## CALL THE MEETI NG TO ORDER

TAKE A ROLL CALL TO DETERMI NE IF THERE IS A QUORUM OF MEMBERS PRESENT

## ITEM NO. 1 COMMUNI CATI ONS

a) Acknowledge communications to come before the Board.
b) Board member disclosure of any ex parte contacts and/or abstentions from the discussion and vote on any agenda item under consideration.
c) Announce any agenda items that will be deferred.

## ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2016-2017

Accept nominations for and elect Chair and Vice-Chair for the coming year.

## ITEM NO. 2 MI NUTES

Consider approval of the minutes from the October 6, 2016 meeting of the Board.

## BEGI N PUBLIC HEARING:

## ITEM NO. 3 OUTDOOR LIGHT CONTAI NMENT VARI ANCE FOR A NEW AUTOMOTI VE SALES DISPLAY LOT; SW CORNER OF W. $29^{\text {TH }}$ STREET AND IOWA STREET [DRG]

B-16-00338: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 editinn The request is for a variance from the Outdoor Lighting Standards relatiag blew Light, which is listed in
 a development site shall notax 0 Qob candles measured at the lot line onto public street
 the southwest corner of W. $29^{\text {th }}$ Street between Iowa Street and the Iowa Street frontage road. Submitted by David Hamby, P. E. with BG Consultants, Inc., for AFAD, Inc., the property owner of record. Deferred from the September $1^{\text {st }}$ and October $6^{\text {th }}$ meetings by the applicant.

## ITEM NO. 4 AUTOMOTIVE SALES DISPLAY AREA VARIANCE FROM A PUBLIC STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY; 2851 IOWA STREET [JSC]

B-16-00339: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 edition. The request is for a variance to reduce the code required 15 feet minimum off-street parking area setback from public street rights-of-way, which is required in Section 20-908(c) of the City Code, to a minimum of 0 feet along the property's frontage on W. $28^{\text {th }}$ Terrace and Iowa Street frontage road. The property is located at 2851 Iowa Street. Submitted by David Hamby, P. E. with BG Consultants, Inc., for AFAD, Inc., the property owner of record. Deferred from the September $1^{\text {st }}$ and October $6^{\text {th }}$ meetings by the applicant.

## ITEM NO. 5 VARIANCE FROM THE MAXIMUM ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT SIZE; 1535 MASSACHUSETTS STREET [JSC]

B-16-00440: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 edition, The request is for a variance from the code permitted maximum size accessond dreing unit in a residential dwelling structure defined in Section 20-534(2)(iv) © (Q) Code. The code standard limits the size of an accessory dwellinguni (O) ndOre that 33 percent of the living area of the primary dwelling or 98) (2) Whichever is less. The proposed size of the accessory dwelling unit is 960 sure feet. The living area in the principal dwelling is 2,106 square feet which limits the size of an accessory dwelling unit to 695 square feet. The property is located at 1535 Massachusetts Street. Submitted by Leticia Cole with Paul Werner Architects for Joann E. Qandil, the property owner of record.

## ITEM NO. 6 PERI METER BUILDING SETBACK VARI ANCE FOR ARTERRA EVENT GALLERY; 2161 QUAIL CREEK DRIVE [DRG]

B-16-00441: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 edition. The request is for a variance from the minimum 30 feet perimeter building setback requirement from the boundary of a planned commercial development district (approved under the terms and conditions of the previous zoning code) as required by reference in Section 20-222(e) of the City Code. The applicant seeks variance approval to reduce the perimeter building setback to a minimum of 10 feet from the west property boundary so they can build an addition on the west side of the existing commercial structure. The property is located at 2161 Quail Creek Drive. Submitted by Allen Belot, Allen Belot Architects, for Arterra, LLC, the property owner of record.

## ITEM NO. 7 MI SCELLANEOUS

a) Consider any other business to come before the Board.

| From: | David Hamby |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | David Guntert |
| Cc: | Sandra Day |
| Subject: | Briggs Display Area BZA Application |
| Date: | Thursday, November 03, 2016 11:30:19 AM |

David,
After our meeting this morning and the Director's intention to administratively approve the revised photometric plan the Owner wishes to withdrawal the BZA application for 2901 lowa Street. Thank you.

David Hamby, P.E., CFM
Vice President
$\square$
1405 Wakarusa Drive | Lawrence, KS 66049
T: 785.749.4474 x 2106 | F: 785.749.7340
Web: www.bgcons.com | Map| Email

[^0]| From: | Leticia Cole |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Leff Crick |
| Cc: | David Guntert |
| Subject: | RE: 1535 Massachusetts St. :Board of Zoning Appeals Report |
| Date: | Monday, October 31, 2016 3:53:11 PM |

Thank you Jeff. At this time we would like to defer this for 1 month.

Leticia Cole
paulwerner ARCHITECTS
123 W. 8th Street, Suite B2
Lawrence, KS 66044
office:785.832.0804 Ext: 302
www.paulwernerarchitects.com

From: Jeff Crick [mailto:jcrick@lawrenceks.org]
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 10:42 AM
To: Leticia Cole
Cc: David Guntert
Subject: 1535 Massachusetts St. :Board of Zoning Appeals Report
Good morning Leticia,

The Board of Zoning Appeals staff report is available on our website at https://assets.lawrenceks.org/assets/pds/planning/bza/bzaagendaNov16Full.pdf. Feel free to let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Thanks,
Jeff

City of Lawrence Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
Jeff Crick, AICP, Planner II - jcrick@lawrenceks.org
Planning and Development Services | City of Lawrence, KS
P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044

Office (785).832.3163 | Fax (785).832.3160

City of Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
LAWRENCE BOARD OF ZONI NG APPEALS
Meeting Minutes of October 6, 2016-7:16 p.m.
Members present: Clark, Gardner, Gascon, Holley, Mahoney, Wilbur
Staff present: Ewert, Crick, Guntert

## ITEM NO. 1 COMMUNI CATI ONS

Mr. David Guntert said Mr. Doug Hassig sent an email requesting Item 5 be tabled for two months so he can gather additional support.

No board members had ex parte to disclose.
Items 3 and 4 were deferred prior to the meeting.

## ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2016-2017

Accept nominations for and elect a Chair and Vice-Chair for the coming year.
Mahoney suggested holding elections next month when all board members could be present.
Mr. Guntert said Mr. Eric Wisner was recently appointed by the Mayor to replace Mr. Scott Kimzey, whose term expired the end of September.

## ITEM NO. 2 MI NUTES

Consider approval of the minutes from the August 4, 2016 meeting of the Board.
Motioned by Holley, seconded by Wilber, to approve the August 4, 2016 Board of Zoning Appeals minutes.

Motion carried 3-0-2, with Clark and Gardner abstaining. Gascon was not present for the vote.

## BEGI N PUBLI C HEARING:

ITEM NO. 3 OUTDOOR LI GHT CONTAI NMENT VARI ANCE FOR A NEW AUTOMOTI VE SALES DISPLAY LOT; SW CORNER OF W. $29^{\text {TH }}$ STREET AND IOWA STREET [DRG]

B-16-00338: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 editin The request is for a variance from the Outdoor Lighting Standards relatino (1) Light, which is listed in

 rights-of-way or othe D) © the southwest corne Of W. $29^{\text {th }}$ Street between Iowa Street and the lowa Street frontage road. Submitted by David Hamby, P. E. with BG Consultants, Inc., for AFAD, Inc., the property owner of record. Deferred from the September 1 meeting by the applicant.

## ITEM NO. 4 AUTOMOTIVE SALES DISPLAY AREA VARIANCE FROM A PUBLIC STREET RI GHT-OF-WAY; 2851 IOWA STREET [J SC]

B-16-00339: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 edition he request is for a variance to reduce the code required 15 feet minim of public street rights-of-way, which is reanir\&b/ Slecelimlin-908(c) of the City Code, to a minimum of 0 feet along the grapris ©ntage on W. $28^{\text {th }}$ Terrace and Iowa Street frontage
 Consultants, Inc., for AFAD, Inc., the property owner of record. Deferred from the September 1 meeting by the applicant.

## ITEM NO. 5 VARIANCE FROM THE REAR YARD BUILDING SETBACK FOR A RESI DENTI AL DWELLI NG DECK ADDITION; 315 HEADWATERS DRIVE [DRG]

B-16-00380: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 edition te request is for a variance from the 30 feet minimum rear yard buildip shodk 世raudrd in an RS7 (SingleDwelling Residential) District which is requiremb/ S/Adill $10-601(a)$ of the City Code. The applicant is seeking a varianceqforad Qalestandard to allow the construction of a 10 feet deep deck addition tha (W) Ane rear yard building setback to a minimum of 20 feet. The property is located at 315 Headwaters Drive. Submitted by Doug Hassig, President of R\&H Builders, Inc., who is the property owner of record.

## ITEM NO. 6 MI SCELLANEOUS

a) Consider any other business to come before the Board.

## Adjourn 7:21pm

## ITEM NO. 3 OUTDOOR LI GHT CONTAI NMENT VARI ANCE FOR A NEW AUTOMOTI VE SALES DISPLAY LOT; SW CORNER OF W. $29^{\text {TH }}$ STREET AND IOWA STREET [DRG]

B-16-00338: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 edition. The request is for a variance from the Outdoor Lighting Standards relating to Spillover Light, which is listed in Section 20-1103(d)(3)(ii) of the City Code to exceed the code standard on the west frontage road on Iowa Street. This code provision states that spillover light from a development site shall not exceed 3 foot-candles measured at the lot line onto public street rights-of-way or other properties in a nonresidential zoning district. The property is located on the southwest corner of W. $29^{\text {th }}$ Street between Iowa Street and the Iowa Street frontage road. Submitted by David Hamby, P. E. with BG Consultants, Inc., for AFAD, Inc., the property owner of record. Deferred from the September $1^{\text {st }}$ and October $6^{\text {th }}$ meetings by the applicant. The legal description for each application is found in the respective project case file which is available in the Planning Office for review during regular office hours, 8-5 Monday Friday.

## B. REASON FOR REQUEST

Applicant's Request - "A variance from Article 20-1103.d.3.ii is requested. That section of the code prohibits spillover light onto Public Street rights-of-way in a non-residential district from exceeding 3 foot-candles at the lot line. We request that the requirement be waived due to the unique situation on the site and the fact that the excess light at the lot line will only spill light onto public streets."

The subject property is a narrow linear parcel located between the west frontage road and the southbound lanes of Iowa Street immediately south of the West $29^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection. This parcel was recently created by a decision from KDOT officials to sell a 36.75 feet by approximately 222 feet portion of Iowa Street/ U.S 59 Highway right-of-way to the applicant.

The site plan proposes to use the parcel as a vehicle sales lot for as many as 25 vehicles. The plan shows six light poles equally spaced along the east edge of the pervious paver parking pad. Each light pole is equipped with two 240 LED light fixtures directed to the west such that the spillover light for the most part occurs along the frontage road and the property on the west side of the frontage road.

## C. ZONING AND LAND USE

Current Zoning \& Land Use:

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:

CS (Commercial Strip) District; vacated street right-of-way currently in turf grass

CS District in all directions; commercial uses in all directions.

## D. ZONING ORDI NANCE REQUI REMENTS

All of Section 20-1103, "OUTDOOR LIGHTING", is shown below to provide context for the applicant's variance request. Section 20-1103(d)(3)(ii) is the specific code standard the
applicant is requesting to vary, which limits spillover light to not exceed 3 foot-candles, measured at the lot line of the property in nonresidential zoning districts.

## 20-1103 OUTDOOR LIGHTING

(a) Purpose

The outdoor lighting standards of this section are intended to eliminate spillover light and light glare on motor vehicle operators, pedestrians, and land uses near light sources. Safety considerations are a primary basis for the regulations, especially pedestrian, motor vehicle and traffic safety. In other cases, the regulations are intended to protect property values and the general welfare by controlling the nuisance aspects of glare or spillover light.
(b) Applicability

The regulations of this section apply to all uses except:
(1) Public Street lights, which are exempt from the standards of this section but are subject to all applicable standards of the Kansas Department of Transportation and the City of Lawrence Public Works Department;
(2) residential uses, which are exempt from the outdoor lighting standards of this section except that spot lights or flood lights that create a glare on neighboring property are prohibited. Off-Street Parking Lots associated with residential uses are not exempt from the outdoor lighting standards of this section;
(3) holiday lighting;
(4) outdoor recreation uses, which are subject only to the standards of Section 20-1103(e); and
(5) Telecommunication Towers and Antennas.

## (c) Exterior Lighting (Photometric) Plan

## (1) When Required

An outdoor lighting plan shall be submitted to the Planning Director whenever outdoor lighting is to be installed or whenever Site Plan Review is required. The lighting plan shall be reviewed to determine whether the proposed outdoor lighting complies with the standards of this section.

## (2) Information Required

Outdoor lighting plans shall include a photometric plan and data on the types of lighting fixtures to be used. The photometric plan includes all of the following unless the Planning Director determines that a thorough review and determination is possible without such information:
(i) Scaled drawing of the site with all outdoor lighting fixture locations identified;
(ii) Fixture specifications, such as catalog cut-sheets. The lighting fixture data shall be based on the photometric plan and shall indicate type of fixture, Height, shielding, luminare type and wattage.
(iii) Lamp type and size.
(iv) A point-by-point illumination array for the major Parking Area or areas. The point-by-point array shall indicate site illumination along the Lot Line at 10 -foot intervals and on the interior of the site at 20 foot intervals.
(d) Lighting Standards
(1) Light Confinement
(i) All outdoor lights shall, to the maximum extent feasible, confine emitted light to the property on which the light is located and not be directed upwards toward the sky.
(ii) All fixtures shall be cut-off fixtures that confine lighting to the subject site and shield the light source from view. Cut-off fixtures are not required when the luminaries are less than 150 watt incandescent.
(iii) Under-Canopy or downcast, roof-mounted lights shall be recessed from the lowest point of the ceiling plane and shall not exceed a maximum of thirty (30) Foot-candles.

(2) Visible Light Sources

Outdoor light sources that are visible within the normal range of vision from any R-zoned property are prohibited, unless the luminaries are less than 150 watt incandescent.
(3) Spillover Light

Spillover light is measured at Grade and is regulated as follows:
(i) Spillover light onto R-zoned property may not exceed 0.2 Footcandles, measured at the residential Lot Line.
(ii) Spillover light onto Public Street rights-of-way or properties in a nonresidential Zoning District may not exceed 3 Foot-candles, measured at the Lot Line of the illuminated site.
(iii) When outdoor lighting is used on property that is across the Street from R-zoned property, the maximum illumination at the Lot Line (abutting the Street right-of-way) of the illuminated site may not exceed one Foot-candle.
(e) Special Standards for Outdoor Recreation Uses Because of their unique requirements for nighttime visibility and their limited hours of operation, outdoor recreation uses are exempt from the preceding outdoor lighting standards of this section. Instead, outdoor recreation uses are subject to the following standards:
(1) Lights at outdoor recreation uses may not exceed a maximum permitted post height of 60 feet.
(2) No flickering or flashing lights are permitted.
(3) Lights may not be illuminated after 11:30 p.m.
(4) As-built lighting and photometric plans are required.
(5) 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 shutoff times for the lights, cutoff fixtures (where feasible) and other techniques.

