LAWRENCE-DOUGLAS COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY HALL, 6 EAST 6TH STREET, CITY COMMISSION MEETING ROOM
AGENDA FOR PUBLIC & NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS
MAY 22 & 24, 2017  6:30PM - 10:30PM

GENERAL BUSINESS:
Recognize Clay Britton and Pennie von Achen for their years of service on Planning Commission.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION SUMMARY
Receive and amend or approve the action summary (minutes) from the Planning Commission meeting of March 15, 2017.

Receive and amend or approve the action summary (minutes) from the Planning Commission meeting of April 24 & 26, 2017.

COMMITTEE REPORTS
Receive reports from any committees that met over the past month.

COMMUNICATIONS
a) Receive written communications from the public.
b) Receive written communications from staff, Planning Commissioners, or other commissioners.
   Added Staff Memo to Item 1A SUP for LMH regarding conditions of approval.
c) Receive written action of any waiver requests/determinations made by the City Engineer.
d) Disclosure of ex parte communications.
e) Declaration of abstentions from specific agenda items by commissioners.
AGENDA ITEMS MAY BE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER AT THE COMMISSION’S DISCRETION
REGULAR AGENDA (MAY 24, 2017) MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:
ITEM NO. 1A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR LMH; 3RD & MICHIGAN ST (SLD)

SUP-17-00153: Consider a Special Use Permit/Institutional Development Plan for a new parking lot at Lawrence Memorial Hospital and a master plan for the Hospital uses, located at 3rd & Michigan St. Submitted by Landplan Engineering for LMH Board of Trustees and City of Lawrence, property owners of record.

ITEM NO. 1B RS5 TO H; 1.38 ACRES; 302, 306, 310, 314, 318, 322 MICHIGAN (SLD)

Z-17-00158: Consider a request to rezone approximately 1.38 acres from RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District to H (Hospital) District, located at 302 Michigan St, 306 Michigan St, 310 Michigan St, 314 Michigan St, 318 Michigan St, and 322 Michigan St. Submitted by Landplan Engineering PA on behalf of Lawrence Memorial Hospital and LMH Board of Trustees, property owners of record.

ITEM NO. 2 A TO I-3; 26.995 ACRES; 1705 N 1399 RD (BJP)

Z-17-00155: Consider a request to rezone approximately 26.995 acres from County A (Agricultural) District to I-3 (Industrial) District, located directly east of 1705 N 1399 Rd. Submitted by Law Office of Dan Watkins on behalf of RD Johnson Excavating Company LLC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 3 PRD TO RM15; 8.566 ACRES; 2115 EXCHANGE CT (KEW)

Z-17-00157: Consider a request to rezone approximately 8.566 acres from PRD (Planned Residential Development) District to RM15 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District, located at 2115 Exchange Ct. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects on behalf of Southwind Capital LLC, property owner of record.

NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:
ITEM NO. 4 FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR MT BLUE ADDITION; 2350 & 2400 FRANKLIN RD (BJP)

FDP-17-00185: Consider a Final Development Plan for Mt. Blue Addition, Lot 1 and Mt. Blue Addition No. 2, Lot 9 to accommodate mini storage units and a gun range and retail store, located at 2350 & 2400 Franklin Rd. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects on behalf of Ace Self Storage LLC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 5 EXTENSION REQUEST; PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR NORTH LAWRENCE RIVERFRONT ADDITION (SLD)

PP-2-1-12: Consider an extension request for a Preliminary Plat for North Lawrence Riverfront Addition, located at 401 North 2nd Street. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for North Mass Redevelopment, LLC, Douglas County Kaw Drainage District, City of Lawrence, Kaw River Estates, LLC, HDD of Lawrence LLC, D & D Rentals of Lawrence LLC, Jeffrey W. Hatfield, Exchange Holdings LLC, Loosehead Investments LLC, and Riverfront Properties of Lawrence LLC, property owners of record.

