty about the future usage of this area (Family Fun Center or other entertainment feature). But focusing on this one proposed entertainment park project, the absence of liquor inside the park would not eliminate inappropriate late night behavior when patrons leave. Perhaps I am excessively cynical here, but my job as Head of School is to think of worst-case scenarios, and in my experience, what I am suggesting hardly requires a dark imagination.

Also at the Raintree meeting yesterday, there was much discussion about neighborhood concerns regarding lighting, noise, security, the quality of judgment demonstrated by young seasonal park employees, and even the uncertainty of what project will inhabit this lot (again, in the center of a residential area of town) not only next year but in 5, 10, and 20 years. Despite the helpful speculations
by the architect on all of these issues—assurances which are the lubricant to get this motion passed—there is no guarantee on any of them. And if you allow this rezoning to occur, the neighbors and schools will be at the mercy of whatever development occurs in this area.

I want the planning committee members to understand that I do not envy their job, and I do not think it is for me to dictate what sort of construction occurs in the neighborhood surrounding my school. However, I think it is very reasonable to see that rezoning and special use permits are difficult hurdles for developers in a situation like this because restrictions are in place for a reason. There is logic and a reason for consistency with these decisions. There is a reason that the present zoning exists.

With respect, I strongly encourage you to oppose this rezoning. And as a final test to this decision making, I would ask you to consider if you would be willing to move into a residence alongside the Family Fun Center if it is built. If you would not, then you will understand how we feel.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

Dr. Don M. Schawang

Head of School
Bishop Seabury Academy
March 8, 2014

Dear Planning Commission:

On behalf of the Board of Trustees of Bishop Seabury Academy and taxpayers to the City of Lawrence, we must express deep concern and firm opposition over the proposed change to the zoning proposed for the Family Fun Center (Z-13-00483).

Bishop Seabury selected its new location a number of years ago based on the existing zoning for the area. We selected the school’s location in a residential area that would offer little risk to the school’s physical structure during non-school hours and outside of school activities. Surely, our neighbors of Raintree and the City owned schools of Southwest Junior High and Sunflower Elementary also considered this criteria in their decision process.

We are positive our decision to locate Bishop Seabury and the decision of the City for its schools would have been different if a “Family Fun Center” were originally located adjacent to a proposed school purchase or construction. Yet, the Planning Commission is entertaining the idea that we accommodate the opposite. The approval of a center that will be a congregation point for young people, after school hours, and outside of school activities, presents inherent risks to our school property, just by the very nature of creating a congregation point. The immediate adjacency of such a center invites the potential for unwanted visits and destruction of property. This is a risk we—as City taxpayers and board members who have been entrusted to ensure the safety of our school—cannot afford to undertake.

This Board of Trustees is not necessarily against such centers when located in a properly zoned (not re-zoned) location and in an area that has been more deliberately chosen to accommodate noise, lighting, security and adjacent business activity. Locating a “family fun center” in a residential area with four schools less than 1/2 mile from the proposed location, is not, in our mind, such an ideal location.

We are a volunteer Board tasked with protecting a school with a mission promising a safe environment for our students. Our Board is unified in opposing this rezoning as a threat to our mandate, and we encourage the Planning Commission to protect our property, mitigate the risk of damage to our City-owned properties, and ensure the continuation of a great neighborhood in the City of Lawrence.

Please reject this proposal.

Most Sincerely,

The Board of Trustees, Bishop Seabury Academy

Dennis Depenbusch, President
Ken Albrecht        Kara Tan Bhala        Stephen Hill        Lynn Segebrecht
Kay Almanza         Reed Dillon          Kathleen Hodge      Beth Wigen
Lori Arnold         Megan Edwards        Shane Mathis        The Right Rev. Dean Wolfe
Patti Bartley       Trip Frizell         Mark Mitchell
I am a parent of 8 children in Lawrence, KS. We are very excited about the possibility of having this in Lawrence, and will be there quite often. My children were ECSTATIC when I told them about this possibly being built.

I am asking each commissioner to please support the proposed Family Fun Center where it is proposed at corner of Clinton Parkway and Inverness Drive. This is an excellent location close to the center of town, and it is my firm belief that the objection you have been getting from the neighborhood surrounding this location are the same objections you would see from any neighbors of any project.

Please make this decision with all Lawrencians in mind, not only the ones that live near this site.

Alex Delaney / (785) 393-6224 / alex@indepsys.com
To the Planning Commission:

I have attended the 1st meeting at which this agenda item was deferred. I was then in attendance when there was a meeting held at Raintree with the architect so citizens could voice their concern. And finally I attended the meeting in which Paul Werner tried to explain the changes they were proposing to make this project acceptable to the neighborhood.

First I will tell you that I moved to Lawrence two years ago to retire. I chose the Wimbledon Townhomes because they were situated in a very nice neighborhood which was quiet and safe. I have enjoyed sitting on my back patio (faces Clinton) when the weather permits for these last two years. It is very upsetting to me that this will not be possible if this Family Fun Center is approved. As a retired person, I am not able to just pick up and move. I had planned for this to be my home for a long time and I see this as a threat to my investment.

The thought of this zoning change is very upsetting. I do not want to see commercial of any kind in a neighborhood of residential housing. It is not appropriate to have this developing in the middle of homes and schools. It worries me that when this development, if allowed, is no longer popular that we will have an eyesore right in our neighborhood.