## E. SPECI FIC ANALYSIS

Section 20-1309(g)(1) in the Development Code lists the five requisite conditions that have to be met for a variance to be approved.

1. The variance request arises from such conditions which are unique to the property in question and not ordinarily found in the same zone or district; and are not created by an action or actions of the property owner or applicant.

Applicant response: "The property is unique in that the existing dimensions limit how the parcel can be lit with lights. The parcel was obtained by the property owner from KDOT in 2012. KDOT determined the dimensions of the property. The existing width of the property is 36.75' which is not ordinarily found in the same zoning district. The existing width of 36.75' creates a situation where the proposed lights will have spillover greater than the 3 footcandles allowed at the lot line."

## Spillover Light:

The subject property was formerly public right-of-way for Iowa Street/U.S. 59 Highway. In 2012, the applicant initiated contact with Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) and the City of Lawrence with interest in acquiring some of the public right-of-way for a car display lot. The decision was made by KDOT officials to sell a portion of the public right-of-way, which is now the subject of this variance request. The variance request is directly tied to actions of the applicant by virtue of their initiating and pursuing the purchase of some of the public right-of-way. Had this parcel not been sold but retained as public right-of-way this variance request would not be necessary.

Finding - The property was created through the sale of a piece of the lowa Street/U.S. 59 Highway right-of-way by KDOT. The applicant pursued the sale of this property from KDOT with the intention to use it as a display lot for cars. The variance request is a direct result of the actions of the applicant, which include the purchase of a challenging size parcel and not lowering the light levels to acceptable levels.

## 2. That the granting of the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.

Applicant response: "Granting the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners as the spillover light will only be located on the public rights-of-way adjacent to the lot line."

## Spillover Light:

In staff's opinion, granting the requested variance to let spillover light surpass the code standard 3 foot-candle maximum at the property line will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents. The applicant's lighting plan displays the proposed light distribution pattern, which primarily shows excess spillover light west of the parcel where the frontage road exists. Because the property is surrounded by other commercial development there are no residential dwellers impacted by the brighter light pattern. The most directly affected property is another automotive dealership (Honda); they have a display lot to the east of their building, which may benefit from the additional illumination coming from this project.

Finding -- Granting the variance to let spillover light surpass the code standard 3 foot-candle maximum at the property line will not have any adverse effect upon the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.

## 3. That the strict application of the provisions of this chapter for which variance is requested will constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application.

Applicant response: "Strict application of the code will prevent the applicant from sufficiently lighting his property. We have looked at various alternatives to meet the code and worked with the lighting manufacturer's to develop an adequate solution but it is not possible to meet the code requirements on this site."

## Spillover Light:

In staff's opinion, strict adherence to the code standard may be a hardship for the property owner because they won't be able to light the vehicle display lot to the intensity levels they desire. The proposed lighting plan shows spillover light levels ranging from 11 to 30 footcandles along the west property line (east edge of the frontage road). The spillover light levels still exceed the 3 foot-candle standard west of the frontage road, although they become less intense. While it may be challenging for the applicant to comply with the city code to keep spillover light dispersion on this parcel at levels that do not exceed the 3 foot-candle maximum past the property line, there must be other lighting options the applicant can use that will contain more light from leaving the property. There have to be many options available in light fixtures, illumination type and amount, internal and external fixture shields for light containment, adjustable lens angles, light pole heights, etc. the applicant can use to reduce or eliminate spillover light.

Lighting levels have been collected by City staff for several nearby auto dealership sales/display lots to provide a comparison with what the applicant is seeking to use if their variance request is granted. As shown in Exhibits A \& B (included in the staff report attachments) the existing light levels along Iowa Street for the surveyed display lots are
significantly lower than the light levels the applicant has proposed for the new display lot.
Finding -- Strict adherence to the 3 foot-candle code standard for spillover light beyond the property line may be a hardship for the property owner because they won't be able to light the vehicle display lot to the intensity levels they desire. However, there have to be many other options available in light fixtures, illumination type and intensity, internal and external fixture
shields for light containment, adjustable lens angles, light pole heights, etc. the applicant can use to reduce or eliminate spillover light.

## 4. That the variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, or general welfare.

Applicant response: "If the variance was granted there would be no adverse effects and the additional light would actually create more visibility at night on the adjacent public streets."

## Spillover Light:

In staff's opinion, granting the variance will allow too much outdoor light beyond the property boundaries onto the adjacent frontage road and property on the west side of the frontage road, which may result in an adverse effect to the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare. The brighter light illumination may create a nuisance factor for nearby property owners and it could also be a distraction for motorists. If granted, other commercial property owners in this area may want to do the same thing with their outdoor site lighting, which is counterproductive to the community's goal of eliminating light glare and spillover light on motor vehicle operators, pedestrians, and nearby land uses.

Finding -- Granting the variance will have an adverse effect on the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare.

## 5. That granting the variance desired will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of this chapter.

Applicant response: "The purpose of the code as stated in Article 20-1103.a is primarily for safety considerations. The granting of the variance will actually provide a safer situation than not allowing lighting on the lot. The additional light will not have an adverse effect on safety."

## Spillover Light:

In staff's opinion, the proposed lighting plan for the vehicle display lot does not meet the general spirit and intent of the development code. The applicant's plan shows lighting levels along the west property line that are approximately $4-10$ times greater than the city's code permits. Decreasing the amount and intensity of spillover light to a level close to the code compliant 3 foot-candle level is necessary for the project to comply with the general spirit and intent of the code.

Finding -- The applicant's lighting plan does not meet the general spirit and intent of the development code. The spillover lighting shown on the plan ranges from 4-10 times the code allowed maximum 3 foot-candles.

## Conclusions:

## Spillover Light:

Staff's analysis concludes the variance request does not meet the five conditions set forth in Section 20-1309(g)(1) of the Development Code which the Board must find present to grant a variance for the building setbacks. Specifically, the applicant's request does not meet the stated purpose of conditions $1,3,4$ and 5.

## Recommendation:

Staff recommends denial of the variance for spillover outdoor site lights exceeding the code maximum 3 foot-candles measured at the lot line based upon the findings in the staff report that conclude this request does not meet the 5 conditions outlined in Section 20-1309(g)(1) required for variance approval.


B-16-00338: Variance from the Outdoor Lighting Standard Limiting Spillover Light at the Property Boundary to Not Exceed 3 foot candles in a Nonresidential Zoned Area; SW Corner of W. 29th Street and Street
Lawrence Planning \& Development Services Dept

City of Lawrence Douglas County

Lawrence Douglas County

## APPLICATION FOR <br> VARIANCE FROM UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP

## OWNER INFORMATION



## APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION

Contact David Hamby, P.E., CFM
$\qquad$
Address 1405 Wakarusa Drive
City Lawrence State KS ZIP 66049

Phone (785) 749-4474 Fax (___)

E-mail $\qquad$ Mobile/Pager $\qquad$ ) $\qquad$
Pre-Application Meeting Date August 3, 2016
Planner Sandra Day

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

Present Zoning District $\qquad$ Present Land Use $\qquad$
Proposed Land Use Vehicle Sales/Display
Legal Description (may be attached) $\qquad$
Address of Property 2901 lowa Street, Lawrence
Total Site Area $\quad 8,162$ SF
Number and Description of Existing Improvements or Structures $\qquad$ Vacant

City of Lawrence Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

## Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office

6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044
(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160 http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

Description of variance requested:
A variance from Article 20-1103.d.3.ii is requested. That section of the code prohibits spillover light onto Public
Street rights-of-way in a non-residential district from exceeding 3 foot-candles at the lot line. We request that the requirement be waived due to the unique situation of the site and the fact that the excess light at the lot line will only spill light onto public streets.

City of Lawrence Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office

## UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP CRITERIA

The Board of Zoning Appeals may approve a zoning variance if it finds that all of the following criteria have been met. The Development Code places the burden on the applicant to show that an application complies with such criteria. Please respond to each criterion to the best of your knowledge. (Attach additional sheets if needed.)

1. That the variance request arises from such conditions which are unique to the property in question and not ordinarily found in the same zoning or district and are not created by action(s) of the property owner or applicant:
The property is unique in that the existing dimensions limit how the parcel can be lit with lights. The parcel was
obtained by the property owner from KDOT in 2012. KDOT determined the dimensions of the property. The
existing width of the property is 36.75 ' which is not ordinarily found in the same zoning district. The existing
width of $36.75^{\prime}$ creates a situation where the proposed lights will have spillover greater than the 3 foot-candles
$\qquad$
2. That granting the variance would not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents:
Granting the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners as the spillover light will
only be located on the public rights-of-way adjacent to the lot line.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
3. That strict application of the provisions of this chapter for which the variance is requested would constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application:
Strict application of the code will prevent the applicant from sufficiently lighting his property. We have looked at various alternatives to meet the code and worked with the lighting manufacturer's to develop an adequate solution but it is not possible to meet the code requirements on this site.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
4. That the variance desired would not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare:
If the variance was granted there would be no adverse affects and the additional light would actually create more visibility at night on the adjacent public streets.

City of Lawrence Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044
(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160 http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/
5. That granting the variance desired would not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of the Development Code:
The purpose of the code as stated in Article 20-1103.a is primarily for safety considerations. The granting of the
variance will actually provide a safer situation than not allowing lighting on this lot. The additional light will not
have an adverse affect on safety.

## SIGNATURE

I/We, the undersigned am/are the (owner(s), (duly authorized agent), (Circle One) of the aforementioned property. By execution of my/our signature, I/we do hereby officially apply for variances as indicated above.

Signature(s):
$\qquad$ Date $\qquad$
$\qquad$ Date $\qquad$

## STAFF USE ONLY

Application No. $\qquad$
Date Received $\qquad$
BZA Date $\qquad$
Fee $\$$ $\qquad$
Date Fee Paid $\qquad$

Lawrence Douglas County<br>Metropolitan Planning Office<br>6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044<br>(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160 http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

## PROPERTY OWNERSHIP LIST CERTIFICATION

As required by Article 13, Section 20-1301(q) of the Development Code, the applicant is responsible for providing certified Ownership information (including names and mailing addresses) of all real property owners within a defined radius from the subject property. The Planning Department is required by the Development Code to use the submitted Ownership list to mail notice of the public hearing to surrounding property owners regarding this Application.

## Ownership Information

The applicant is responsible for providing certified Ownership information. Current Ownership information shall be obtained from the Douglas County Clerk. Ownership information will be considered current if it is no more than $\mathbf{3 0}$ days old at the time an application is submitted to the Planning Department.

## Radius of Notification

The Ownership list shall include the record Owner of the subject property and all Owners of property located within 200 feet of the subject property. If the subject property is adjacent to the City limits the area of notification shall be extended to at least 1,000 feet into the unincorporated area.

A map of the "Radius of Notification" can be obtained at the Applicant's request at the Planning Office. The map indicates ownership of each property and can be used to check the accuracy and completeness of the Ownership List. The map will be supplied at the Applicant's expense. Allow 10 business days to receive the map.

## THE FOLLOWING IS TO BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT.

I certify that I have read and understood the above information and that the submitted Ownership list:

1. was a) obtained from and b) certified by the Douglas County Clerk,
2. is current (no more than $\mathbf{3 0}$ days old), and
3. includes all property owners within the required notification radius of the subject property.


August 5, 2016
Date

David J. Hamby
Printed Name


Exhibit A: Photometric Light Readings Collected by City Staff at Nearby Auto Dealership Lots



1 inch $=150$ feet

Exhibit B: Photometric Light Readings Collected by City Staff for South lowa Street Auto Dealership Lots


(
2 Photometric Site Plan






$\left.\begin{array}{r}1 \\ 2\end{array}\right)$ Photometric Site Plan



[^1]
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## Cree Edge ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Series

LED High Output Area/Flood Luminaire featuring Cree TrueWhite ${ }^{\circledR}$ Technology

## Product Description

The Cree Edge ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ High Output Area/Flood luminaire is designed to deliver high lumen packages with precise optical control. The unit features a slim, low profile design that minimizes wind load and a rugged die cast aluminum adjustable arm that mounts to a horizontal or vertical $2^{\prime \prime}(51 \mathrm{~mm})$ IP, 2.375-2.50" ( $60-64 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) O.D. steel tenon. Tenon length must be a minimum of $3.75^{\prime \prime}$ ( 95 mm ). The direct mount bracket accessory allows for further mounting flexibility. Available with Cree TrueWhite ${ }^{\text {e }}$ Technology, the Cree Edge ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ High Output helps to beautifully render true colors and deliver value beyond energy savings.
Applications: Auto dealerships, parking lots, campuses, facade lighting, high-mast and general site lighting applications

## Performance Summary

Utilizes Cree TrueWhite ${ }^{\circledR}$ Technology on 5000K Luminaires
Patented NanoOptic ${ }^{\circledR}$ Product Technology
Made in the U.S.A. of U.S. and imported parts
CRI: Minimum 70 CRI (4000K \& 5700K); 90 CRI (5000K)
CCT: $4000 \mathrm{~K}(+/-300 \mathrm{~K}), 5000 \mathrm{~K}(+/-300 \mathrm{~K}), 5700 \mathrm{~K}(+/-500 \mathrm{~K})$ standard
Limited Warranty ${ }^{\dagger}$ : 10 years on luminaire/10 years on Colorfast DeltaGuard ${ }^{\circledR}$ finish
${ }^{+}$See http://lighting.cree.com/warranty for warranty terms
HV Mount (shown in horizontal position)


120 LED


240 LED

## Accessories

| Field-Installed |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bird Spikes | Backlight Control Shields |
| XA-BRDSPKXAK12 | XA-30BLS-4 |
| -120 LED | - Four-pack for 120 LED |
| XA-BRDSPKXAK24 | - Unpainted stainless steel |
| -240 LED | XA-30BLS-8 |
|  | - Eight-pack for 240 LED |
|  | - Unpainted stainless steel |



HV Mount (shown in Vertical position)Direct Mount Bracket- see page 13 for weight \& dimensions

## Ordering Information

## Example: ARE-EHO-2M-HV-12-E-UL-SV-700

|  |  |  |  | HV |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Product | Optic |  |  | Mounting | LED <br> Count (x10) | Series | Voltage | Color Options | Drive Current | Options |  |  |
| ARE- <br> EHO | 2M <br> Type II Medium <br> 2MB <br> Type II <br> Medium w/BLS <br> 3M <br> Type III Medium | 3MB <br> Type III Medium w/BLS <br> 4M <br> Type IV Medium <br> 4MB <br> Type IV Medium w/BLS | 5M <br> Type V Medium 5S <br> Type V Short <br> AF <br> Automotive <br> FrontlineOptic ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ | HV <br> Horizontal/ Vertical Tenon <br> - For EHO-UNV direct mount bracket, refer to Tenons \& Brackets on page 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | E | UL <br> Universal 120-277V <br> UH <br> Universal $347-480 \mathrm{~V}$ | BK <br> Black <br> BZ <br> Bronze <br> SV <br> Silver <br> WH <br> White | $\begin{aligned} & 700 \\ & 700 \mathrm{~mA} \\ & 1000 \\ & 1000 \mathrm{~mA} \end{aligned}$ | DIM 0-10V Dimming <br> - Control by others <br> - Refer to Dimming spec sheet for details <br> - Can't exceed specified drive current <br> F Fuse <br> - When code dictates fusing, use time delay fuse <br> - Refer to ML spec sheet for availability with ML options <br> - Not available with UH voltage | R | NEMA ${ }^{\oplus}$ Photocell Receptacle <br> - 3-pin receptacle per ANSI C136.10 <br> - Intended for downlight applications with maximum $45^{\circ}$ tilt <br> - Consult factory for vertical tenon application <br> - Photocell and shorting cap by others <br> - Refer to ML spec sheet for availability with ML options |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLD- } \\ & \text { EHO } \end{aligned}$ | 15 <br> $15^{\circ}$ <br> Flood <br> 25 <br> $25^{\circ}$ <br> Flood | 40 <br> $40^{\circ}$ <br> Flood <br> 70 <br> $70^{\circ}$ <br> Flood | SN <br> Sign <br> N6 <br> NEMA ${ }^{\oplus} 6$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ML Multi-Level <br> - Refer to ML spec sheet for details <br> - Intended for downlight applications at $0^{\circ}$ tilt <br> - Not available with UH voltage or 240 LEDs with 1000 mA drive current | 40K <br> 50K | 4000K Color Temperature <br> - Minimum 70 CRI <br> - Color temperature per luminaire <br> 5000K Color Temperature <br> - Minimum 90 CRI <br> - Utilizes Cree TrueWhite ${ }^{\oplus}$ Technology <br> - Color temperature per luminaire |

NOTE: Price adder may apply depending on configuration

US: lighting.cree.com/lighting

## Product Specifications

## CREE TRUEWHITE ${ }^{\oplus}$ TECHNOLOGY

A revolutionary way to generate high-quality white light, Cree TrueWhite ${ }^{\circledR}$ Technology is a patented approach that delivers an exclusive combination of $90+$ CRI, beautiful light characteristics and lifelong color consistency, all while maintaining high luminous efficacy - a true no compromise solution.