MISCELLANEOUS NEW OR OLD BUSINESS

Consideration of any other business to come before the Commission.
**ADJOURN**

**CALENDAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2017</th>
<th>May 2017</th>
<th>June 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PCCM Meeting:**

(Generally 2nd Wednesday of each month, 7:30am-9:00am)
# 2017
## LAWRENCE-DOUGLAS COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION
### MID-MONTH & REGULAR MEETING DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid-Month Meetings, Wednesdays 7:30 – 9:00 AM</th>
<th>Mid-Month Topics</th>
<th>Planning Commission Meetings 6:30 PM, Monday and Wednesday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jan 11</strong></td>
<td><strong>CANCELLED</strong></td>
<td>Jan 23 Jan 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feb 8</strong></td>
<td>Douglas County Natural Areas Assessment – Kelly Kindscher</td>
<td>-- Feb 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mar 8</strong></td>
<td>East Lawrence Rezoning Dg Co Food System Assessment &amp; Plan</td>
<td>Mar 13 Mar 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apr 12</strong></td>
<td>Development Review Process – Planning 101</td>
<td>Apr 24 Apr 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>CANCELLED</strong></td>
<td>May 22 May 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jun 14</strong></td>
<td>APA Conference recap</td>
<td>Jun 26 Jun 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jul 12</strong></td>
<td>Michael Davidson – Explore Lawrence Hotel Market &amp; Short Term Rentals</td>
<td>Jul 24 Jul 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aug 9</strong></td>
<td>Transportation 2040 Update</td>
<td>Aug 21 Aug 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sep 13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep 25 Sep 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oct 11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 23 Oct 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 13 Nov 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dec 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 18 Dec 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PC Orientation – all day (tbd)**

**Suggested topics for future meetings:**
- How City/County Depts interact on planning issues
- Stormwater Stds Update – Stream Setbacks
- Overview of different Advisory Groups – potential overlap on planning issues
- Joint meeting with other Cities’ Planning Commissions
- Joint meeting with other Cities and Townships – UGA potential revisions
- New County Zoning Codes
- Tour City/County Facilities
- Water Resources
- Communication Towers – Stealth Design, # of co-locations, notice area
- WIFI Connectivity & Infrastructure Planning
- Oread Overlay Districts & Design Guidelines
- Comprehensive Plan – Goals & Policies
- Affordable Housing
- Retail Market Impacts
- Case Studies

**Meeting Locations**
The Planning Commission meetings are held in the City Commission meeting room on the 1st floor of City Hall, 6th & Massachusetts Streets, unless otherwise noticed.

**Planning & Development Services | Lawrence-Douglas County Planning Division | 785-832-3150 | www.lawrenceks.org/pds**
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## 2017 Planning Commission Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sands</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struckhoff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Achen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
March 15, 2017
Meeting Action Summary

March 15, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.
Commissioners present: Britton, Butler, Carpenter, Culver, Kelly, Sands, Struckhoff, von Achen, Weaver, Willey
Staff present: McCullough, Stogsdill, Day, Larkin, M. Miller, Pepper, Ewert

GENERAL BUSINESS

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION SUMMARY MINUTES
Receive and amend or approve the action summary (minutes) from the Planning Commission meeting of February 22, 2017.

Motioned by Commissioner Britton, seconded by Commissioner Butler, to approve the February 22, 2017 Planning Commission action summary minutes.

Motion carried 8-0-1, with Commissioner Struckhoff abstaining. Commissioner Weaver was not present for the vote.

COMMITTEE REPORTS
Receive reports from any committees that met over the past month.

Commissioner Culver said the Transportation 2040 Steering Committee met and will continue to meet throughout the year to work on the updated draft plan. He said they went over some of the projects and developments completed since the last plan. He said they talked a little bit about the fiscal realities. He said they also reviewed the public participation plan and were trying to get a survey out to as many people as possible. He said the goal was to get about 2,300 surveys from the public. He stated federal performance measures would go into plan. He said their next meeting would be early summer of 2017.