As a grandparent I love having family things to do with my grandchildren but even that does not get me excited about the Family Fun Center being in our neighborhood. This project needs to be developed in an area appropriate for this commercial type of development. The lights on till midnight, the noise from the batting cages and go karts (electric or not there is noise) and the additional traffic is not welcome in this residential area. It is already difficult to exit from Wimbledon onto Inverness because there is a blind area for cars coming north on Inverness. Additional traffic will only make this matter worse. Although the architect said that a beer license would not be applied for the first year, we are all smart enough to know that is something that will stay on their agenda.

This brings me to another upsetting item. We have asked at every meeting for the name of the developer and have been denied that information. If this person or persons is so honest and trustworthy with their intent on this development then why not come forward and reveal who they are. My inclination is that the architect is a part of the development and is protecting the identity of others. If they are not willing to come and talk to us, then why would we trust them.

I have been told that other projects have been opposed in the past for this land but since I am new to Lawrence I do not have all those facts. But even on this project no notices were given to neighbors - was told you had to live within 200 feet. That is an unrealistic measure - all neighbors are entitled to know what is proposed in their neighborhood especially when it will affect their home values and the safety of our homes and children. I was told that at one time a park was proposed for this area but has been turned down. If you want things for families to do, a park is a great solution and acceptable to all.

Know there is a movement by a tax group and Alex Delaney supporting this project. Obviously they do not live in our neighborhood but I will submit to them and to the Planning Commission this proposal. If you are so sure that this will not affect the home value of my home, then please buy my townhome now. I am willing to sell it to you at the price I paid plus the additional money I have invested in it. I can have it vacant in one month for any buyer. I am sure I will have many offers since none of you think this project will affect all of our home values. Many others like me, retirees on set incomes who just wanted a quiet, safe neighborhood, do not want to be betrayed by your actions.

Please consider what you will be doing if you approve this zoning change. You will take a residential area which is loved by many and turn it into a commercial zone. That is not why I originally moved to Lawrence.

Sincerely,

Viv Hammond
4227 Wimbledon Drive
Lawrence, KS 66047
To Mr. Bryan Culver, Chairman, and Planning Commissioners
Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission

RE: ITEMS NO. 8, 9A, 9B, & 9C, TEXT AMENDMENT AND SUP FOR PARTICIPANT SPORTS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION USES and FAST ORDER FOOD WITH DRIVE THROUGH.

Dear Chairman Culver and Planning Commissioners:

Please see the letter attached that we wrote to you regarding the Text Amendment to allow Participant Sports and Outdoor Recreation Uses in the CN2 District. Included are our comments on the rezoning and the Special Use Permits as applied to the subject tract in Inverness Park.

We would like to emphasize the points made in that letter against this Text Amendment as well as against permitting the Outdoor Participant Sports uses and Fast Order Food Drive-Through in the subject tracts.

In view of this recent proposal and the staff recommendations, we also suggest that rezoning the CN2 District to the subject location submits the neighborhood in the future to this and other unsuitable uses. Consequently, we hope you will consider the following additional comments.

1. We ask that you deny the rezoning of the subject tract to the CN2 District. In the future, before reconsidering any rezoning for the subject tract, the ten acres allotted to that tract for the CN2 District in the Inverness Park District Plan should be reduced to 5 acres to permit an RSO rezoning and use to take up the remaining acreage.

2. Any rezoning for that area should specifically limit the ordinance to the suggestions and approval of the Inverness Park neighborhood to allow only those uses needed by the residents.

Sincerely yours,

Cille King
President

Alan Black
Chairman
Land Use Committee

Attachment
February 23, 2014

To Mr. Bryan Culver, Chairman, and Planning Commissioners
Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission

ITEM NO. 4 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE; PARTICIPANT
SPORTS & RECREATION,
OUTDOOR USES WITH SUP IN CN2
ITEM NO. 5B: SPECIAL USE PERMIT; FAMILY FUN CENTER; W. 24TH PLACE AND
INVERNESS DRIVE
ITEM NO. 5C: SPECIAL USE PERMIT; FAST ORDER FOOD WITH DRIVE-THRU; 4300 W 24TH
PLACE

Dear Chairman Culver and Planning Commissioners:

For many reasons, we request that you not approve Items No. 4, 5B and 5C.

The CN districts are neighborhood commercial districts and were designed to
provide goods and services for the immediate neighborhoods where they are located.
The recreational uses that will be permitted, if the Text Amendment, Item No. 4 is
approved, permit the type of commercial outdoor recreational uses that have multiple
environmental and planning ramifications. We believe that the likely negative impacts
of these proposals have not been adequately reviewed in the Staff Report, and when
carefully considered, would lead to the conclusion that because of these possible
outcomes, they should not be included as permitted uses in the CN districts, even with
a SUP.

1. The applicant has indicated the proposed uses in his report to the Staff. The
noise levels of the outdoor uses, specifically the batting cages, Go-Karts, and shouting
customers, cannot be buffered.

2. The lights will not be able to be properly screened. Although the lights may
shine down, the reflections cannot be shielded.

3. The intensity of the traffic can be predicted to be worse at times than would
be the case for normal shopping areas.

4. In terms of the planning considerations, the recreational use and the drive-
ins will absorb all of the available commercial space so that the uses really needed
by a neighborhood such as a drug store, grocery store, sit-down restaurant, and the
other uses for which the CN2 District was intended, will not be possible. The
Comprehensive Plan severely limits the amount of recreational space for the
Neighborhood Centers and the CC200 Centers for this reason (please see Chapter 6
of Horizon 2020, page 6-12, paragraph 2 under the Section, "Recreational Uses.")