## CONSTRUCTION \& MATERIALS

- Slim, low profile, minimizing wind load
- Luminaire sides are rugged die cast aluminum with integral, weathertight LED driver compartments and high performance heat sinks
- Adjustable arm that mounts to a horizontal or vertical 2 " $(51 \mathrm{~mm})$ IP, $2.375-2.50 "(60-64 \mathrm{~mm})$ O.D. steel tenon. Tenon length must be a minimum of 3.75 " ( 95 mm )
- Surface-mount directly to a vertical or horizontal surface with direct mount bracket (refer to Tenons and Brackets table on page 12)
- Luminaire may be field adjusted for use in uplight position. Please refer to installation instructions for details
- Extruded aluminum adjustable mounting shaft
- Luminaire is adjustable from horizontal $90^{\circ}$ towards pole and $120^{\circ}$ away from pole
- Exclusive Colorfast DeltaGuard ${ }^{\circledR}$ finish features an E-Coat epoxy primer with an ultra-durable powder topcoat, providing excellent resistance to corrosion, ultraviolet degradation and abrasion. Silver, bronze, black, and white are available
- Weight: See weight charts on pages 1 and 13


## ELECTRICAL SYSTEM

- Input Voltage: 120-277V or $347-480 \mathrm{~V}, 50 / 60 \mathrm{~Hz}$, Class 1 drivers
- Power Factor: > 0.9 at full load
- Total Harmonic Distortion: < $20 \%$ at full load
- Integral 10 kV surge suppression protection standard
- To address inrush current, slow blow fuse or type C/D breaker should be used
- Maximum 10V Source Current: 120 LED: $0.40 \mathrm{~mA} ; 240$ LED: 0.80 mA


## REGULATORY \& VOLUNTARY QUALIFICATIONS

- cULus Listed
- Suitable for wet locations
- Consult factory for CE Certified products
- 10kV surge suppression protection tested in accordance with IEEE/ANSI C62.41.2
- Meets FCC Part 15, Subpart B, Class A standards for conducted and radiated emissions
- Certified to ANSI C136.31-2001, 3G bridge and overpass vibration standards
- DLC qualified. Exceptions apply when ordered with backlight control, 5000 K CCT with 1000 mA drive current, or 5000 K CCT with 700 mA drive current and $2 \mathrm{M}, 3 \mathrm{M}$ or 70 optics. Please refer to www.designlights.org/QPL for most current information
- Luminaire and finish endurance tested to withstand 5,000 hours of elevated ambient salt fog conditions as defined in ASTM Standard B 117
- Meets Buy American requirements within ARRA
- Dark Sky Friendly, IDA Approved. Please refer to www.darksky.org/ for most current information
- RoHS compliant. Consult factory for additional details

| Electrical Data* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LED Count } \\ & (\times 10) \end{aligned}$ | System Watts 120-480V | Total Current |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 120 V | 208V | 240 V | 277V | 347 V | 480 V |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 267 | 2.24 | 1.29 | 1.12 | 0.99 | 0.80 | 0.58 |
| 24 | 533 | 4.49 | 2.57 | 2.24 | 1.97 | 1.62 | 1.16 |
| 1000 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 421 | 3.61 | 2.06 | 1.80 | 1.61 | 1.25 | 0.90 |
| 24 | 831 | 7.16 | 4.04 | 3.54 | 3.14 | 2.50 | 1.81 |

* Electrical data at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual wattage may differ by $+/-10 \%$ when operating between $120-480 \mathrm{~V}+/-10 \%$

| Recommended Cree ${ }^{\text {® }}$ Edge High Output Series Lumen Maintenance Factors (LMF) ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ambient | Initial LMF | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{hr}^{2} \\ & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { LMF } \end{aligned}$ | 50K hr <br> Projected ${ }^{2}$ <br> LMF | 75K hr Calculated ${ }^{3}$ LMF | 100 K hr Calculated ${ }^{3}$ LMF |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \\ & \left(41^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 1.04 | 0.99 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 0.93 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \\ & \left(50^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 1.03 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.94 | 0.92 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \\ & \left(59^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 1.02 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.91 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \\ & \left(68{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 1.01 | 0.96 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.90 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \\ & \left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.91 | 0.89 |

${ }^{1}$ Lumen maintenance values at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ are calculated per TM-21 based on LM-80 data and in-situ luminaire testing
${ }^{2}$ In accordance with IESNA TM-21-11, Projected Values represent interpolated value based on time durations that are within six times ( 6 X ) the IESNA LM-80-08 total test duration
(in hours) for the device under testing ((DUT) i.e. the packaged LED chip)
${ }^{3}$ In accordance with IESNA TM-21-11, Calculated Values represent time durations that exceed six times (6X) the IESNA LM-80-08 total test duration (in hours) for the device under testing ((DUT) i.e. the packaged LED chip)

## Photometry

All published luminaire photometric testing performed to IESNA LM-79-08 standards by a NVLAP accredited laboratory. To obtain an IES file specific to your project consult: www.cree.com/Lighting/Tools-and-Support/Exterior-IES-Configuration-Tool

2M


ITL Test Report \#: 78643
ARE-EHO-2M-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K Initial Delivered Lumens: 32,284


ARE-EHO-2M-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}$ (7.6m) A.F.G. Initial Delivered Lumens: 61,352 Initial FC at grade

| Type II Medium Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LED Count (x10) | 4000K |  | 5000K |  | 5700K |  |
|  | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 22,829 | B3 U1 G3 | 18,088 | B3 U1 G3 | 23,707 | B3 U1 G3 |
| 24 | 45,687 | B5 U1 G4 | 36,199 | B4 U1 G4 | 47,445 | B5 U1 G4 |
| 1000 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 30,656 | B4 U1 G4 | 24,289 | B3 U1 G3 | 31,835 | B4 U1 G4 |
| 24 | 61,352 | B5 U1 G5 | 48,609 | B5 U1 G4 | 63,711 | B5 U1 G5 |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens
** For more information on the IES BUG (Backlight-Uplight-Glare) Rating visit:
www.ies.org/PDF/Erratas/TM-15-11BugRatingsAddendum.pdf. Valid with no tilt

2MB


ITL Test Report \#: 78683 ARE-EHO-2MB-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K Initial Delivered Lumens: 24,579


ARE-EHO-2MB-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G. Initial Delivered Lumens: 46,213 Initial FC at grade

| Type II Medium w/BLS Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LED Count (x10) | 4000K |  | 5000K |  | 5700K |  |
|  | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 17,196 | B2 U1 G2 | 13,625 | B2 U1 G2 | 17,857 | B2 U1 G2 |
| 24 | 34,414 | B3 U1 G4 | 27,266 | B3 U1 G3 | 35,738 | B3 U1 G4 |
| 1000mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 23,092 | B2 U1 G3 | 18,296 | B2 U1 G2 | 23,980 | B2 U1 G3 |
| 24 | 46,213 | B3 U1 G4 | 36,615 | B3 U1 G4 | 47,990 | B3 U1 G5 |

[^2]
## Cree Edge ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ LED High Output Area/Flood Luminaire

## Photometry

All published luminaire photometric testing performed to IESNA LM-79-08 standards by a NVLAP accredited laboratory. To obtain an IES file specific to your project consult: www.cree.com/Lighting/Tools-and-Support/Exterior-IES-Configuration-Tool

3M


TL Test Report \#: 78638
ARE-EHO-3M-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K nitial Delivered Lumens: 30,916


ARE-EHO-3M-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G Initial Delivered Lumens: 58,165 Initial FC at grade

| Type III Medium Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LED Count (x10) | 4000K |  | 5000K |  | 5700K |  |
|  | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 21,643 | B3 U1 G3 | 17,148 | B3 U1 G3 | 22,476 | B4 U1 G4 |
| 24 | 43,314 | B4 U1 G4 | 34,318 | B4 U1 G4 | 44,980 | B5 U1 G5 |
| 1000 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 29,064 | B4 U1 G4 | 23,028 | B3 U1 G3 | 30,182 | B4 U1 G4 |
| 24 | 58,165 | B5 U1 G5 | 46,084 | B5 U1 G5 | 60,402 | B5 U1 G5 |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens
* For more information on the IES BUG (Backlight-Uplight-Glare) Rating visit
www.ies.org/PDF/Erratas/TM-15-11BugRatingsAddendum.pdf. Valid with no tilt

3MB


ITL Test Report \#: 78733 ARE-EHO-3MB-**-12-E-UL-1000 Initial Delivered Lumens: 23,622


ARE-EHO-3MB-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G Initial Delivered Lumens: 43,026 Initial FC at grade

| Type III Medium w/BLS Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LED Count (x10) | 4000K |  | 5000K |  | 5700K |  |
|  | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 16,010 | B2 U1 G3 | 12,685 | B1 U1 G3 | 16,626 | B2 U1 G3 |
| 24 | 32,041 | B3 U1 G4 | 25,386 | B2 U1 G4 | 33,273 | B3 U1 G4 |
| 1000mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 21,499 | B2 U1 G4 | 17,034 | B2 U1 G3 | 22,326 | B2 U1 G4 |
| 24 | 43,026 | B3 U1 G5 | 34,090 | B3 U1 G4 | 44,681 | B3 U1 G5 |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens
* For more information on the IES BUG (Backlight-Uplight-Glare) Rating visit:
www.ies.org/PDF/Erratas/TM-15-11BugRatingsAddendum.pdf. Valid with no tilt


## Photometry

All published luminaire photometric testing performed to IESNA LM-79-08 standards by a NVLAP accredited laboratory. To obtain an IES file specific to your project consult: www.cree.com/Lighting/Tools-and-Support/Exterior-IES-Configuration-Tool

4M


ITL Test Report \#: 77685
ARE-EHO-4M-**-12--E-UL-700-50K Initial Delivered Lumens: 19,507


ARE-EHO-4M-**-24--E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G. Initial Delivered Lumens: 61,352 Initial FC at grade

| Type IV Medium Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LED Count (x10) | 4000K |  | 5000K |  | 5700K |  |
|  | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 22,829 | B3 U1 G3 | 18,088 | B3 U1 G3 | 23,707 | B3 U1 G3 |
| 24 | 45,687 | B5 U1 G4 | 36,199 | B4 U1 G4 | 47,445 | B5 U1 G4 |
| 1000 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 30,656 | B4 U1 G4 | 24,289 | B3 U1 G3 | 31,835 | B4 U1 G4 |
| 24 | 61,352 | B5 U1 G5 | 48,609 | B5 U1 G5 | 63,711 | B5 U1 G5 |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens
** For more information on the IES BUG (Backlight-Uplight-Glare) Rating visit:
www.ies.org/PDF/Erratas/TM-15-11BugRatingsAddendum.pdf. Valid with no tilt

4 MB


ITL Test Report \#: 78734 ARE-EHO-4MB-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K Initial Delivered Lumens: 25,113


ARE-EHO-4MB-**-24-E-UL-1000-4OK Mounting Height: 25' 7.6 m ) A.F.G. Initial Delivered Lumens: 46,213 Initial FC at grade

| Type IV Medium w/BLS Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LED Count (x10) | 4000K |  | 5000K |  | 5700K |  |
|  | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 17,196 | B2 U1 G3 | 13,625 | B1 U1 G2 | 17,857 | B2 U1 G3 |
| 24 | 34,414 | B2 U1 G4 | 27,266 | B2 U1 G4 | 35,738 | B3 U1 G4 |
| 1000 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 23,092 | B2 U1 G3 | 18,296 | B2 U1 G3 | 23,980 | B2 U1 G4 |
| 24 | 46,213 | B3 U1 G5 | 36,615 | B3 U1 G4 | 47,990 | B3 U1 G5 |

[^3]
## Cree Edge ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ LED High Output Area/Flood Luminaire

## Photometry

All published luminaire photometric testing performed to IESNA LM-79-08 standards by a NVLAP accredited laboratory. To obtain an IES file specific to your project consult: www.cree.com/Lighting/Tools-and-Support/Exterior-IES-Configuration-Tool

5M


TL Test Report \#: 78580
ARE-EHO-5M-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K Initial Delivered Lumens: 32,328


ARE-EHO-5M-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: 25' (7.6m) A.F.G. Initial Delivered Lumens: 64,539 Initial FC at grade

| Type V Medium Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LED Count (x10) | 4000K |  | 5000K |  | 5700K |  |
|  | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 24,015 | B5 U1 G3 | 19,027 | B4 U1 G2 | 24,939 | B5 U1 G3 |
| 24 | 48,061 | B5 U1 G4 | 38,079 | B5 U1 G4 | 49,909 | B5 U1 G4 |
| 1000 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 32,249 | B5 U1 G4 | 25,551 | B5 U1 G3 | 33,489 | B5 U1 G4 |
| 24 | 64,539 | B5 U1 G5 | 51,135 | B5 U1 G5 | 67,021 | B5 U1 G5 |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens
* For more information on the IES BUG (Backlight-Uplight-Glare) Rating visit
www.ies.org/PDF/Erratas/TM-15-11BugRatingsAddendum.pdf. Valid with no tilt
$5 s$


ITL Test Report \#: 78687 ARE-EHO-5S-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K |nitial Delivered Lumens: 37,329