Commissioner Culver said the Metropolitan Policy Board met last month and went through the Unified Planning Work Plan for 2017. He said there were a few larger items and dollar amounts allocated to those efforts.

EX PARTE / ABSTENTIONS / DEFERRAL REQUEST
- Ex parte:
  Commissioner Struckhoff said he received a letter from Mr. Matt Gough regarding the Landfill Text Amendment.
- No abstentions.

Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:
http://www.lawrenceks.org/boards/planning-commission/agendas
ITEM NO. 1A  RS7 & PUD TO RM24-PD; 1.418 ACRES; 2021 CROSSGATE/1809 BIRDIE WAY (SLD)

Z-17-00009: Consider a request to rezone approximately 1.418 acres from RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District and PUD (Planned Unit Development) District to RM24-PD (Multi-Dwelling Residential-Planned Development) District, located at 2021 Crossgate Dr. (1809 Birdie Way, Lot 1 Alvamar Inc one Addition) Submitted by Paul Werner Architects for Eagle 1968 LC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 1B  PUD TO RM24-PD; .558 ACRE; 2021 CROSSGATE/1575 BIRDIE WAY (SLD)

Z-17-00011: Consider a request to rezone approximately .558 acre from PUD (Planned Unit Development) District to RM24-PD (Multi-Dwelling Residential-Planned Development) District, located at 2021 Crossgate Dr. (1575 Birdie Way, Lot 2 Alvamar Inc one Addition) Submitted by Paul Werner Architects for Eagle 1968 LC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 1C  FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR ALVAMAR LOT 1; 1809 BIRDIE WAY (SLD)

FDP-17-00028: Consider a revised Final Development Plan for Alvamar Lot 1, located at 1809 Birdie Way for the addition of an 8,200 SF multi-purpose building. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for Eagle 1968 LC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 1D  FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR ALVAMAR LOT 2; 1575 BIRDIE WAY (SLD)

FDP-17-00029: Consider a revised Final Development Plan for Alvamar Lot 2, located at 1575 Birdie Way for the relocation of the apartment clubhouse and pool area. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for Alvamar Apartments LC, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Sandra Day presented items 1A-1D together.

6:45pm Commissioner Weaver arrived.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Ms. Joy Rhea, Paul Werner Architects, displayed an image of the golf course on the overhead.

PUBLIC HEARING
No public comment.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Sands asked if the purpose of moving the clubhouse was aesthetic. He inquired about what would go there.

Ms. Rhea said that was correct. She said it would be vacant.

Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:
http://www.lawrenceks.org/boards/planning-commission/agendas
Commissioner von Achen said she had not heard negative comments from the neighbors. She asked staff to comment.

Ms. Day said she talked to neighbors who had questions regarding the street.

Commissioner Willey asked if the cart barn would be thought of as an event space or just used as needed.

Ms. Rhea said the cart storage would not be an event space but that it could be used in the event of rain.

Commissioner Culver inquired about the bufferyard on the west side of property line.

Ms. Rhea said the required bufferyard would be restored. She stated it was a note on the final development plan that if the bufferyard disappeared it would be fixed.

**ACTION TAKEN on 1A**
Motioned by Commissioner Britton, seconded by Commissioner Struckhoff, to approve the request to rezone approximately 1.418 acres from RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District and PUD (Planned Unit Development) District to RM24-PD (Multi-Dwelling Residential-Planned Development) District based on the findings presented in the staff report and forwarding it to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval and subject to the following use restrictions:

1. Retail uses, as accessory to the golf course.
2. Office uses, accessory to the direct operation of the golf course and banquet/reception facility (Event Center) or management of accessory uses directly associated with the golf course.
3. Eating and Drinking Establishments, including a night club (to be operated as a banquet/reception facility only), Fast Order Food, Quality Restaurant, and Accessory Bar uses.
4. Transient Accommodations, including a Hotel with not more than twenty-four (24) guest rooms.