5. The type of outdoor commercial recreation proposed to be permitted here with the SUP we
believe belongs in more regionally based commercial districts; that is, the CC4 or CC6 Districts. The
more logical location for this type of use would be in the larger shopping center or centers close to the
Rock Chalk Park, or for that matter, in the Rock Chalk Park itself.
For the same reasons, we ask that you not approve the SUP for Item No. 5B.

We also ask that you not approve Item No. 5C, the SUP for the Fast Order Food With Drive-Thru use. The Fast Order Food With Drive-Thru use would be much more intense than under normal circumstances because the clientele of the recreation center would add to the customer base. The use, itself, was not anticipated for CN districts under normal circumstances because of the increase in traffic and clutter that it would bring, and the combination of fast food drive-thru plus the outdoor commercial recreation center here could do real damage to the neighborhood.

Again, we appeal to the Planning Commission to deny Items 4, 5B, and 5C.

Sincerely yours,

Cille King, President

Alan Black, Chairman
Land Use Committee
Have heard there is a proposal on the table and would like to weigh in as IN FAVOR....have made two trips out of town in seven days to take kids to Family Fun Centers and would rather spend my money in Lawrence...thanks Mary Beth Petr
Mr. Culver,

I am writing to state my opposition to the “Family Fun Center” that is being proposed at Clinton Parkway and Inverness. This is a terrible idea that will affect my neighborhood and my home. Even with no alcohol, this is a bad location. It is too close to schools and homes. I cannot be at the meeting on Wednesday but I wanted to state my opposition to this.

Please don’t support this. Thank you.

Theresa Shively-Porter
4412 Gretchen Ct
Lawrence, KS 66047
785.842.7713
Petition
in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)
located at 4300 W 34th Place and allowing a
Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
• Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
• Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
• Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
• Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
• Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
• The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
• Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name
Marguerite Carlson
Ruth Sleeper
Melissa Meisinger
Debra S. Sheff
Debra Hensgen
Michelle Meyer
Dale V. Millward
Nancy Shaffer
Karen Sima
Wayne Koch

Name
Jadeene Herring
Jocelyn Shaw
Rochelle Mandel
Jo S. Bjork
Nancy Bjork
Christine Colbert
Beth Cullon
Karen Fred
Susan Nightingale
Nancy Hansen
Petition
in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)
located at 4300 W 34th Place and allowing a
Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
• Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
• Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
• Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
• Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
• Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
• The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
• Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name

Name
Glen Clark
Barbara Oliver
Jane Naumi
Earl Wilmer
Earl King
Barbara Oliver
Katherine
Jeremy Bethe-Jordal
Rose M. Richardson
Josh A. Blum
Larry Carlson
Elizabeth Freer
Dorine Schen
Geyer
Patsy F. Hines
Becca Booth
Sue Sack
Katie Nix
Ady S.
Helen Weis
Mel Johnson
Petition

in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)
located at 4300 W 4th Place and allowing a
Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
• Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
• Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
• Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
• Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
• Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
• The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
• Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name

Christina Alwood
Michele Blediger
Amy Wade
Jenny Allen
Sue L. Reid
Donna B. Utter
Kris Adams
Betty Adams

Name

Karin Koch
Emily Neese
Judy West
Ray E. Wood
Sheila O'Meara
DeWoods
Georgia Gants-Sgment
Judy Bielke
R. C. 


Petition
in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)
located at 4300 W 24th Place and allowing a
Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
• Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
• Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
• Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
• Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
• Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
• The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
• Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name
Kathy Kluske
Mandy Wade
Sarah Allinh
Erin Arline
Farhang Khosh
David Pakou
Deanna Benoda
Nancy Benoda
Chris Grabiec
Mark Wis

Name
Petition
in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)
located at 4300 W24th Place and allowing a
Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
• Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
• Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
• Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
• Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
• Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
• The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
• Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name
Christine Hoang
Barbara Snyder
Clay Smith
Sandra Hoffman
Mike Moore
Cathy Miller
Carrie Morris

Name
First Halverson
Ellis
Amy Woolley
Sharon
Sandy Stover
Lee Wilson

Petition

in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)
located at 4300 W 34th Place and allowing a
Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
• Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
• Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
• Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
• Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
• Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
• The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
• Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name

Clay Blake
Regan D'Green
Jaxon Patterson
Riley Bredemus
Stella Coblener
Hannah Motsinger
Amelia Thies
Oliver Rubenstein
Jordan Grabast
Tim Huffman
Simon Ruland

Name

Mari Risley
Allie Williams
Hadie Ash
Logan Schwalb
Andrew Hansen
Petition
in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center) located at 4300 W 34th Place and allowing a Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
• Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
• Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
• Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
• Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
• Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
• The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
• Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name

Danielle Dong
Ryan Malloy
Raleigh Merrill
Jack Bellerence
Leo Weis
Tye Spence
Sam Hertzog
Micaiah Mercado
Diego Steven Heine
Bailey M Sandholm

Name
Petition

in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)
located at 4300 W 34th Place and allowing a
Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
- Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
- Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
- Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
- Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
- Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
- The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
- Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name
Amy Anderson
Sara Bledsoe
William Burns
Sydney Miller
Maddy Moore
Sam Hutches
Laurin Schwall
Joseph Dale
Ella Frederick
Marley Stearns
Eva Ackley