ARE-EHO-5S-**-24-E-UL-1000-4OK Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G Initial Delivered Lumens: 71,710 Initial FC at grade

| Type V Short Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LED Count (x10) | 4000K |  | 5000K |  | 5700K |  |
|  | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 26,684 | B4 U0 G2 | 21,142 | B4 U1 G2 | 27,710 | B5 U0 G3 |
| 24 | 53,401 | B5 U0 G4 | 42,310 | B5 U1 G4 | 55,455 | B5 U0 G4 |
| 1000 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 35,832 | B5 U0 G3 | 28,390 | B5 U1 G3 | 37,210 | B5 U0 G3 |
| 24 | 71,710 | B5 U0 G5 | 56,816 | B5 U1 G4 | 74,468 | B5 U0 G5 |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens
* For more information on the IES BUG (Backlight-Uplight-Glare) Rating visit:
www.ies.org/PDF/Erratas/TM-15-11BugRatingsAddendum.pdf. Valid with no tilt


## Photometry

All published luminaire photometric testing performed to IESNA LM-79-08 standards by a NVLAP accredited laboratory. To obtain an IES file specific to your project consult: www.cree.com/Lighting/Tools-and-Support/Exterior-IES-Configuration-Tool

AF


ITL Test Report \#: 78579
ARE-EHO-AF-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K Initial Delivered Lumens: 36,341


ARE-EHO-AF-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G. Initial Delivered Lumens: 69,319 Initial FC at grade

| Automotive FrontlineOptic ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LED Count (x10) | 4000K |  | 5000K |  | 5700K |  |
|  | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings" <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 | Initial Delivered Lumens* | BUG <br> Ratings** <br> Per <br> TM-15-11 |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 25,794 | B3 U0 G2 | 20,437 | B3 U0 G1 | 26,786 | B3 U0 G2 |
| 24 | 51,621 | B4 U0 G2 | 40,900 | B4 U0 G2 | 53,606 | B4 U0 G2 |
| 1000 mA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 34,638 | B4 U0 G2 | 27,444 | B3 U0 G2 | 35,970 | B4 U0 G2 |
| 24 | 69,319 | B5 U0 G3 | 54,922 | B4 U0 G2 | 71,986 | B5 U0 G3 |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens
** For more information on the IES BUG (Backlight-Uplight-Glare) Rating visit:
www.ies.org/PDF/Erratas/TM-15-11BugRatingsAddendum.pdf. Valid with no tilt
$15^{\circ}$



## ITL Test Report \#: 78519

FLD-EHO-15-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K Initial Delivered Lumens: 38,859


FLD-EHO-15-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G. $-60^{\circ}$ tilt Initial Delivered Lumens: 73,303 Initial FC at grade

| $\mathbf{1 5}^{\circ}$ Flood Optic Distribution |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| LED Count <br> (x10) | 4000 K | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 27,276 | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens |  |  |
| 24 | 54,588 | 21,611 | 28,326 |  |
| 1000 mA | 36,628 | 29,250 | 56,687 |  |
| 12 | 73,303 | 58,079 | 38,037 |  |
| 24 |  | 76,123 |  |  |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens


## Cree Edge ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ LED High Output Area/Flood Luminaire

## Photometry

All published luminaire photometric testing performed to IESNA LM-79-08 standards by a NVLAP accredited laboratory. To obtain an IES file specific to your project consult: www.cree.com/Lighting/Tools-and-Support/Exterior-IES-Configuration-Tool
$25^{\circ}$


TL Test Report \#: 78520 LD-EHO-25-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K Initial Delivered Lumens: 38,828


FLD-EHO-25-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G. $-60^{\circ}$ tilt Initial Delivered Lumens: 73,303 Initial FC at grade

| $25^{\circ}$ Flood Optic Distribution |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4000K | 5000K | 5700K |
| LED Count (x10) | Initial Delivered Lumens* | Initial Delivered Lumens* | Initial <br> Delivered Lumens* |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |
| 12 | 27,276 | 21,611 | 28,326 |
| 24 | 54,588 | 43,250 | 56,687 |
| 1000 mA |  |  |  |
| 12 | 36,628 | 29,021 | 38,037 |
| 24 | 73,303 | 58,079 | 76,123 |

Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens
$40^{\circ}$


ITL Test Report \#: 78521 FLD-EHO-40-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K nitial Delivered Lumens: 36,476


FLD-EHO-40-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G. $-60^{\circ}$ tilt Initial Delivered Lumens: 71,710 Initial FC at grade

| $40^{\circ}$ Flood Optic Distribution |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4000K | 5000K | 5700K |
| LED Count (x10) | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens* | Initial Delivered Lumens* | Initial Delivered Lumens* |
| 700 mA |  |  |  |
| 12 | 26,684 | 21,142 | 27,710 |
| 24 | 53,401 | 42,310 | 55,455 |
| 1000 mA |  |  |  |
| 12 | 35,832 | 28,390 | 37,210 |
| 24 | 71,710 | 56,816 | 74,468 |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens


## Photometry

All published luminaire photometric testing performed to IESNA LM-79-08 standards by a NVLAP accredited laboratory. To obtain an IES file specific to your project consult: www.cree.com/Lighting/Tools-and-Support/Exterior-IES-Configuration-Tool
$70^{\circ}$


ITL Test Report \#: 78522 FLD-EHO-70-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K Initial Delivered Lumens: 33,030


FLD-EHO-70-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G. $-60^{\circ}$ tilt Initial Delivered Lumens: 65,336 Initial FC at grade

| $70^{\circ}$ Flood Optic Distribution |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| LED Count <br> $(\times 10)$ | 4000 K | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 24,312 | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens |  |  |
| 24 | 48,654 | 38,549 | 25,247 |  |
| 1000 mA | 32,647 | 25,867 | 50,525 |  |
| 12 | 65,336 | 51,766 | 33,903 |  |
| 24 |  | 67,849 |  |  |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens

SN


ITL Test Report \#: 78563 FLD-EHO-SN-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K Initial Delivered Lumens: 34,961


FLD-EHO-SN-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G. $-60^{\circ}$ tilt Initial Delivered Lumens: 66,132 Initial FC at grade

| Sign Optic Distribution |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| LED Count <br> (x10) | 4000 K | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 24,608 | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens |  |  |
| 24 | 49,248 | 19,497 | 25,555 |  |
| 1000 mA | 33,045 | 39,019 | 51,142 |  |
| 12 | 66,132 | 52,397 | 34,316 |  |
| 24 |  | 68,676 |  |  |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens


## Cree Edge ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ LED High Output Area/Flood Luminaire

## Photometry

All published luminaire photometric testing performed to IESNA LM-79-08 standards by a NVLAP accredited laboratory. To obtain an IES file specific to your project consult: www.cree.com/Lighting/Tools-and-Support/Exterior-IES-Configuration-Tool

N6


TL Test Report \#: 78562
FLD-EHO-N6-**-12-E-UL-1000-40K nitial Delivered Lumens: 38,110


FLD-EHO-N6-**-24-E-UL-1000-40K Mounting Height: $25^{\prime}(7.6 \mathrm{~m})$ A.F.G. $-60^{\circ}$ tilt Initial Delivered Lumens: 73,303 Initial FC at grade

| NEMA 6 Distribution |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| LED Count <br> (x10) | 4000 K | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 27,276 | Initial <br> Delivered <br> Lumens |  |  |
| 24 | 54,588 | 21,611 | 2800 K |  |
| 1000 mA |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 36,628 | 29,021 | 56,687 |  |
| 24 | 73,303 | 58,079 | 38,037 |  |

* Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens

Cree Edge ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ LED High Output Area/Flood Luminaire

## Luminaire EPA

| Horizontal/Vertical Tenon Mount and EHO-UNV Direct Mount Bracket |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LED Count (x10) | Luminaire <br> Weight | Single |  | $2 \mathrm{a} 90^{\circ}$ | 2 1 $180^{\circ}$ | $2 \mathrm{~A} 180^{\circ}$ | $3 \mathrm{C} 90^{\circ}$ | $3 \mathrm{~A} 120^{\circ}$ | $3 \mathrm{~A} 180^{\circ}$ | $4 \mathrm{C} 90^{\circ}$ | $4 \mathrm{a} 180^{\circ}$ |
| Tenon Configuration If used with Cree tenons, please add tenon EPA with Luminaire EPA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Vertical | Horizontal | Vertical | Vertical | Vertical | Vertical | Vertical | Vertical | Vertical | Vertical |
|  |  | PB-1A*; <br> PW-1A3; <br> EHO-UNV | Horizontal Tenon | PB-2A*; <br> PB-2R2.375: <br> PW-2A3; <br> (2) EHO-UNV | PB-2A*; <br> PB-2R2.375; <br> PW-2A3 <br> (picture does not apply) | PB-2A*; <br> PB-2R2.375; <br> PW-2A3 <br> (picture doesn't apply) | PB-3A*; PB-3R2.375: (3) EHO-UNV |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PB-3A*; } \\ & \text { PB-3R2.375 } \end{aligned}$ | PB-4A* ${ }^{*}$ (90); PB-4R2.375; <br> (4) EHO-UNV | PB-4A*(180): <br> PB-4R2.375 |
| $0^{\circ}$ Tilt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 45.3 lbs . <br> ( 20.6 kg ) | 1.41 | 1.41 | 2.35 | 2.83 | 2.83 | 3.76 | 3.76 | 4.24 | 4.70 | 5.66 |
| 24 | 80.5 lbs . <br> (36.6kg) | 1.41 | 1.41 | 2.80 | 2.83 | N/A | 4.22 | 4.22 | N/A | 5.61 | N/A |
| $10^{\circ}$ Tilt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 45.3 \mathrm{lbs} . \\ & (20.6 \mathrm{~kg}) \end{aligned}$ | 1.49 | 1.41 | 2.90 | 2.98 | 2.98 | 4.39 | 4.39 | 5.96 | 5.81 | 7.95 |
| 24 | 80.5 lbs . <br> (36.6kg) | 2.38 | 1.97 | 2.38 | 4.76 | N/A | 6.18 | 6.18 | N/A | 7.59 | N/A |
| $20^{\circ}$ Tilt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 45.3 \mathrm{lbs} . \\ & (20.6 \mathrm{~kg}) \end{aligned}$ | 2.11 | 1.71 | 3.53 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 5.64 | 5.64 | 8.45 | 7.05 | 11.26 |
| 24 | 80.5 lbs . <br> (36.6kg) | 3.46 | 3.11 | 4.87 | 6.92 | N/A | 7.12 | 7.12 | N/A | 9.74 | N/A |
| $30^{\circ}$ Tilt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 45.3 \mathrm{lbs} . \\ & (20.6 \mathrm{~kg}) \end{aligned}$ | 2.69 | 2.30 | 4.11 | 5.39 | 5.39 | 6.80 | 6.80 | 10.78 | 8.22 | 14.37 |
| 24 | 80.5 lbs. <br> (36.6kg) | 4.59 | 4.23 | 6.97 | 9.19 | N/A | 10.60 | 10.60 | N/A | 12.01 | N/A |
| $45^{\circ}$ Tilt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 45.3 \mathrm{lbs} . \\ & (20.6 \mathrm{~kg}) \end{aligned}$ | 3.50 | 3.11 | 4.91 | 6.99 | 6.99 | 8.40 | 8.40 | 13.98 | 9.82 | 18.64 |
| 24 | 80.5 lbs . <br> (36.6kg) | 6.03 | 5.73 | 7.44 | 10.31 | N/A | 13.48 | 13.48 | N/A | 14.89 | N/A |
| $60^{\circ}$ Tilt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 45.3 \mathrm{lbs} . \\ & (20.6 \mathrm{~kg}) \end{aligned}$ | 4.12 | 3.74 | 5.54 | 8.25 | 8.25 | 9.66 | 9.66 | 16.49 | 11.08 | 21.99 |
| 24 | 80.5 lbs . <br> (36.6kg) | 7.24 | 6.91 | 8.65 | 12.37 | N/A | 15.89 | 15.89 | N/A | 17.30 | N/A |
| $70^{\circ}$ Tilt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 45.3 \mathrm{lbs} . \\ & (20.6 \mathrm{~kg}) \end{aligned}$ | 4.41 | 4.03 | 5.83 | 8.83 | 8.83 | 10.24 | 10.24 | 17.65 | 11.65 | 23.54 |
| 24 | $\begin{aligned} & 80.5 \mathrm{lbs} . \\ & (36.6 \mathrm{~kg}) \end{aligned}$ | 7.76 | 7.45 | 9.17 | 15.51 | N/A | 16.93 | 16.93 | N/A | 18.34 | N/A |
| $80^{\circ}$ Tilt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 45.3 \mathrm{lbs} . \\ (20.6 \mathrm{~kg}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4.59 | 4.21 | 6.00 | 9.18 | 9.18 | 10.59 | 10.59 | 18.36 | 12.01 | 24.47 |
| 24 | 80.5 lbs . <br> (36.6kg) | 8.06 | 7.79 | 9.48 | 16.12 | N/A | 17.54 | 17.54 | N/A | 18.95 | N/A |
| $90^{\circ}$ Tilt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 45.3 \mathrm{lbs} . \\ (20.6 \mathrm{~kg}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4.64 | 4.26 | 6.06 | 9.29 | 9.29 | 10.70 | 10.70 | 18.58 | 12.12 | 24.77 |
| 24 | 80.5 lbs . <br> (36.6kg) | 8.14 | 7.89 | 9.56 | 16.29 | N/A | 17.70 | 17.70 | N/A | 19.12 | N/A |

[^4]
## Tenon EPA

| Part Number | EPA |
| :--- | :--- |
| PB-1A* | None |
| PB-2A* $^{*}$ | 0.82 |
| PB-3A* | 1.52 |
| PB-4A*(90) | 1.11 |
| PB-4A*(180) | 2.22 |
| PB-2R2.375 | 0.92 |
| PB-3R2.375 | 1.62 |
| PB-4R2.375 | 2.32 |
| PW-1A3** | 0.47 |
| PW-2A3** | 0.94 |
| WM-2 | 0.08 |
| WM-2L | 0.13 |
| WM-4L | 0.32 |
| EHO-UNV | 0.22 |


| Tenons and Brackets ${ }^{\ddagger}$ (must specify color) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Square Internal Mount Vertical Tenons (Steel) <br> - Mounts to 3-6" ( $76-152 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) square aluminum or steel poles <br> Wall Mount Brackets <br> - Mounts to wall or roof <br> WM-2 - Horizontal <br> WM-4L - Extended L-Shape <br> WM-2L - Extended Horizontal | Round External Mount Vertical Tenons (Steel) <br> - Mounts to $2.375^{\prime \prime}(60 \mathrm{~mm})$ O.D. round aluminum or steel poles or tenons $\begin{array}{ll} \text { PB-2R2.375 - Twin } & \text { PB-4R2.375 - Quad } \\ \text { PB-3R2.375 - Triple } & \end{array}$ <br> Mid-Pole Bracket <br> - Mounts to square pole <br> PW-1A3** - Single <br> PW-2A3** - Double <br> Direct Mount Bracket <br> - Mounts to minimum $4^{\prime \prime}(102 \mathrm{~mm})$ round or square; aluminum or steel pole or can be surface-mounted directly to a vertical or horizontal surface <br> - See Direct Mount Configurations table below <br> - Poles must be field drilled for direct mount <br> EHO-UNV |