Unanimously approved 10-0.

**ACTION TAKEN on 1B**
Motioned by Commissioner Britton, seconded by Commissioner Struckhoff, to approve the request to rezone approximately .558 acres, from PUD (Planned Unit Development) District to RM24-PD (Multi-Dwelling Residential-Planned Development) District based on the findings presented in the staff report and forwarding it to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval and subject to the following use restrictions:

1. Retail uses, as accessory to the golf course.
2. Office uses, accessory to the direct operation of the golf course and banquet/reception facility (Event Center) or management of accessory uses directly associated with the golf course.

3. Eating and Drinking Establishments, including a night club (to be operated as a banquet/reception facility only), Fast Order Food, Quality Restaurant, and Accessory Bar uses.

4. Transient Accommodations, including a Hotel with not more than twenty-four (24) guest rooms.

Unanimously approved 10-0.

**ACTION TAKEN on 1C**
Motioned by Commissioner Britton, seconded by Commissioner Struckhoff, to approve Alvamar Lot 1 Revised Final Development Plan based upon the findings of fact presented in the body of the staff report and subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the recording of the Final Development Plan a Final Plat shall be submitted and approved and recorded with the Register of Deeds Office.
2. Provision of a revised plan that updates the Landscape calculations per the 99 parking spaces shown on the face of the drawing.

Unanimously approved 10-0.

**ACTION TAKEN on 1D**
Motioned by Commissioner Britton, seconded by Commissioner Struckhoff, to approve revised Final Development Plan based upon the findings of fact presented in the body of the staff report and subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the recording of the Final Development Plan a Final Plat shall be submitted and approved and recorded with the Register of Deeds Office.
2. Provision of a revised plan that includes a landscape plan for the west property line bufferyard per staff approval.

Unanimously approved 10-0.
ITEM NO. 2  PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR MERCATO; 6200 W 6TH ST (MKM)

PP-17-00010: Consider a Preliminary Plat for Mercato, an eight-lot commercial subdivision on approximately 121 acres located at 6200 W 6th St (northwest corner of W 6th Street & George Williams Way). Submitted by Landplan Engineering PA on behalf of Kentucky Place, LC; Tanglewood, LC; JDS Kansas, LC; Scotsdale Properties, LC; Tat Land Holding Company, LC; Sojac Land Company, LC; and Venture Properties, Inc. property owners of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Mary Miller presented the item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Mr. Brian Sturm, Landplan Engineering, said the development group did not agree with the required East 902 Road improvements and he would like it stricken from the conditions. He felt the condition was burdensome and outside the Subdivision Regulations. He said this development should not be responsible for improvement of E 902 Road. He said a sidewalk along the south side of Rock Chalk Drive should have been built when Rock Chalk Park was developed.

PUBLIC HEARING
No public comment.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Mr. McCullough said he thought the applicant was in agreement with the conditions. He said East 902 Road was a street coming into this node and it was the owner’s responsibility in accordance with the transportation plan. He said it was a necessary street to the development. He said this is the time, during the platting of the property, to provide the infrastructure that the development demands. He stated staff’s position was firm and the development policy required the developer pay for it. He said if infrastructure was not there to support the CC600 zoning then staff may not have recommended approval of the project. He said the sidewalk on Rock Chalk Drive was in response to the Mercato plat with residential lots backing to Rock Chalk Drive.

Commissioner von Achen asked staff to speak about the agreement.

Mr. McCullough said that was only laying down the framework for the timing of closing the outer road to the highway and providing right in/right access on Mercato Lane.

Commissioner Sands asked staff for a comparable CC600 zoning of 100,000 gross ft.

Mr. McCullough said the Walmart on 6th Street was just under 100,000 gross ft.

Ms. Miller said it limited the number of big buildings to two.

Mr. McCullough said certain uses, such as hotel, are not included in the retail count.