Name
Cian O’Lear
Joan Green
Ben Boppert
Jenna Pollard
Lucas Dowd
Will Hedges
Willeighby Farm
Petition
in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)
located at 4300 W 34th Place and allowing a
Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
- Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
- Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
- Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
- Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
- Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
- The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
- Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name
Patrick Hoffman
Ethan Tangporin
Sophia Eddinger
Matthew Bermaegewicz
Jakiah Smith Evans
Audrey Nguyen-Hoang
Abbey Hossler
Jackson Grant
Alyssa Carlson
Jacob Geinig
Brielle Cardston
Ruddhi Duvvur
Lauren Malik

Name
Luke Hornberger
Gibson Huston
Lauren (Date) Alexander
Samuel J. Hindman
Briggs MacRe Arian-Lawrence
Sophia Brecker Sturm
Madison Kühle
Dashuj Farris
Ferat Ejer
Josh Willins
Shawn Cleavinger
Mina Khosh
OLIVIA SEMMER
Samantha Derrnan
Petition

in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)
located at 4300 W 34th Place and allowing a
Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
• Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
• Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
• Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
• Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
• Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
• The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
• Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name

Audrey Baskam
Joe Ridgy
Jean Chun
Dowen Boyd
Will Sandrow
Maren Dee
Charlotte Lupp
Erin Higging
Caroline Schmidt
Risa Khosh
Brayden Shumaker

Name

Andrea Dee
Erinn Rose Waldson
Julie Holder
Lyric Sloan
Angela Marcellino
KBK & W
Del Koemiec
Elsie Parker
Petition

in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)
located at 4300 W 24th Place and allowing a
Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
- Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
- Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
- Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
- Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
- Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
- The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
- Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name
Oyin Erorh
Jeremiah Lutz
Anah Lutz
Rose Brings
Colleen Stock
Laura Hines
Brian Mulher
Hyacinth Clic
Sherry Milh
Kirsten Matzen
Ann E. Kichart

Name
Tom Matzen
Tichene Jones
ERIKA TULL
Cliff Tull
Sherri Soule
Amy Risley
Angela Sue
B. F. Rice
becka hickson
Leslie Miller

...
Petition
in Opposition to the Rezoning
from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential Office) to CN2 (Neighborhood Shopping Center)
located at 4300 W 24th Place and allowing a
Special Use Permit for a Family Fun Center and Fast Food Drive-Thru Restaurant

We the undersigned oppose this development for the following reasons:
- Does not fit within the guidelines of the original Horizon 2020 development plan.
- Is an inappropriate match in a residential area.
- Will add additional traffic in an area already plagued with traffic congestion.
- Serving alcohol with four schools nearby is inappropriate and dangerous given the traffic issues.
- Outdoor recreation, walking trails, and batting cages are already available in the area.
- The noise and lights late into the night will disturb the sleep of residents.
- Increased vandalism and late night unruliness.

Name

Name

[Signatures]

[Signatures]
Hi Scott,

Please add my voice to support for the Family Fun Center.

When my family and I moved here in 1990 there was a putt putt and batting cages if I remember correctly out on South Iowa. As our children grew, we lamented the loss of a family suitable facility to take our kids for fun. As I understand the proposal there would also be facilities to host birthday parties, batting cages and an electric powered go kart track.

Although my kids are grown and no longer live in Lawrence, my wife and I fully support this project encourage our city commission to give the proposal every consideration possible to bring this facility to Lawrence.

Thank you.

John Ross
Lawrence-Douglas County Planning Commission
City Hall
6 East 6th Street
Lawrence, KS 66044

Dear Planning Commission Members:

I write to voice my strong opposition to

- ITEM NO. 9A RSO TO CN2; 10.97 ACRES; 4300 W 24th PLACE (SLD/TLH)
- ITEM NO. 9B SPECIAL USE PERMIT; FAMILY FUN CENTER; 4300 W 24TH PLACE (SLD/TLH)
- ITEM NO. 9C SPECIAL USE PERMIT; FAST ORDER FOOD WITH DRIVE-THRU; 4300 W 24TH PLACE (SLD)

A family fun center has a place in Lawrence, but it should not be in the middle of a residential area on Clinton Parkway. There are a number of reasons I oppose this rezoning.

First and foremost is that the city’s long-term plan for this area calls for only limited commercial development. Rezoning for CN2 runs contrary to Horizon 2020 and makes Clinton Parkway more like the heavily-developed region of 23rd Street east of Iowa.

Second is the impact on the quality of life for the neighbors. The whine of go-cart engines, the constant pinging of aluminum bats in batting cages, extensive lighting until late at night, and music broadcast outdoors would be very intrusive for residents in the area and diminish property values.

Finally, this development would dramatically increase motor traffic on Inverness, Crossgate, and W. 24th Street. Inverness, in particular with its divides will be negatively impacted.

There are better places for this development in Lawrence, for example, at the site for sale across from Hallmark on McDonald Drive or W. 6th Street beyond George Williams.

I urge you to deny this request for rezoning.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Weis
Dear City Commissioners,

My two sons are 18 and 19 now but I certainly wish that they had a Family Fun Center when they were growing up. Lawrence is in need of recreational activities for children. We do not have a skating rink. We do not have amusement or water parks. We do not have mini-golf. We do not have laser tag. Even the batting cages do not work half the time.

I am in FULL support of the proposed Family Fun Center. I hope you are too. Please make this happen for the children of Lawrence.

Thank you.