${ }^{\ddagger}$ Refer to the Bracket and Tenons spec sheet for more details

Specify pole size: $3\left(3^{\prime \prime}\right), 4\left(4^{\prime \prime}\right), 5\left(5^{\prime \prime}\right)$, or $6\left(6^{\prime \prime}\right)$ for single, double or triple luminaire orientation or $4\left(4^{\prime \prime}\right), 5\left(5^{\prime \prime}\right)$, or $6\left(6^{\prime \prime}\right)$ for quad luminaire orientation
These EPA values must be multiplied by the following ratio: Fixture Mounting Height/Total Pole Height. Specify pole size: 3 ( $3^{\prime \prime}$ ), 4 ( $4^{\prime \prime}$ ), $5\left(5^{\prime \prime}\right)$, or $6\left(6^{\prime \prime}\right)$

## Direct Mount Configurations

| Compatibility with EHO-UNV Direct Mount Bracket |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LED Count (x10) | $2 \mathrm{C} 90^{\circ}$ | $2 \mathrm{~A} 180^{\circ}$ | $3 \mathrm{C} 90^{\circ}$ | $3 \mathrm{~A} 120^{\circ}$ | $4 \mathrm{C} 90^{\circ}$ |
| 4" Square |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 24 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 4" Round |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | N/A | $\checkmark$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 24 | N/A | $\checkmark$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5" Square |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | N/A | $\checkmark$ |
| 24 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | N/A | $\checkmark$ |
| 5" Round |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | N/A | $\checkmark$ | N/A | $\checkmark$ | N/A |
| 24 | N/A | $\checkmark$ | N/A | $\checkmark$ | N/A |
| 6" Square |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | N/A | $\checkmark$ |
| 24 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | N/A | $\checkmark$ |
| 6" Round |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 24 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |

## Cree Edge ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ LED High Output Area/Flood Luminaire

HV Mount (shown in vertical position) 120 LED


| LED Count (x10) | Weight |
| :--- | :--- |
| 12 | 45.3 lbs. (20.5kg) |
| 24 | 80.5 lbs. $(36.5 \mathrm{~kg})$ |



Direct Mount Bracket (accessory sold separately)
120 LED


## ITEM NO. 4 PARKI NG AREA SETBACK VARI ANCES; 2851 I OWA STREET [J SC]

B-16-00339: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 edition. The request is for a variance to reduce the code required 15 feet minimum off-street parking area setback from public street rights-of-way, which is required in Section 20-908(c) of the City Code, to a minimum of 0 feet along the property's frontage on W. 28th Terrace and Iowa Street frontage road. The property is located at 2851 I owa Street. Submitted by David Hamby, P. E. with BG Consultants, Inc., for AFAD, Inc., the property owner of record.

## B. REASON FOR REQUEST

Applicant's Request - "A variance from Article 20-908.c is requested. That section of the code requires a minimum setback of 15 ' from right-of-way in a CS zoning district. We request that the setback be reduced to $0^{\prime}$ to match similar areas in the adjacent area and zoning district. The proposed site plan shows an area on the east side of the existing building where vehicles would be displayed if the variance is approved. The variance is requested for vehicle display and not for general public parking."

## C. ZONI NG AND LAND USE

Current Zoning \& Land Use:
CS (Commercial Strip) District; Vehicle Sales and Service: Light Equipment Sales/Rental. Briggs Auto Group: Used Sales.

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:
CS (Commercial Strip) District; to the north, east, west, and south; various retail and commercial uses.

## D. ZONI NG ORDI NANCE REQUI REMENTS

Section 20-908(c), "Location: Nonresidential Districts," has standards defining the minimum parking area setbacks for each zoning district. In the CS District, the location of off-street parking areas in commercial zoning districts is listed as a minimum of 15 feet from the right-ofway.

## E. SPECIFIC ANALYSIS

Section 20-1309(g)(1) in the Development Code lists the five requisite conditions that have to be met for a variance to be approved.

1. The variance request arises from such conditions which are unique to the property in question and not ordinarily found in the same zone or district; and are not created by an action or actions of the property owner or applicant.

Applicant response: "The property is unique in that it has an extraordinarily large right-of-way on its east side. The distance from the west edge of the frontage road to the property line is a minimum of 22' and a maximum of 35'. The 15' setback would be in addition to the width mentioned previously. The typical width between the edge of the road and the edge of the parking area for vehicle dealerships along 29'h Terrace is about 18' (Subaru, Chrysler, Nissan) up to a maximum of 25' (Honda). Along the frontage road on the east side of Iowa Street the distance from the edge of the frontage road to the vehicle display ranges from 15' to 19'. The property to the north (Hyundai) has a vehicle display setback of $O^{\prime}$ from the property line. "

The applicant's request to reduce the required 15 foot setbacks to a 0 foot setback along the property's Iowa Street and $W 28^{\text {th }}$ Terrace frontages stems from the reuse of the existing building as a vehicle sales showroom. This request is not required to comply with the required parking amount for the proposed use of the existing structure. Instead, the requested variance is to permit an outdoor vehicle display space for the applicant between the existing building and rights-of way. Projects with similar outdoor vehicle sales area have complied with the setback request.

The property has existed in this configuration since construction in 1976 as a retail sales and storage building. Similarly, the property has maintained fixed property lines since platting in 1972. The site plan submitted with this application indicates this space will be used as an outdoor sales area, and is not required parking for the use of this site. This proposed use is currently under site plan review to convert it from a retail commercial use to a vehicle sales and service use. (SP-16-00234)

Most of this area was developed prior to the adoption of the 2006 Land Development Code. Staff reviewed the surrounding properties with similar uses and parking within the CS Zoning District to understand the approval and development timing for parking closer to the public rights-of-way. Many of the locations in the vicinity were approved utilizing the discontinued 1966 Zoning Code, which allowed parking to be located closer to rights-of-way for a period of time prior to 1984. The 1966 Zoning Code in certain commercial circumstances stated that parking, "may occupy all or any part of any required yard or court space." (1966 Zoning \& Planning Code, §20-1203) A later amendment to the code modified this requirement to include a setback from rights-of-way for parking development; "Commercial and office developments designed, built or redeveloped after August 28, 1984, shall be designed with off-street parking facilities (including aisleways and parking stalls) 15 feet back from the street right-of-way line." ( 1966 Zoning \& Planning Code, §20-1216(a)) One property that was reviewed under the 2006 Land Development Code was granted an administrative waiver from the 15 foot parking setback allowing it to be consistent with the existing development pattern and because the wide green space and medians designed into $\mathrm{W} .29^{\text {th }}$ Terrace that are a unique design feature constructed into this local street. These conditions and level of service are not present along either lowa Street or W. $28^{\text {th }}$ Terrace.


Figure 1: Subject Site \& Similar Uses with Approval Dates

The Iowa Street frontage road does present a unique right-of-way condition with a larger deviation to the west at this location than what is present along other blocks of the Iowa Street. However, this larger right-of-way is consistent along the western side of the 2800 block of Iowa Street presenting a consistent and uniform development pattern from the frontage road. The existing condition along W . $28^{\text {th }}$ Terrace is equally as varied, but also not designed in the same typology as W. $29^{\text {th }}$ Terrace.

While the previous Zoning Code allowed parking closer than 15 feet to the right-of-way, since the adoption of the Land Development Code other development projects in the vicinity and within the same zoning district have complied with this setback requirement.
2. That the granting of the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.

Applicant response: "Granting the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners as the adjacent vehicle dealerships already have a similar setback to the one we are requesting."

In staff's opinion, the requested variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents. Notice was provided to property owners within a 200 foot distance of the subject property to inform them of the application filed by the property owner.

As of the time this report was written, staff has not been contacted by any property owner expressing concerns or objections to the applicant's request. Staff has received inquiries regarding the process and requirements for similar items.
3. That the strict application of the provisions of this chapter for which variance is requested will constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application.

Applicant response: "Strict application of the code will prevent the applicant from being able to use this property to its fullest extent. There will not be enough room on the east side of the building to provide an area for vehicle display. Adequate vehicle display area is required for a vehicle dealership to function properly. "

The minimum 15 foot parking setbacks as prescribed in Section 20-908(c) is a standard that is consistent for all non-residential zoning districts throughout Lawrence. While the change from a previous code to the current code was not an action initiated by the applicant, it is difficult to interpret it as a unique hardship. While the minimum parking setback might not be ideal for the proposed use, it is consistently applied to similar new and redeveloping vehicle dealerships within the community.

In staff's opinion, strict adherence to the Land Development Code would not be an unnecessary hardship at this property. The property has been zoned CS since the adoption of the Land Development Code in 2006, and the 15 foot parking setback has also been a part of the Code since its adoption. Complying with the setback requirement would not prohibit the use of the site as a used car dealership. While the setback requirement might not create an ideal design for this proposed use, it is consistently applied and required for other commercial development, including those with similar uses.
4. That the variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, or general welfare.

Applicant response: "If the variance was granted there would be no adverse effects. The display area on the east side of the building will create opportunity for the vehicle dealership to function properly which in turn will generate sales tax which supports the community as a whole."

In staff's opinion, granting the requested variances will not create an adverse effect upon the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare. The request would be contained within the parcel owned by the applicant. This would not create any spillover noxious effects to the surrounding area.

There is a long-standing community value in maintaining setbacks to ensure desired items such as green space, landscaping, and an aesthetically appealing streetscape are created and maintained. Some areas, such as Downtown Lawrence, are designed without setbacks for specific reasons; however, for this building typology and suburban setting the Land Development Code was constructed with the concept of a parking setback to ensure the presence of plantings, and to help create and maintain a uniform streetscape that is not
singularly dominated by vehicle parking directly adjacent to property lines. Establishing and maintaining a consistent setback line and visually unified setbacks provide a reference point for shaping the physical character of this portion of Lawrence and S. Iowa Street. Setbacks of this nature are typically landscaped with trees, shrubs, and ground cover to soften views of the structure and provide visual interest, while conveying a defined urban feeling by creating a sense of containment along the street edge. This, in turn, adds to a feeling of security and comfort for both pedestrians and motorists.
5. That granting the variance desired will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of this chapter.

Applicant response: "The purpose of the code as stated in Article 20-901. a is to ensure that the off-street parking, loading and access demands of various land uses will be met without adversely affecting surrounding areas. The granting of the variance will not adversely affect surrounding areas in part due to the extra-large right-of-way that exists in front of the proposed vehicle display area. This area is an Auto Plaza where vehicle sales and service areas are located. The location of vehicle display areas in front of the buildings is commonplace and expected and is what we are requesting. "

In staff's opinion, approval of this variance would not be consistent with the general spirit and intent of the Land Development Code. While having parking closer to Iowa Street is common within the area, many of those locations were developed under a discontinued requirement. A similar setback requirement was previously incorporated into the 1966 Zoning Code at the same 15 foot setback distance from rights-of-way. The applicable section of Article 9: "Parking, Loading and Access" creates a consistent setback of parking from the public rights-of-way throughout the City of Lawrence. While this particular portion of Iowa Street utilizes a frontage road for access management purposes, the standard specifically lists a minimum setback from rights-of-way.

Conclusions: Staff's analysis of this variance application finds the request does not meet all five conditions set forth in Section 20-1309(g)(1) of the Land Development Code that the Board must find existing to grant a variance.

Recommendation: Staff cannot recommend approval of the requested variance to reduce the 15 foot minimum parking setback requirement to a minimum of zero feet along $\mathrm{W} .28^{\text {th }}$ Terrace and the Iowa Street frontage road.


B-16-00339: Variance from the Code Required 15 Feet Off-Street Parking Setback from a Public Street Right-of-Way for a New Automobile Display Area; 2851 Iowa Street

City of Lawrence Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044
(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160
http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

## APPLICATION FOR <br> VARIANCE FROM UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP



APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION
Contact David Hamby, P.E., CFM
Company BG Consultants, Inc.
Address 1405 Wakarusa Drive
City Lawrence $\quad$ State KS ZIP 66049

Phone (785) 749-4474 Fax (___)

E-mail $\qquad$ Mobile/Pager (___) $\qquad$
Pre-Application Meeting Date August 3, 2016 Planner Sandra Day

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

Present Zoning District CS Present Land Use $\qquad$
Proposed Land Use Vehicle Sales/Display
Legal Description (may be attached) See Attached
Address of Property 2851 lowa Street, Lawrence
Total Site Area 53,797 SF
Number and Description of Existing Improvements or Structures Two existing buildings

City of Lawrence Douglas County

Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office<br>6 East $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044 (785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160 http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
Description of variance requested:
A variance from Article 20-908.c is requested. That section of the code requires a minimum setback of 15 ' from right-of-way in a CS zoning district. We request that the setback be reduced to $0^{\prime}$ to match similar areas in the adjacent area and zoning district. The proposed site plan shows an area on the east side of the existing building where vehicles would be displayed if the variance is approved. The variance is requested for vehicle display and not for general public parking.

City of Lawrence Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office

6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044
(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160 http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

## UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP CRITERIA

The Board of Zoning Appeals may approve a zoning variance if it finds that all of the following criteria have been met. The Development Code places the burden on the applicant to show that an application complies with such criteria. Please respond to each criterion to the best of your knowledge. (Attach additional sheets if needed.)

1. That the variance request arises from such conditions which are unique to the property in question and not ordinarily found in the same zoning or district and are not created by action(s) of the property owner or applicant:
The property is unique in that it has an extraordinarily large right-of-way on its east side. The distance from the west edge of the frontage road to the property line is a minimum of $22^{\prime}$ and a maximum of $35^{\prime}$. The $15^{\prime}$ setback
would be in addition to the width mentioned previously. The typical width between the edge of the road and the
edge of the parking area for vehicle dealerships along 29th Terrace is about 18' (Subaru, Chrysler, Nissan) up to
a maximum of $25^{\prime}$ (Honda). Along the frontage road on the east side of lowa Street the distance from the edge of
the frontage road to the vehicle display ranges from 15' to 19'. The property to the north (Hyundai) has a vehicle display setback of 0 ' from the property line.
2. That granting the variance would not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents:
Granting the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners as the adjacent vehicle
dealerships already have a similar setback to the one we are requesting.

City of Lawrence Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
3. That strict application of the provisions of this chapter for which the variance is requested would constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application:
Strict application of the code will prevent the applicant from being able to use this property to its fullest extent.
There will not be enough room on the east side of the building to provide an area for vehicle display. Adequate
vehicle display area is required for a vehicle dealership to function properly.
4. That the variance desired would not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare:
If the variance was granted there would be no adverse affects. The display area on the east side of the building
will create opportunity for the vehicle dealership to function properly which in turn will generate sales tax which
supports the community as a whole.
5. That granting the variance desired would not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of the Development Code:
The purpose of the code as stated in Article 20-901.a is to ensure that the off-street parking, loading and access
demands of various land uses will be met without adversely affecting surrounding areas. The granting of the
variance will not adversely affect surrounding areas in part due to the extra large right-of-way that exists in front
of the proposed vehicle display area. This area is an Auto Plaza where vehicle sales and service areas are
located. The location of vehicle display areas in front of the buildings is commonplace and expected and is
what we are requesting.