Kimberly Williams
Realor/Broker, ABR, GRI
McGrew Real Estate
1501 Kasold Drive
Kimberly@KIWilliams.com
Cell: 785-312-0743

“You can get everything in life you want if you will just help enough other people get what they want.” Zig Ziglar
April 21, 2014

RE: Agenda Items 8, 9A, 9B and 9C related to proposal for family fun center at Clinton Parkway & Inverness Drive

Dear Planning Commissioners:

On your agenda this month are a series of related items to the application for a family fun center in my neighborhood. The planning for this use has progressed over the past several months with adjustments made to the site plan and uses proposed to address points raised by planning staff, and by the public through communications to the Planning Commission. I believe earnest efforts have been made by the applicant's representative to address some of the points raised, but the principal point and central issue is that the location proposed is not a good match with the proposed use. Were the use and location a “good match”, the applicant would need neither to request amending the CN2 Zoning District to increase the uses permitted in it, nor requesting special approval (re: SUP) for uses that are not permitted by right in the district.

I believe there can be found a broad community consensus that such recreational uses would fill a need of families in Lawrence. There is also a very large neighborhood consensus that this need – these uses – should not be filled by the approval of the requests before you in items 8, 9A, 9B and 9C. Approval of these requests would be at the detriment of those who live, work and play in the neighborhoods along Clinton Parkway. There is an interconnected community of neighborhoods that have developed between the two nodal neighborhood commercial centers at Kasold Drive and at Wakarusa Drive along the Parkway. This community has developed through the four educational facilities that exist along either side of the parkway; the recreational bike/hike trail along the parkway; and over 30 years of development of subdivisions that have formed these neighborhood,

The developer's proposal and the staff report look at the plans, policies and Zoning Regulations and support one “truth”. As anyone involved in planning can tell you, there is often more than one way to view the planning documents, policies and implementation tools. I would ask you to consider another, equally valid, set of facts derived from the same planning documents - the neighborhood plan, the comprehensive plan, and the Zoning Regulations – used to support recommendations for approval.

I raise four points for your consideration:
1) Neighborhood planning and the Inverness Park District Plan;
2) Horizon 2020’s policies regarding neighborhood commercial developments;
3) The function of Zoning Regulations to implement the comprehensive plan
4) Community gateways and the role of Clinton Parkway since the early 1970s as a gateway to the west.

Neighborhood Planning and the Inverness Park District Plan

The timeline of development activity presented in the staff report for Item No. 9A begins in 1999 with the annexation of the quarter section of ground, which was an isolated unincorporated 160 acres surrounded by a neighborhood that had been developing for over 20 years. The annexation of this property was preceded by planning of the entire 160 acres to guide its development and promote integration of the uses in these areas with the already developed neighborhoods and neighborhood schools. The progression of denser/more intense uses from Clinton Parkway, on the north, to single-family residential subdivision south of the natural drainage divide followed sound planning principles in 1999. These same planning principles are espoused today for newly annexed areas in Chapter 15
Place Making and in the Lawrence Smart Code (although this specific area has not been identified on Map 15-1).

Horizon 2020 notes in the introductory chapter that the, “...city and county use the Comprehensive Plan to evaluate development proposals; to coordinate development at the fringes of the county’s cities; to form the foundation for specific area plans...” [emphasis added]

The Inverness Park District Plan is a type of “specific area plan” [re: Horizon 2020, pg 14-1]. According to the comprehensive plan, there are six reasons or purposes of developing a Specific Issue/District Plan. Two of these purposes are particularly relevant to the applications for land use changes in our neighborhood:

“4. Determine if development proposals are land use changes are in accordance with the community’s long term vision.
5. Provide a shared vision for area’s residents/owners and local government entities.” [re: Horizon 2020, pg 14-2]

The community of neighborhoods along Clinton Parkway, between Kasold Drive and Wakarusa Drive, and the two existing neighborhood commercial centers have seen 19 changes proposed to the planning documents and guiding policies for their neighborhood since 1999. Note 4 of these were withdrawn or not built and one was denied. That translates into over 70% of the proposed changes being adopted and developed. The neighborhood is not adverse to change, but it has grown more defensive in what changes to accept. The 2012 District Plan revision was guided by previous battles to keep at bay the numerous and repetitive proposals to increase residential densities and increase the percentage of rental housing in an owner-occupied residential area. The desire to not increase the percentage of rental housing is not unique to the Inverness Park area; it is a shared concern with the Oread and Centennial neighborhoods that border the University of Kansas. Through the development of neighborhood plans and neighborhood planning in Lawrence in the 1970s and 1980s, planning & housing statistics supported the premise that the stability of a neighborhood is closely tied to a predominance of owner-occupied residences. As the number of owner-occupied residences dips below 2/3rds the neighborhood housing stock begins to deteriorate.

The proposed rezoning to CN2, Neighborhood Commercial, the SUP for Outdoor Recreational facilities, and the amendments to the Zoning Regulations to add the developer's desired uses to the permitted uses in the CN2 are not part of the area residents/owners “shared vision”.

Horizon 2020's policies regarding neighborhood commercial developments:

CN1, Inner Neighborhood Commercial and CN2, Neighborhood Commercial are both neighborhood commercial districts. The CN1 district is a more desirable and appropriate neighborhood commercial district for our neighborhood because:

- CN1 was designed to serve existing neighborhood needs and the policies for this type of neighborhood commercial development were revised in 2008, recognizing the usefulness of this type of zoning for new CN1 areas within established neighborhoods [RE: ]
- This site shares similar siting and neighborhood compatibility issues with sites identified in Horizon 2020 as existing inner-neighborhood commercial center sites [re: page 6-6 in Horizon 2020].
New inner-neighborhood commercial centers are designed as “an integrated part of the surrounding neighborhood so that appearance of the commercial area does not detract from the character of the neighborhood.” [re: page 6-20 in Horizon 2020]

New Neighborhood Commercial Centers (CN2 sites) are identified in Horizon 2020 [page 6-21] and planning policies recommend new neighborhood commercial centers occur “at least” 1 mile radius from existing or new Commercial Centers. [page 6-33 in Horizon 2020].

The neighborhood commercial centers at Clinton Parkway and Kasold Drive and Clinton Parkway and Wakarusa Drive are 1.5 miles apart. The new CN2 at Clinton Parkway and Crossgates Drive is ½ mile from the Kasold Commercial Center and 1 mile from the Wakarusa Commercial Center.

Standards for new Inner-Neighborhood Commercial Centers, in policy 3.3 of Chapter 6 Horizon 2020, fit the neighborhoods needs more precisely than the proposal before the Commission. The standards in this policy are:

1. Inner-Neighborhood Commercial Centers shall be allowed only in those situations where the center is an integral part of an overall planned neighborhood or if the Center can be integrated into an existing neighborhood;
2. Centers shall not have gas pumps, drive-thru or drive-up facilities;
3. Centers may include residential uses;
4. Centers shall have no more than 3,000 gross square feet of commercial space; and
5. Centers shall be designed as an integrated part of the surrounding neighborhood so that their appearance does not detract from the character of the neighborhood.[ page 6-31 in Horizon 2020]

The function of Zoning Regulations to implement the comprehensive plan:

Zoning Regulations are intended to implement the goals and policies in the comprehensive plan. There purpose should not be to mold and craft a piece of property so that a developer’s desires can be ‘shoehorned’ into a site that is not appropriate for the proposed use. The request to “amend” the permitted uses in the CN2 district impact all areas zoned CN2. Drive through uses and outdoor recreational events, if improperly located in the CC, CR and CS zoning districts, should be thoroughly reviewed based on the impact on all existing CN2 centers, not just the development proposal before the Commission at this time.

Community gateways and the role of Clinton Parkway since the early 1970s as a gateway to the west.

Clinton Parkway is identified as a community gateway in Horizon 2020. It was identified in Plan 95, the previous land use plan, as a Community Gateway. Neighbors, property owners, and users of the recreational trails along Clinton Parkway have all enjoyed the support of the Lawrence governing bodies and planning commissioners to stay true to the vision that Clinton Parkway could be something different and better than its counterpart (23rd Street) to the east of Iowa Street. Please consider the impacts of the noise and light pollution associated with the proposed development and the litter and trash that are a likely outcome of the addition of a fast food restaurant along the Parkway.

Please consider the large out-pouring from our neighbors and this written communication to you that are in opposition to this development proposal for the specific commercial uses and outdoor recreational uses. They are not meeting a need, desire, or interest of our collective neighborhoods. Please deny the outdoor recreational SUP request and the text amendments to the ZR for the CN2 district and either deny the CN2 rezoning request or recommend a lesser change to CN1, which more
accurately and adequately – without need of text amendments – meets the stated priorities for neighborhood commercial in the Inverness Park District Plan.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda and Richard Finger
4117 Wimbledon Drive
The video for the community meeting held at Raintree Montessori School regarding the family fun center proposal can be found on YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yd-dAUmC-ZI
Hi Jim and Jon

Since you are the only Planning Commission Members I know, you two are the lucky recipients of my concerns about this project:-) I am an officer in the Wimbledon Terrace Townhomes Association and I know the Commission has received our February 14th letter noting the HOA's objections to this rezoning request, so I will try not to restate those issues. Please know that I have attended both meetings convened by Paul Werner.

In his April 4th letter to neighborhood residents Mr. Warner stated that the developer will not be seeking a cereal malt beverage license until at least the second season of operation. He seemed to think this satisfied the neighborhood concerns; however, I did not find this statement reassuring and obviously an application for a 3.2 beer license could happen at any time. I am confident there are a number of student age residents in the several apartment complexes that adjoin this property and it seems likely it would certainly be a destination point for consumption of CMB and alcohol, not birthday parties for elementary aged children.

At the April 14th meeting both Paul Warner and Mike Riling refused to name the developers. Obviously, that is their prerogative; however it is clear that supervision, staffing and public safety issues of this proposal have not been addressed.

Jim, you are the one who educated me about law enforcement planning as far as the campus and I clearly remember you describing the similarities between a university campus and large resort areas; this Fun Center seems to fall into the entertainment destination category. You talked about law enforcement planning and staffing when students arrived on campus, residence halls opening, football weekends, commencement, etc. and as nearly as I can figure out the Fun Center developers intend to have heavy usage and seasonal large crowds.

On the one hand the spokesmen for the project frame it as an entertainment area for young families, but on the other hand it is clear the intent is rezoning for commercial use which has a huge impact on the neighborhoods on both sides of Clinton Parkway. The unknown developers have not adequately addressed the traffic, noise, lighting issues and all the accompanying public safety concerns.

One of the planning staff's documents states that the Fun Center would create an amenity that neighborhood residents could walk to. As you both know the definition of amenity is something that makes life easier, pleasant and attractive, I do not view noisy go-karts, batting cages, miniature golf, bright lights until 10:30 at night, an arcade and beer bar as amenities enhancing this area.

Thank you both for your attention to my concerns and thank you for you service to the City of Lawrence and Douglas County; it is a time consuming and for the most part a thankless job.