## SIGNATURE

I/We, the undersigned am/are the (owners)), (duly authorized agent) (Circle One) of the aforementioned property. By execution of my/our signature, I/we do hereby officially apply for variances as indicated above.

Signature (s):


Date $B / 5 / 16$
$\qquad$ Date $\qquad$
$\qquad$ Date $\qquad$

STAFF USE ONLY
Application No. $\qquad$
Date Received $\qquad$
BZA Date $\qquad$
Fee $\$$ $\qquad$
Date Fee Paid $\qquad$

## PROPERTY OWNERSHIP LIST CERTIFICATION

As required by Article 13, Section 20-1301(q) of the Development Code, the applicant is responsible for providing certified Ownership information (including names and mailing addresses) of all real property owners within a defined radius from the subject property. The Planning Department is required by the Development Code to use the submitted Ownership list to mail notice of the public hearing to surrounding property owners regarding this Application.

## Ownership Information

The applicant is responsible for providing certified Ownership information. Current Ownership information shall be obtained from the Douglas County Clerk. Ownership information will be considered current if it is no more than $\mathbf{3 0}$ days old at the time an application is submitted to the Planning Department.

## Radius of Notification

The Ownership list shall include the record Owner of the subject property and all Owners of property located within 200 feet of the subject property. If the subject property is adjacent to the City limits the area of notification shall be extended to at least 1,000 feet into the unincorporated area.

A map of the "Radius of Notification" can be obtained at the Applicant's request at the Planning Office. The map indicates ownership of each property and can be used to check the accuracy and completeness of the Ownership List. The map will be supplied at the Applicant's expense. Allow 10 business days to receive the map.

## THE FOLLOWING IS TO BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT.

I certify that I have read and understood the above information and that the submitted Ownership list:

1. was a) obtained from and b) certified by the Douglas County Clerk,
2. is current (no more than $\mathbf{3 0}$ days old), and
3. includes all property owners within the required notification radius of the subject property.


August 5, 2016
Date

David J. Hamby
Printed Name


## ITEM NO. 5 ACCESSORY DWELLI NG UNI T SI ZE VARI ANCES; 1535 MASSACHUSETTES STREET [J SC]

B-16-00440: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 edition. The request is for a variance from the code permitted maximum size accessory dwelling unit in a residential dwelling structure defined in Section 20-534(2)(ix) of the City Code. The code standard limits the size of an accessory dwelling unit to no more that 33 percent of the living area of the primary dwelling or 960 square feet, whichever is less. The proposed size of the accessory dwelling unit is 960 square feet. The living area in the principal dwelling is 2,106 square feet which limits the size of an accessory dwelling unit to 695 square feet. The property is located at 1535 Massachusetts Street. Submitted by Leticia Cole with Paul Werner Architects for Joann E. Qandil, the property owner of record.

## B. REASON FOR REQUEST

Applicant's Request - "We request a variance to the maximum size of an accessory dwelling unit. The code states the maximum size be no more than $33 \%$ of the living area of the detached dwelling or 960 square feet, whichever is less. We request to use the greater of these two calculations."

## C. ZONI NG AND LAND USE

Current Zoning \& Land Use:

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:

RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential - 7,000 square feet) District; Detached Dwelling use.

RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential - 5,000 square feet) District; to the east and west; Single and Multi-Family Residential uses.

RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential - 7,000 square feet) District; to the north and south; Single and Multi-Family Residential uses.

## D. ZONI NG ORDI NANCE REQUI REMENTS

Section 20-534(2)(ix), "Accessory Dwelling Units: Size," has standards defining the maximum size for an accessory dwelling unit. This standard sets the maximum size of an Accessory Dwelling Unit may be no more than (33\%) of the living area of the Detached Dwelling or Attached Dwelling, or 960 square feet, whichever is less.


Figure 1: 2016 Aerial Photograph of Site

## E. SPECI FIC ANALYSIS

Section 20-1309(g)(1) in the Development Code lists the five requisite conditions that have to be met for a variance to be approved.

1. The variance request arises from such conditions which are unique to the property in question and not ordinarily found in the same zone or district; and are not created by an action or actions of the property owner or applicant.

Applicant response: "This situation of applying for an Accessory Dwelling permit for a 20 year old building is a unique situation. The existing accessory dwelling unit is 999 square feet with a garage on the first floor. Except for the existing size, the building meets all of the other requirements for an accessory dwelling - 1) it is owner occupied, 2) the entrance faces the front lot line, 3) the lot has the correct number of parking spaces for the primary and accessory dwelling. The option of walling off a portion of the interior from use as an option to meet the size restriction for an accessory dwelling unit is a function of this being an existing building versus new construction. This lot is a much larger lot than any of the other lots in the neighborhood and zoning district by almost 5,000 square feet and would allow a much larger primary dwelling than is currently built. The existing primary dwelling could have 775 square feet added to it and $33 \%$ of its size would equal 960 square feet, making the two size restrictions equal. Therefore, we believe the 960 square foot size limit should be the size enforced. "

The applicant's request for the variance from the Accessory Dwelling Unit size limitation derives from the unit's existence prior to the unit's registration with the Planning Department. Staff has determined that the accessory structure was permitted in September of 1996, for the construction of a 2-story, 3-car garage. There is a permit restriction noting the detached garage was, "not to be an apartment or commercial business." As part of the research to determine the construction timeline for the accessory dwelling unit no other permit history was found in Development Services records to show when the unit was finished. Therefore, staff is unable to determine when the accessory dwelling unit was established. The owner was advised on the original building permit at the time of construction that the creation of an apartment/accessory dwelling unit was not permitted. At this time, the owner has filed an application for an Accessory Dwelling Unit that is under review by the Planning Office. Given the information available, staff believes that the request is created by an owner action since the unit has been completed at some time prior to the approval of an Accessory Dwelling Unit registration application. The requested variance would provide a post hoc approval for the existing unit as constructed.
2. That the granting of the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.

Applicant response: "Adjacent property owners will not know how much of the interior is blocked off from use either way."

In staff's opinion, the requested variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents. Notice was provided to property owners within a 200 foot distance of the subject property to inform them of the application filed by the property owner. As of the time this report was written, staff has not been contacted by any property owner expressing concerns or objections to the applicant's request. Staff has received inquiries regarding the process and requirements for similar items.
3. That the strict application of the provisions of this chapter for which variance is requested will constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application.

Applicant response: "Strict application of walling off 304 square feet of the 999 square foot space instead of 39 square feet would dramatically restrict the function of the space in its current configuration and application. "

The Land Development Code specifically limits the size that an Accessory Dwelling Unit can be for registration. Section 20-534(2)(ix) states that, "The maximum size of an Accessory Dwelling Unit may be no more than (33\%) of the living area of the Detached Dwelling or Attached Dwelling, or 960 square feet, whichever is less." Utilizing the living area measurement of 2,106 square feet provided by the Douglas Co. Appraiser's Office, $33 \%$ of that area is a possible maximum of 695 square feet. Both of those size requirements have been in place since the adoption of the Land Development Code.

In instances where a property contains a structure and/or the use is no longer permitted under
the present zoning, the applicant would be advised to file a nonconforming use registration application. However, nonconforming use registration requires the applicant to demonstrate that the structure/use was legally established at a time when it was permitted. This avenue is not available at this time since records cannot confirm when the dwelling unit was created, and if it was at a time when it would have been permissible. Therefore, the best possible remedy is by seeking a variance for the Accessory Dwelling Unit size limitation to permit the continuance of the Accessory Dwelling Unit registration application.

In a typical application the size standard would not constitute a hardship since the unit would not be constructed prior to the registration application. However, this unit has been completed prior to the approval of an Accessory Dwelling Unit application, and possibly before the approval of the Land Development Code. Since a time for the unit's completion is not available through the building permit history, staff cannot determine if the 1966 Zoning Code or the 2006 Land Development Code is the truly applicable one to use for determination. In instances where this cannot be determined, deference is given to the Land Development Code. Given the particulars of this specific application, the hardship would not derive from the strict application of the Land Development Code.
4. That the variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, or general welfare.

Applicant response: "There is nothing about the walling off 39 square feet versus 304 square feet of the interior of this accessory dwelling unit that would adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare. This is private space."

In staff's opinion, granting the requested variances will not create an adverse effect upon the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare. The request would be contained within the parcel owned by the applicant. This would not create any spillover noxious effects to the surrounding area.
5. That granting the variance desired will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of this chapter.

Applicant response: "The general intent of the Development Code is to limit the size of accessory dwelling units on a given lot so as not to be disproportionate to the primary dwelling unit and its lot. Given the large size of this lot and that the primary dwelling unit could be much larger; using the 960 square foot size limit for the accessory dwelling follows the intent of the Code."

In staff's opinion, approval of this variance would not be consistent with the general spirit and intent of the Land Development Code. This section of the code was written to include a mechanism allowing for a scale of sizes linked to the existing residence size, while also providing a cap ensuring that the additional dwelling unit would remain accessory to the principal residence. This was to ensure that these structures would, "respect the general building scale and placement of structures to allow sharing of common space on the lot, such as driveways and yards." The subject property's lot size and the existing residence illustrates a
measured approach to ensuring this ratio, even though the garage structure was constructed prior to the adoption of the 2006 Land Development Code.

Conclusions: Staff's analysis of this variance application finds the request does not meet all five conditions set forth in Section 20-1309(g)(1) of the Land Development Code that the Board must find existing to grant a variance.

Recommendation: Staff cannot recommend approval of the requested variance to increase the maximum size for the Accessory Dwelling Unit from 695 square feet to 960 square feet.


B-16-00440: Variance to Waive the Code Required Maximum Size of an Accessory Dwelling Unit Located at 1535 Massachusetts Street

City of Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

6 East th $^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.Q. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044
(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160
http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

## APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE FROM UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP

| Name(s) Joann Qandil |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contact |  |  |
| Address 1535 Massachusetts |  |  |
| City Lawrence | State KS ZIP | 66044 |
|  | Fax (__ ) |  |
| E-mail kejike456@hotmail.com | Mobile/Pager ( _ ) |  |

## APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION

Contact Leticia Cole
Company Paul Werner Architects
Address 123 W 8th Street, Suite B2

| City Lawrence | State KS ZIP 66044 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Phone (___) | Fax (___) |
| E-mail leticiac@paulwernerarchitects.com | Mobile/Pager (__) |
| Pre-Application Meeting Date Sept. 26, 2016 | Planner Jeff Crick / David Guntert |

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

Present Zoning District $\qquad$ Present Land Use Detached Dwelling

Proposed Land Use Detached dwelling with accessory dwelling unit
Legal Description (may be attached) Attached
Address of Property 1535 Massachusetts
Total Site Area $\qquad$
Number and Description of Existing Improvements or Structures 2,106 SF 2-story primary residence, and a 999 SF 2-story garage building

City of Lawrence Douglas County

PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

## Description of variance requested:

We request a variance to the maximum size of an accessory dwelling unit. The code states the maximum size be no more than $33 \%$ of the living area of the detatched dwelling or 960 square feet, whichever is less. We request to use the greater of these two calculations.

City of Lawrence Douglas County

PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office<br>6 East $^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044<br>(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160 http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

## UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP CRITERIA

The Board of Zoning Appeals may approve a zoning variance if it finds that all of the following criteria have been met. The Development Code places the burden on the applicant to show that an application complies with such criteria. Please respond to each criterion to the best of your knowledge. (Attach additional sheets if needed.)

1. That the variance request arises from such conditions which are unique to the property in question and not ordinarily found in the same zoning or district and are not created by action(s) of the property owner or applicant:
This situation of applying for an Accessory Dwelling permit for a 20 year old building is a unique situation. The existing
accessory dwelling unit is 999 square feet with a garage on the first floor. Except for the existing size, the building meets all of the other requirements for an accessory dwelling - 1) it is owner occupied, 2) the entrance faces the front lot line,
3) the lot has the correct number of parking spaces for the primary and accessory dwelling. The option of walling off a portion of the interior from use as an option to meet the size restriction for an accessory dwelling unit is a function of this
being an existing building versus new construction. This lot is a much larger lot than any of the other lots in the neighborhood and zoning district by almost 5,000 square feet and would allow a much larger primary dwelling than is currently built. The
existing primary dwelling could have 775 square feet added to it and $33 \%$ of its size would equal 960 square feet, making the two size restrictions equal. Therefore, we believe the 960 square foot size limit should be the size enforced.

## 2. That granting the variance would not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents:

Adjacent property owners will not know how much of the interior is blocked off from use either way.
3. That strict application of the provisions of this chapter for which the variance is requested would constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application:
Strict application of walling off 304 square feet of the 999 square foot space instead of 39 square feet would dramatically
restrict the function of the space in its current configuration and application.
4. That the variance desired would not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare:
There is nothing about the walling off 39 square feet versus 304 square feet of the interior of this accessory dwelling unit that
would adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare. This is private space.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

City of Lawrence Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

## Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office

6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044
(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160
5. That granting the variance desired would not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of the Development Code:
The general intent of the Development Code is to limit the size of accessory dwelling units on a given lot so as not to be
disproportionate to the primary dwelling unit and its lot. Given the large size of this lot and that the primary dwelling unit
could be much larger, using the 960 square foot size limit for the accessory dwelling follows the intent of the Code.

## SIGNATURE

I/We, the undersigned am/are the (owners)), (duly authorized agent), (Circle One) of the aforementioned property. By execution of my/our signature, I/we do hereby officially apply for variances as indicated above.
signatures): Letium Bu put Col Date $\qquad$ 10.7 .16
$\qquad$ Date $\qquad$
$\qquad$ Date $\qquad$

STAFF USE ONLY
Application No. $\qquad$
Date Received $\qquad$
BZA Date $\qquad$
Fee \$ $\qquad$
Date Fee Paid $\qquad$

Legal Description for 1535 Massachusetts:

The North 25 feet of Lot 10; all of Lot 11; the East 55 feet of Lot 6; the East 55 feet of North 25 feet of Lot 7, all in Block 10, in Babcock's Enlarged Addition to the City of Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas.

$\qquad$ $7^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2016 , make to as the "Undersigned", being of lawful age, do hereby on this the following statements to wit:

1. I/We the Undersigned, on the date first above written, am/are the lawful owner(s) in fee simple absolute of the following described real property:

See "Exhibit A, Legal Description" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.
2. I/We the undersigned, have previously authorized and hereby authorize Pawl Werner Architects (Herein referred to as "Applicant"), to act on my/our behalf for the purpose of making application with the Planning Office of Lawrence/Douglas County, Kansas, regarding 1535 Massachusetts __ (common address), the subject property, or portion thereof. Such authorization includes, but is not limited to, all acts or things whatsoever necessarily required of Applicant in the application process.
3. It is understood that in the event the Undersigned is a corporation or partnership then the individual whose signature appears below for and on behalf of the corporation of partnership has in fact the authority to so bind the corporation or partnership to the terms and statements contained within this instrument.

IN WITNESS THEREOF $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{r}}$ I, the Undersigned, have set my hand and seal below.