Hope you both are well...
Best...
Ann Eversole
Co-President Wimbledon Terrace Townhomes Association
Mr. Kelly--

I am writing to oppose the change in zoning and special use permit requested by the developers of the "Family Fun Center" at the corner of Clinton Parkway and Inverness. My children attend Raintree Montessori, and I feel that a family fun center serving alcohol is inappropriate for that site. Instead, I suggest that the zoning remain the same and that the city of Lawrence work to bring an office development to that site. It is currently over-built with apartments, and the current road infrastructure will not support commercial development. I plan on attending the March 24th Planning Commission meeting to express my concerns in person.

Best regards,

Donna Ginther
4716 Muirfield Drive
Lawrence, KS 66047
Dear Planning Commissioner Members,

We recently have been reading about plans to build a Family Fun Center at 4300 W. 24th Place. We own the town homes on Adam Avenue to the west of this proposed Family Fun Center and we are adamantly opposed to the rezoning of the land to accommodate this business as well as passing of a special use permit. The area were they are proposing to build this Family Fun Center/ go-kart park is surrounded by apartments, town homes and single family homes. It is not an appropriate area to place a Family Fun Center that includes a go-kart track and outdoor facilities. The noise, lighting and traffic would be very disruptive to the neighborhood as well as bring down the property values in the neighborhood. Adding the sale of alcohol and the late hours the park would be open also increases the chance of crime (drunk driving, disorderly conduct, noise, etc.) to the area. A more appropriate area for this kind of business would be south of this neighborhood, across the by-pass next to the soccer and baseball fields where this kind of traffic and noise will not disrupt families.

Thank you for your time,

Candy Gunderson
Garber Enterprises, Inc.
Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

First, I would like to thank you for serving our community. I appreciate that you have many hours of your time in this capacity. I am writing to you regarding the upcoming vote on the rezoning/special use requests put forth to the planning commission by a project known as the Family Fun Center. I live near the intersection of 18th and Wakarusa and not far from Inverness and Bob Billings. I have seen much development along these two corridors over the years. After 13 years, the office building at 18th and Wakarusa is still only partially leased. I am wondering when this office building will be a good idea. The shopping center on the SE corner of Wakarusa and Bob Billings has had four restaurants go in and out at it's anchor location and is constantly replacing tenants - there must be a lot of money to be made in strip malls even if there are empty spaces. However, the philosophy of "if you build it, they will come", doesn't really hold true in either of these locations, but the landscape has been permanently changed. The Bella Serra "complex" (oh joy, more buildings are coming!) is a "ginormous" change to the environment - good idea? - if you live on the top two floors of that building (what views!) - not so much for anyone else. These are deeds that are already done, and cannot be undone. The landscape has been permanently changed.

I ask you to PLEASE consider this before approving a zoning change. Is this the best case scenario for this property or the worse case scenario? I doubt the homeowners, who purchased single family homes, many of whom have children that attend nearby schools, but who now live with multiple apartment complexes had in mind when they purchased their property - but maybe I am making a huge assumption. I don't believe I am.

Regarding the Family Fun Center project: A potential nightmare in property values for the nearby neighborhoods, 140 parking spaces, alcohol, noise, lights - the list goes on. Here is another disturbing issue that I hate to even think about; with FOUR schools nearby and neighborhoods full of kids within walking distance of this proposed facility, many with two working parents, what type of person would most like to frequent this area - or worse - get a job there? Let's not make it so easy for them, please. What if it gets built and then vacated in a few years due to a lack of business? What will the landscape of the neighborhood look like then? Lawrence does need more kid and family entertainment - no question about that - but this belongs out on Iowa Street. Perhaps, this belongs east on 23rd street, both where commercial businesses are already part of the landscape. I am all for progress, but I think a real visionary asks themselves hard questions about what the environment will look like in the future and the long term effects of designs and uses of land. Please be a visionary before voting on this issue. Think about the name PARKWAY. Think about what this landscape will look like in 20-30 years? Thank you so much for your consideration in this matter. I look forward to Monday night's meeting.

Sincerely,

Karen S Hartnett
4725 Carmel Place
Lawrence, KS 66047
Dear Planning Commission Members:
The area residents of the property surrounding Inverness Drive and 23rd Street Parkway have been misled and were not publicly informed of meetings concerning the proposals to re-zone the property until just prior to the meeting held in February when your committee was panning to vote on the re-zoning proposal. When the area citizens became aware of this, we appeared before your board, and were grateful that you listened to our concerns and voted to defer the vote until a later meeting. Mr. Paul Werner, the architect for this Family Fun Center, had not held any public meeting as required to inform the public of this issue. Since that deferral, two public meetings have been held, and as a resident of the Wimbledon Terrace Townhomes Association located directly across the street off 23rd Parkway to the north from the proposed fun center, I wish to express the frustration and aggravation in the lack of direct answers to our questions and concerns about this center from Mr. Werner; he and, now his lawyer Michael Riling, continue to insist that alcohol be a part of their plans for this center even though the public (even the young school children) have adamantly been opposed to this at every meeting. If you accept the re-zoning proposal to change the property to a CN-2, that will be the direction of this property development, and we do NOT want that to happen. This is a lovely neighborhood surrounded by many schools with young innocent but easily influenced children, family residential neighborhoods with strong property values. Keep our neighborhood safe and beautiful. Don't let a blight befall this area with noisy go-karts, loud aluminum batting cages, bright lights, loud amplified music, and bright lights with many issues of traffic, security, and management...nor the evils of alcohol! Preserve the Parkway!!!!! Thank you for your consideration of families and youth on this issue. See you Wednesday evening.
Truly, Ruth Hiss
Wimbledon Terrace Townhomes Association, Secretary
Dear Commissioner,

Please find my attached letter regarding the Family Fun Center proposal.