## Owner

Owner
STATE OF KANSAS
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this $\qquad$ day of October, 2016 by JoAnn Qandil

My Commission Expires:


## Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office

6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044
(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160
http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

## PROPERTY OWNERSHIP LIST CERTIFICATION

As required by Article 13, Section 20-1301(q) of the Development Code, the applicant is responsible for providing certified Ownership information (including names and mailing addresses) of all real property owners within a defined radius from the subject property. The Planning Department is required by the Development Code to use the submitted Ownership list to mail notice of the public hearing to surrounding property owners regarding this Application.

## Ownership Information

The applicant is responsible for providing certified Ownership information. Current Ownership information shall be obtained from the Douglas County Clerk. Ownership information will be considered current if it is no more than $\mathbf{3 0}$ days old at the time an application is submitted to the Planning Department.

## Radius of Notification

The Ownership list shall include the record Owner of the subject property and all Owners of property located within 200 feet of the subject property. If the subject property is adjacent to the City limits the area of notification shall be extended to at least 1,000 feet into the unincorporated area.

A map of the "Radius of Notification" can be obtained at the Applicant's request at the Planning Office. The map indicates ownership of each property and can be used to check the accuracy and completeness of the Ownership List. The map will be supplied at the Applicant's expense. Allow $\mathbf{1 0}$ business days to receive the map.

## THE FOLLOWING IS TO BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT.

I certify that I have read and understood the above information and that the submitted Ownership list:

1. was a) obtained from and b) certified by the Douglas County Clerk,
2. is current (no more than $\mathbf{3 0}$ days old), and
3. includes all property owners within the required notification radius of the subject property.

10.7 .16

Date

Leticia Bryant cole
Printed Name

JAMIE SHEW
DOUGLAS COUNTY CLERK
1100 Massachusetts
Lawrence, KS 66044
Marni Penrod-Chief Deputy Clerk Heather Dill-Deputy Clerk Elections

September 20, 2016

A CERTIFIED PROPERTY OWNERSHIP LIST WITHIN 200 FT OF 1535 MASSACHUSETTS ST (U03966A). 09/20/2016. REQUESTED BY LETICIA COLE OF PAUL WERNER ARCHITECTS.

JOHN R. NICHOLS
DOUGLAS COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE
1100 MASSACHUSETTS ST
LAWRENCE, KS 66044
785-832-5147
jnichols@douglas-county.com

Douglas County Real Estate Division
County Clerk's Office. I do hereby certify the Property Ownership listed hereto, to be true and accurate.



| JOINPIN | owner1 | owner2 | owner3 | address | city | state\| | zip | plate | PID | Quickrefid | situs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 103-06-0-20-05-016.00-0 | BEMIS CHARLES A |  |  | 8572 WALNUT DR | LOS ANGELES | CA | 90046 | U03941A | 023-103-06-0-20-05-016.00-0 | R21927 | 1515 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-05-015.00-0 | JAGER WILLIAM D |  |  | 872 WENDT TER | LAGUNA BEACH | CA | 92651 | U03938A | 023-103-06-0-20-05-015.00-0 | R21926 | 1521 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-05-014.00-0 | SADI PROPERTIES II LLC |  |  | 3551 LAKEMONT DR | BONITA SPRINGS | FL | 34134 | U03925 | 023-103-06-0-20-05-014.00-0 | R21925 | 1525 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-05-013.00-0 | NICE JULIE |  |  | 1531 VERMONT ST | LAWRENCE | Ks | 66044 | U03921B | 023-103-06-0-20-05-013.00-0 | R21924 | 1531 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-05-012.00-0 | ROBERTS JESSICA C TRUSTEE |  |  | PO BOX 562 | SALINE | MI | 48176 | U03923A | 023-103-06-0-20-05-012.00-0 | R21923 | 1535 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-05-011.00-0 | BANNWARTH TIMOTHY D | BANNWARTH MANDIE A |  | 1539 VERMONT ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03924 | 023-103-06-0-20-05-011.00-0 | R21922 | 1539 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-10-001.00-0 | ENNIS CHARLES F | ennis beth a |  | 1605 VERMONT ST | LAWRENCE | Ks | 66044 | U03890A | 023-103-06-0-20-10-001.00-0 | R21987 | 1605 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-002.00-0 | CENTRAL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH |  |  | 1501 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03955A01 | 023-103-06-0-20-04-002.00-0 | R21896 | 1501 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-03-004.00-0 | OUI JEANETTE P PERKINS |  |  | 1512 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | Ks | 66044 | U03975 | 023-103-06-0-20-03-004.00-0 | R21878 | 1512 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-013.00-0 | WALLACE VICTOR LTRUSTEE |  |  | 1509 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03969A | 023-103-06-0-20-04-013.00-0 | R21909 | 1509 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-003.00-0 | ALLEN RICHARD M | Allen dawn d |  | 2000 SW WALDEN DR | Lees SUMMIT | MO | 64081 | U03957 | 023-103-06-0-20-04-003.00-0 | R21898 | 1520 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-03-005.00-0 | BELLEMERE MATTHEW M | VANWALLEGHEM JULIAE |  | 1516 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | кs | 66044 | U03976 | 023-103-06-0-20-03-005.00-0 | R21879 | 1516 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-004.00-0 | HIGLEY MICHAEL | BYLEEN ELIZABETH |  | 1524 VERMONT ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03958A | 023-103-06-0-20-04-004.00-0 | R21899 | 1524 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-012.00-0 | CUSHMAN GREGORY T |  |  | 1527 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03959-02 | 023-103-06-0-20-04-012.00-0 | R21908 | 1527 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-03-006.00-0 | EDWARDS BRIAN K | EDWARDS CHRISTINA L |  | 1520 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | ט03977 | 023-103-06-0-20-03-006.00-0 | R21880 | 1520 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-005.00-0 | WEILAND KYLE | WEILAND KATHERINE |  | 1327 NEW HAMPSHIREST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03960 | 023-103-06-0-20-04-005.00-0 | R21900 | 1526 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-03-015.00-0 | SUNDSTROM CHRISTINEJ |  |  | 1529 NEW HAMPSHIREST | LAWRENCE | ks | 66044 | U03988A | 023-103-06-0-20-03-015.00-0 | R21889 | 1529 NEW HAMPSHIREST |
| 103-06-0-20-03-007.00-0 | SLAGLE ERIN |  |  | 1530 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03978A | 023-103-06-0-20-03-007.00-0 | R21881 | 1530 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-011.00-0 | QANDIL JOANN E TRUSTEE |  |  | 1535 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03966A | 023-103-06-0-20-04-011.00-0 | R21907 | 1535 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-006.00-0 | WOODALL DEBORAH D |  |  | 1530 VERMONT ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03961 | 023-103-06-0-20-04-006.00-0 | R21901 | 1530 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-03-014.00-0 | besson erin | BESSON DAVID |  | 1535 NEW HAMPSHIRE ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03989 | 023-103-06-0-20-03-014.00-0 | R21888 | 1535 NEW HAMPSHIREST |
| 103-06-0-20-03-008.00-0 | ROSS DAVID J |  |  | 1855 E 950 RD | LAWRENCE | Ks | 66049 | U03980A | 023-103-06-0-20-03-008.00-0 | R21882 | 1532 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-007.00-0 | SMITH AMBER B |  |  | 1534 VERMONT ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03962 | 023-103-06-0-20-04-007.00-0 | R21902 | 1534 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-03-013.00-0 | SCHINEIDER LOIS R |  |  | 3708 STETSON DR | LAWRENCE | KS | 66049 | U03986 | 023-103-06-0-20-03-013.00-0 | R21887 | 1537 NEW HAMPSHIREST |
| 103-06-0-20-03-009.00-0 | MANN GREGORY J | MCKINNEY SUZANNE H |  | 1540 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | Ks | 66044 | U03981B | 023-103-06-0-20-03-009.00-0 | R21883 | 1540 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-010.00-0 | SMITH CAROL A |  |  | 2744 CHIPPERFIELD RD | LAWRENCE | KS | 66047 | U03967 | 023-103-06-0-20-04-010.00-0 | R21906 | 1539 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-008.00-0 | PARK DONNA |  |  | 1538 VERMONT ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03963A | 023-103-06-0-20-04-008.00-0 | R21903 | 1538 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-009.01-0 | Slough james a | SLOUGH DONIM |  | POBOX 763 | Lawrence | Ks | 66044 | U03965 | 023-103-06-0-20-04-009.01-0 | R21905 | 1545 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-03-010.00-0 | tosaka shu | GROVE HEIDIE |  | 1546 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03983 | 023-103-06-0-20-03-010.00-0 | R21884 | 1546 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-04-009.00-0 | Slough james a | SLOUGH DONI M |  | POBOX 763 | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03964-01 | 023-103-06-0-20-04-009.00-0 | R21904 | 1544 VERMONT ST |
| 103-06-0-20-12-002.00-0 | ROSBOROUGH SCOTT W | ROSBOROUGH JANA S |  | 1602 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U04012A | 023-103-06-0-20-12-002.00-0 | R22017 | 1602 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-11-001.00-0 | BURG J GREGORY | BURG MARY G |  | 1603 MASSACHUSETTS ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U04011 | 023-103-06-0-20-11-001.00-0 | R22004 | 1603 MASSACHUSETTS ST |
| 103-06-0-20-11-002.00-0 | KAMPSCHROEDER HALLEY E | KAMPSCHROEDER JOAN T |  | 1600 VERMONT ST | LAWRENCE | KS | 66044 | U03998A | 023-103-06-0-20-11-002.00-0 | R22005 | 1600 VERMONT ST |

City of Lawrence
Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160 http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

## Determination of Completeness, Accuracy, and Sufficiency

I have reviewed the variance application submitted by:
Name: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$
Application No. $\qquad$

Based upon the submitted information, I find the application to be:
$\square \quad$ Complete (based upon the items reviewed)

- Incomplete, inaccurate, or insufficient (circle) for the following reasons:
- The application or plan contains one or more significant inaccuracies or omissions that hinder timely or competent evaluation of the plan's/application's compliance with Development Code standards.
$\square$ The application contains multiple minor inaccuracies or omissions that hinder timely or competent evaluation of the plan's/application's compliance with Development Code standards.
- Other


## Planner

Date
(1) Resubmit by $\qquad$ to be placed on the agenda for the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting on $\qquad$ . (All resubmitted materials must be deemed to be complete, accurate, and sufficient.)


## ITEM NO. 6 PERI METER BUI LDI NG SETBACK VARI ANCE FOR ARTERRA; 2161 QUAI L CREEK DRI VE [DRG]

B-16-00441: A request for a variance as provided in Section 20-1309 of the Land Development Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2015 edition. The request is for a variance from the minimum 30 feet perimeter building setback requirement from the boundary of a planned commercial development district (approved under the terms and conditions of the previous zoning code) as required by reference in Section 20-222(e) of the City Code. The applicant seeks variance approval to reduce the perimeter building setback to a minimum of 10 feet from the west property boundary so they can build an addition on the west side of the existing commercial structure. The property is located at 2161 Quail Creek Drive. Submitted by Allen Belot, Allen Belot Architects, for Arterra, LLC, the property owner of record. The legal description for each application is found in the respective project case file which is available in the Planning Office for review during regular office hours, 8-5 Monday Friday.

## B. REASON FOR REQUEST

Applicant's Request - "The owner would like to construct a 788 s.f. addition to the West side of the existing building facing the Alvamar Golf Course, architecturally compatible with the existing structure. The additional space will be used partly for storage \& the remaining space for event accessory uses such as set-up space, gift tables for weddings, and display area for corporate events."

## C. ZONI NG AND LAND USE

Current Zoning \& Land Use:

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:

PCD - [Parkway Plaza] (Planned Commercial Development) District; commercial structure used for event venues with ancillary off-street parking north of the building.

PUD - [Alvamar] (Planned Unit Development) District to the north, west and southwest; duplex dwellings and attached single-dwelling residential homes to the north. Alvamar Golf Course to the west. Singledwelling residential homes to the southwest.

PCD - [Parkway Plaza] District to the south and east; commercial uses to the south and east. Commercial uses to the south and east. Multi-dwelling residential uses are found to the northeast.

## D. ZONI NG ORDI NANCE REQUI REMENTS

Section 20-222(e), "PUD, PRD, PCD, PID, POD (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT) DISTRICTS, Density and Dimensional Standards", in the Development Code indicates that the development or expansion of any structure in the planned development district needs to comply with the terms and conditions of the original approval of the planned development.

Section 20-1006(i)(1), "GENERAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS - PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS, Peripheral Boundary," in the previous Zoning Ordinance called for a peripheral boundary of not less than 30 feet for all buildings, structures and parking lots.

Section 20-1008(D)(2), "Periphery Boundary," in the old Zoning Ordinance also refers to a 30 feet periphery boundary requirement for all buildings, structures and parking lots in a planned commercial development.

## E. SPECI FIC ANALYSIS

This variance request was previously considered by the Board of Zoning Appeals in 2014. It is identical to the previous request, which received unanimous approval (5-0) from the Board at the August 7, 2014 meeting. Section 20-1309(k) in the Development Code places a 24 -month approval time limit on variances granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals. If a city building permit is issued during the 24 -month time period and substantial construction based upon the building permit has taken place, the variance is vested with the property. In this case, no building permit was issued during this 24 -month time period; and, no request was made by the property owner to extend approval of the variance. Therefore, the variance expired on August 7, 2016.

Section 20-1309(g)(1) in the Development Code lists the five requisite conditions that have to be met for a variance to be approved.

1. The variance request arises from such conditions which are unique to the property in question and not ordinarily found in the same zone or district; and are not created by an action or actions of the property owner or applicant.

Applicant response: "In order to make the proposed 788 s.f. addition, compatible with the existing interior floor plan, half of the space would encroach into the required side yard setback. The unique condition that exists in this encroachment is the heavy existing forestation, mostly coniferous \& thus year round, that occurs along the entire length of this addition which does and will completely enshroud the structure from view along the public side of the Alvamar Golf Course. The Course is characterized by large bentgrass greens and flowing fairways, the park-land style allows players \& outside observers to enjoy the scenic beauty of the natural Eastern Kansas landscaping. The proposed addition most likely will not destroy any of the trees that comprise this heavy visual screen into the property.

In general, the purpose of setbacks is to ensure that the use of the property does not infringe on the rights of the neighbors and to allow for lawns, trees, for light \& sunshine into the buildings on each side and to provide space for outdoor living by the occupants. Setbacks also allow for reasonable drainage to occur away from structures \& into drainage channels. The proposed 788 s.f. addition \& 375 s.f. encroachment would be negligible in the context of the several hundred acres of golf course, described above, that are adjacent to this setback.

With the Alvamar Golf Course entirely to the West of this property there would be ample open space remaining were an addition to be completed \& would continue to fulfill the spirit of the setback requirement."

The subject property is a corner lot on the northwest corner of W. $22^{\text {nd }}$ Street and Quail Creek Drive. It is a non-typical shaped lot with the length of the lot oriented in a north-south direction. Quail Creek Drive is a curvilinear roadway along the lot's east boundary. Because of the roadway configuration, the lot depth (east-west) continually changes depending upon where the point of measurement is made along the street frontage. This unusual lot shape creates a development challenge for building on the property in accordance with the development standards for building setbacks and periphery boundary setbacks.