Thank you for taking the time to read it and for giving this matter your attention.

We appreciate your commitment to making sure Lawrence continues to be the unique and vibrant community it is.

We shall see you Wednesday.

Regards,

Lleanna McReynolds, M.Ed.
Head of School
We are adamantly opposed to the SUP and re-zone of this property for that use.

My wife and I attended several of the recent neighborhood meetings with the architect on this matter and reviewed the plans. Although a family fun Center’ does sound favorable in title, bringing the proposed indoor and outdoor facility to our tranquil residential neighborhood would impact our near community in the following manner:

**Noise:** Emanating from the batting cages, clanking of aluminum bats on hard hit balls
Race track with screeching tires, slamming of bumpers and race-car simulated music piped in
Unruly cheering and encouragement of patrons

**Workers:** Having casual seasonal workers operate the facility can attract those with unstable work history

**Children safety:** Having this center in close proximity to a number of schools can serve as a convenient magnet for child molesters. Having open parking lots available for congregation by strangers is not conducive for family values

**Traffic:** Although the reports indicate that the traffic circle is only 50~60% of capacity, at school start and end times, and afterschool events (track meets, games) the area is overwhelmed.

**Long-Term Viability:** We will not support, visit or partake in any of these activities including electronic gaming. We feel that in the longer term, this seasonal enterprise will fail leaving behind an abandoned facility in disrepair

In summary, we feel a Family Fun Center can do better on the outskirts of town, not in this close family neighborhood. We request that you **support us to oppose this rezone** and permit request.

Stephen & Helen Slade
4219 Teal Drive
Sunflower Park
Lawrence KS 66047
Greetings Planning Commission Members,

I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed development at Inverness and 24th Street. There are so many reasons this isn't a good idea, but I would like to specifically site excess noise, lights, traffic congestion, and available alcohol near several schools.

I live on W. 25th Place and the traffic before and after school is very busy it is, sometimes I can't even turn onto my own street because of the volume and drivers blocking the intersection. The increased traffic activity during the week and weekends if this proposal is accepted would be unimaginable. I am also concerned about crime, as it has already increased in our neighborhood in the last few years.

I enjoy family activities as much as the next person, but I think this is the wrong location, and not just because it's my neighborhood. I don't think any family neighborhood with schools would be appropriate for this type of entertainment. There are so many other choices that would be better - one option would be the area closer to Rock Chalk park, or even better, the area toward the end of south Iowa, close to where the by-pass will be completed would be ideal, and attract more out of town visitors.

I plan on attending the meeting on March 24.

Thank you for your time,

Nancy Stump
4417 W. 25th Place
Lawrence
Hi, Patrick,

1) You’re on the Planning Commission? I didn’t know that. Your name and e-mail address were listed on the note from Raintree Montessori School. According to my wife, the Family Fun Center under consideration for the Southeast corner of Clinton Parkway and Inverness is an awful idea. (I’m not as passionate about it, because I think go-karts are pretty fun). In the interest of preserving my marital bliss, you can, however, count this e-mail as being against the Family Fun Center.

2) I’ve recently submitted my application to Lawrence Public Schools. I’m interested in Special Education openings at the High Schools, especially Free State. If you have any advice or inside information for me; or if you can share with the hiring team how amazing I would likely be for the position, I would appreciate it. If you don’t have nice things to say about me, never-mind.

Thanks!

Brian Williams
Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to voice my oppositions to the proposed Family Fun Center for the property 4300 West 24th Place on Clinton Parkway. I live in the neighborhood behind Bishop Seabury Academy and have a son who attends this school.

About two weeks ago I attended a community meeting at Raintree School where the architect of the proposed development presented his design for the Family Fun Center. This Center will have Go Carts, Putt Putt Golf and a Video Arcade. Plans are to serve alcohol at the Fun Center.

In my opinion, a residential neighborhood near four schools is not an appropriate location for this kind of center. This will be a place where junior high, high school and college students gather and loiter. It will increase the traffic in our neighborhood, increase noise in the neighborhood, and will likely increase vandalism and other related crimes in our neighborhood.

I have another reason for believing that this development is not appropriate for a family neighborhood. Industries that make things for children, market heavily to them, a kind of entertainment that is fast paced and stimulating. Children have very few havens of quiet and calm. The family home as well as the school are two settings that, with thought, can provide a measure of peace and calm in the lives of our children.

The proposed Family Fun Center is a form of entertainment that is stimulating. While I believe there is a place for this kind of entertainment, having it in the middle of a residential neighborhood with family homes and schools is not, in my opinion, an appropriate setting for it. Our children need some protected time in their lives that is calm and not so stimulating, and again, the home and the school are among the few places left that can provide this to them.

For all of these reasons, I am asking you to oppose placing the proposed Family Fun Center in our neighborhood near our homes and our schools.

I write this letter from several perspectives. My home is located near the proposed development. I have a son who attend Bishop Seabury Academy which is directly across Clinton Parkway from the proposed development. I also have some understanding of how the environments that surround our children can affect their development, as I have a medical background in psychiatry and mental health.

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter.

Sincerely,
Susan Yoshida, MD
4124 Wimbledon Drive
Lawrence, Kansas  66047