The subdivision, which includes the subject property, was platted in 1993. The existing commercial structure, patio and parking lot were built in 1996. The current property owner was not involved with the creation of the subdivision plat or the original site development.

Finding -- The unusual lot shape creates a development challenge to build on this property in accordance with the development standards for building setbacks and periphery boundary setbacks.

## 2. That the granting of the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.

Applicant response: "This minor encroachment into what appears to the casual observer to be vast acres of open space \& mature forest would go unnoticed by adjacent property owners \& residents. In fact due to the vastness of open space \& no buildings on the adjacent golf course to compare to, no encroachment will be noticed because no setback can be identified by sight."

In staff's opinion, the requested variance to reduce the periphery boundary building setback from 30 feet to a minimum of 10 feet for the proposed 788 square feet building addition on the back side of the commercial structure will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents. The most directly impacted property is to the west of the subject property. It is owned by Alvamar, Inc., and is developed as a golf course. The subject property is near the tee box of one hole on the course. A wooded landscape buffer is present on the back side of the property which extends onto the golf course property.

Notice was provided to property owners within a 200 feet distance of the subject property to inform them of the application filed by the property owner. As of the time this report was written, staff has received written comments from one property owner (email is attached with the report). Staff believes the concerns mentioned in the email can be more appropriately addressed with the revised final development plan for the building addition, which is currently being reviewed by staff for the December Planning Commission Meeting.

Finding - Limiting the variance to apply only to the proposed building addition will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.
3. That the strict application of the provisions of this chapter for which variance is requested will constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application.

Applicant response: "Strict interpretation of this ordinance would cause the owner an undue hardship in being able to continue to rehabilitate this previously abandoned building and satisfy a community need for a Class A event space for groups to meet, especially in the context of the vast amount of open space adjacent to it."

A review of the history of this property revealed that in February 1995, the Planning Commission approved a variance allowing parking areas to be built no closer than 10 feet from an exterior lot line while considering a Final Development Plan for Phases IIA, IIB \& III of the PCD. The subject property was identified as Phase III on this development plan. Based upon this action, the parking lot was built 10 feet from the west property boundary.

In May 1996, the Planning Commission granted a variance from the perimeter boundary setback for the patio area on the west and northwest side of the former Pachamama's Restaurant building. The Planning Commission's action approved a variance allowing the patio to be 5 feet from the perimeter boundary along the west side of the PCD with a condition that the applicant obtains written approval from the property owner to the west. The owner of the golf course provided a letter to the city indicating their approval of the patio's location, which allowed the owner to proceed with the project.

Finding -- Previous actions by the Planning Commission for the patio and parking lot setbacks when the original development plans were approved, makes compliance with a 30 feet perimeter boundary setback for the proposed 788 square feet building addition an unnecessary hardship for the property owner.
4. That the variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, or general welfare.

Applicant response: "I would request that the answer to 2 above be used to address this question."

In staff's opinion, granting the requested variance will not create an adverse effect upon the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare. As stated before the location of the addition is on the back side of the building which backs up to a tee box for one hole on Alvamar Golf Course. There are no nearby structures, businesses or residences on the back side of the property; only open space which is used as a golf course.

Finding -- Granting the requested variance will not create an adverse effect upon the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare.
5. That granting the variance desired will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of this chapter.

Applicant response: "I would request that the answer to 2 above be used to address this question."

In staff's opinion, approval of this variance is not opposed to the general spirit and intent of the Development Code. The unusual lot shape creates development challenges for being able to comply with all of the code standards. Several variances were previously approved by the Planning Commission under the old Zoning Ordinance during the consideration of final development plans for the phased development of this PCD District. These variances explain the current setbacks for the parking lot and patio.

The applicant's request for a 10 feet perimeter boundary setback, which is needed for only approximately one-half of the proposed 788 s.f. building addition, is consistent with the setback variance for the parking lot to the north of the building. In staff's analysis, the
development pattern along the west boundary of the property was previously defined by the actions taken by the Planning Commission when the original development plans were considered. The applicant's request is merely asking for variance approval to use the established periphery setback for the small addition along the west side of the building.

Finding -- The variance is not opposed to the general spirit and intent of the Development Code. The applicant's request for a 10 feet perimeter boundary setback, needed only for approximately one-half of the proposed 788 s.f. building addition, is consistent with a previous setback variance for the parking lot to the north of the building.

Conclusions: Staff's analysis of this variance application finds the request can meet all five conditions set forth in Section 20-1309(g)(1) of the Development Code the Board must find existing to grant a variance.

## Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the requested variance, applied only to the proposed building addition, based upon the findings in the staff report that conclude the applicant's request meets the 5 conditions outlined in Section 20-1309(g)(1) needed for variance approval.


B-16-00441: Variance to Reduce the 30 Feet Perimeter Boundary Setback in a PCD District for a Small Building Addition to Arterra Event Gallery Located at 2161 Quail Creek Drive

Lawrence Planning \& Development Services Dept
Subject Property October 14, 2016

## APPLI CATI ON FOR VARI ANCE FROM UNNECESSARY HARDSHI P

## OWNER I NFORMATI ON

Name(s) Arterra, LLC
Contact _ Wayne McDaniel, member Arterra, LLC
Address 2161 Quail Creek Drive
City $\qquad$ State_KS $\qquad$ ZP 66047

Phone (785) 766-8088 Fax ( $\qquad$
$\qquad$
E-mail waymacd@gmail.com Mobile/Pager ( $\qquad$ ) $\qquad$

## APPLI CANT/ AGENT I NFORMATI ON

Contact Allen Belot

Company Allen Belot Architect
Address 708 West Ninth Suite 205
City Lawrence State KS_ZP 66044

Phone (785) 843-4670 Fax $\qquad$
$\qquad$
E-mail allen@allenbelotarchitect.om Mobile/Pager ( $\qquad$ ) $\qquad$
Pre-Application Meeting Date 24 J une 14 Planner David Guntert

## PROPERTY I NFORMATI ON

Present Zoning District PUD Present Land Use $\qquad$ Event Gallery

Proposed Land Use Same
Legal Description (may be attached) attached
Address of Property 2161 Quail Creek Drive
Total Site Area 55,565 gsf
Number and Description of Existing Improvements or Structures Single story 5,000 restaurant building used as a special event gallery with 49 parking spaces on site.

City of Lawrence Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office

6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044 (785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160 http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

Description of variance requested:
The owner would like to construct a 788 sf addition to the West side of the existing building facing the Alvamar Gold Course, architecturally compatible with the existing structure. The additional space will be used partly for storage \& the remaining space for event accessory uses such as set-up space, gift tables for weddings, display area for corporate events.

## UNNECESSARY HARDSHI P CRITERI A

The Board of Zoning Appeals may approve a zoning variance if it finds that all of the following criteria have been met. The Development Code places the burden on the applicant to show that an application complies with such criteria. Please respond to each criterion to the best of your knowledge. (Attach additional sheets if needed.)

1. That the variance request arises from such conditions which are unique to the property in question and not ordinarily found in the same zoning or district and are not created by action(s) of the property owner or applicant:
In order to make the proposed 788 sf addition, compatible with the existing interior floor plan,
half of the space would encroach into the required side yard setback. The unique condition that exists in this encroachment is the heavy existing forestation, mostly coniferous \& thus year round, that occurs along the entire length of this addition which does \& will completely enshroud the structure from view along the public side of the Alvamar Golf Course. The Course is characterized by large bentgrass greens and flowing fairways, the park-land style allows players \& outside observers to enjoy the scenic beauty of the natural Eastern Kansas landscaping. The proposed addition most likely will not destroy any of the trees that comprise this heavy visual screen into the property.

In general, the purpose of setbacks is to ensure that the use of the property does not infringe on the rights of the neighbors and to allow for lawns, trees, for light \& sunshine into the buildings on each side and to provide space for outdoor living by the occupants. Setbacks also allow for reasonable drainage to occur away from structures \& into drainage channels. The proposed 788 sf addition \& 375 sf encroachment would be negligible in the context of the several hundred acres of golf course, described above, that are adjacent to this setback.

With the Alvamar Golf Course entirely to the West of this property there would be ample open space remaining were an addition to be completed \& would continue to fulfill the spirit of the setback requirement.

City of Lawrence Douglas County

# Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office <br> 6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044 (785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160 <br> http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/ 

2. That granting the variance would not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents:
This minor encroachment into what appears to the casual observer to be vast acres of open space \& mature forest would go unnoticed by adjacent property owners \& residents. In fact due to the vastness of open space \& no buildings on the adjacent golf course to compare to, no encroachment will be noticed because no setback can be identified by sight.
3. That strict application of the provisions of this chapter for which the variance is requested would constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application:
Strict interpretation of this ordinance would cause the owner an undue hardship in being able to continue to rehabilitate this previously abandoned building and satisfy a community need for a Class A event space for groups to meet, especially in the context of the vast amount of open space adjacent to it.
4. That the variance desired would not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare:
I would request that the answer to 2 . above be used to address this question.
5. That granting the variance desired would not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of the Development Code:
I would request that the answer to 2 . above be used to address this question.

## SI GNATURE

I, the undersigned am the duly authorized agent of the aforementioned property. By execution of my signature, I do hereby officially apply for variances as indicated above.


Signature(s): $\qquad$ Date October 7, 2016

## STAFF USE ONLY

Application No. $\qquad$
Date Received $\qquad$
BZA Date $\qquad$
Fee \$ $\qquad$
Date Fee Paid $\qquad$

Lawrence Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Office
6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044 (785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160
http://www lawrenceplanning org

## OWNER AUTHORIZATION

I Wayne McDaniel, member of Arterra, LLC, , hereby referred to as the "Undersigned", being of lawful age, do hereby on this $\qquad$ fth day of October , 2016, make the following statements to wit:

1. I the Undersigned, on the date first above written, am a lawful member/owner in fee simple absolute of the following described real property:

Arterra Event Gallery located at 2161 Quail Creek Drive
2. I the undersigned, have previously authorized and hereby authorize

Allen Belot of Allen Belot Architect
(Herein referred to as "Applicant"), to act on my/our behalf for the purpose of making application with the Planning Office of Lawrence/Douglas County, Kansas, regarding 2161 Quail Creek Drive Lawrence, KS
(common address), the subject property, or portion thereof. Such authorization includes, but is not limited to, all acts or things whatsoever necessarily required of Applicant in the application process.
3. It is understood that in the event the Undersigned is a corporation or partnership then the individual whose signature appears below for and on behalf of the corporation of partnership has in fact the authority to so bind the corporation or partnership to the terms and statements contained within this instrument.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I, the Undersigned, have set my hand and seal below.


STATE OF KANSAS
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this $\qquad$ day of October, 2016, by Wayne McDaniel
My Commission Expires: 6-16-2017
 7/1/2006

City of Lawrence Douglas County
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Lawrence Douglas County<br>Metropolitan Planning Office

6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044
(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160
http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

## PROPERTY OWNERSHIP LIST CERTI FI CATI ON

As required by Article 13, Section 20-1301(q) of the Development Code, the applicant is responsible for providing certified Ownership information (including names and mailing addresses) of all real property owners within a defined radius from the subject property. The Planning Department is required by the Development Code to use the submitted Ownership list to mail notice of the public hearing to surrounding property owners regarding this Application.

## Ownership Information

The applicant is responsible for providing certified Ownership information. Current Ownership information shall be obtained from the Douglas County Clerk. Ownership information will be considered current if it is no more than $\mathbf{3 0}$ days old at the time an application is submitted to the Planning Department.

## Radius of Notification

The Ownership list shall include the record Owner of the subject property and all Owners of property located within 200 feet of the subject property. If the subject property is adjacent to the City limits the area of notification shall be extended to at least 1,000 feet into the unincorporated area.

A map of the "Radius of Notification" can be obtained at the Applicant's request at the Planning Office. The map indicates ownership of each property and can be used to check the accuracy and completeness of the Ownership List. The map will be supplied at the Applicant's expense. Allow $\mathbf{1 0}$ business days to receive the map.

## THE FOLLOWI NG IS TO BE COMPLETED AND SUBMI TTED BY THE APPLI CANT.

I certify that I have read and understood the above information and that the submitted Ownership list:

1. was a) obtained from and b) certified by the Douglas County Clerk,
2. is current (no more than $\mathbf{3 0}$ days old), and
3. includes all property owners within the required notification radius of the subject property.


Signature
October 7, 2016
Date
Allen C. Belot

[^5]Lawrence Douglas County<br>Metropolitan Planning Office<br>6 East $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, P.O. Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044<br>(785) 832-3150 Fax (785) 832-3160<br>http://www.lawrenceks.org/pds/

## "Exhibit A, Legal Description"

LOT 5 PARKWAY PLAZA NO. 4






| To: | David Guntert |
| :--- | :--- |
| Subject: | Arterra"s Event Gallery |
| Date: | Wednesday, October 19, 2016 4:49:22 PM |

Just to follow up on our telephone conversation yesterday. I live about 50 feet West of the 200
notification area. If Arterra's does get approval for a setback variance and approval to expand with in 10 feet from their West property line I do have some questions-concerns for the future.

1. Is the expansion fully enclosed or just more open space? Either way, there has been later afternoons-
evenings that the noise level can be heard at my residence. Is it possible to ask for time like 9:00 pm to
stop events that cause excessive noise?
2. Is the parties that attend events at Arterra's going to remain on their property or allowed to go around or
through the two rail coral fence and roam around the Alvamar Golf Course number 2 green that is about
30 feet from my residence? Numerous times this summer, usually on Saturday or Sunday late afternoons-
evenings there has been up to a dozen to a dozen and a half event goers (mostly weddings) that use this area
for wedding photos. The younger children wind up on the golf course green that that could cause damage
to the green. When I am working in my back yard or on my house I feel like I should give them the privacy to
take their photos. However, I feel I should have the right to my property especially when people are
trespassing on private property. I am requesting that a reasonable time for entertainment condition along with
event guests staying on their property condition be put on their site plan before a building permit is issued.
Thanks for your time.
Gene Shaughnessy
3604 Hartford Court

[^0]:    This message, including attachments, may contain confidential and legally privileged information intended solely for the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and do not take any action based on the information and do not disclose, store or distribute the information to any third party. Nothing in this email shall be construed as a legally binding contract or offer to contract unless expressly written. BG Consultants, Inc. accepts no liability for the information contained in this email or for the consequences of any action taken unless the information is expressly confirmed as a representation of the company

[^1]:    PROPOSED LIGHTING POWER SCHEDULE
    

[^2]:    * Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens
    ** For more information on the IES BUG (Backlight-Uplight-Glare) Rating visit
    www.ies.org/PDF/Erratas/TM-15-11BugRatingsAddendum.pdf. Valid with no tilt

[^3]:    * Initial delivered lumens at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$. Actual production yield may vary between -10 and $+10 \%$ of initial delivered lumens
    ** For more information on the IES BUG (Backlight-Uplight-Glare) Rating visit
    www.ies.org/PDF/Erratas/TM-15-11BugRatingsAddendum.pdf. Valid with no tilt

[^4]:    Note: Not for use with aluminum tenons

[^5]:    Printed Name