Commissioner Britton inquired about the law requiring the developer to pay for these things.
Mr. McCullough said it was an analysis of the demand created. He said two big box stores and more retail square footage was driving the need for appropriate road infrastructure to the site. He said the development policy outside of the Subdivision Regulations put the cost burden on the development itself.

Commissioner Culver inquired about the applicant saying the road was outside the boundaries of the property.

Mr. McCullough said it was an argument that staff did not agree with.

Commissioner Culver asked if 902 Road was not closed would the developer still be required to improve it.

Mr. McCullough said it was necessary to address 902 Road with this development. He said 902 Road was serving the development and was a primary road to the development.

Commissioner Kelly inquired about the development north of Rock Chalk Park.

Mr. McCullough said it was designated for residential density. He said there was some market pressure to do something to the north.

Commissioner Butler asked the applicant to show on the drawing what the developer did not feel they should be responsible for.

Mr. Sturm said the developer was responsible to upgrade streets within the development and provide connections to the edges of the development.

Commissioner von Achen asked the applicant about internal traffic flow.

Mr. Sturm said there was a collector street that would tie George Williams Way east to west over to East 902 Road. He said there was also an east/west local street further north that would bring people from George Williams Way into the development. He said the primary movements would be at the 6th Street and George Williams Way intersection. He said Mercato Drive would be a collector street.

Commissioner von Achen asked if Mr. Sturm agreed East 902 Road needed to be improved.

Mr. Sturm said when demand is shown with a traffic impact study. He did not feel it needed to be improved at this time with Mercato paying for it.

Commissioner Carpenter inquired about sidewalks.

Mr. Sturm said he disputes that improvement costs should be this developer’s responsibility.

Commissioner Sands said he would be willing to bend a little on the sidewalk issue. He said if the back of the store goes on the south side then a sidewalk wouldn't necessarily be used. He said East 902 Road was going to serve this property almost exclusively.

Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:
http://www.lawrenceks.org/boards/planning-commission/agendas
Commissioner Britton said the orientation of the buildings was not known at this time.

Mr. McCullough said that was correct.

Commissioner Britton felt the property would be a lot better if it did not have the backside of buildings facing Rock Chalk Park. He said he had not heard anything compelling to get rid of the sidewalks and felt the development would be better with sidewalks. He said regarding East 902 Road it was consistent to have the developer foot the bill for the improvements. He asked if this development was different than other situations.

Mr. McCullough said sometimes the improvements come in benefit districts and sometimes has to do with how directly it effects the property and the timing of the project. He said Rock Chalk Drive was paid for by Rock Chalk Park but would benefit Mercato.

Mr. Matt Gough said the development was tiny piece of a big piece. He said he did not interpret the agreement to require the owner to assume the responsibility of East 902 Road. He said the course of the roads could change. He said there was a 10’ sidewalk on the north side of Rock Chalk Drive instead of two 5’ sidewalks on each side and it was probably better to move pedestrians across the street on one side.

Commissioner Willey felt the staff conditions should be upheld as written.

**ACTION TAKEN**
Motioned by Commissioner Willey, seconded by Commissioner von Achen, to approve the Preliminary Plat, PP-17-00010, of Mercato Addition subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall provide a revised preliminary plat with the following changes:
   a. Show and note the entire length of George Williams Way, except where the access points are proposed, as ‘access restricted’.
   b. Revise the note regarding the closing of E 902 access to W 6th Street/ Hwy 40 to note that this access shall be removed by the property owner—developer, at developer’s expense, with the construction of Mercato Drive Lane and the disturbed area shall be seeded and maintained until vegetation is established.
   c. Add a note that indicates that the developer shall improve, at developer’s cost, Renaissance Drive (currently E 902 Road) to City standards to the north boundary of the property with the construction of Mercato Lane.
   d. Revise Note 1 under ‘Provision and Financing of Roads, Sewer and Other Public Services’ to note that right-of-way shall be provided for external as well as internal streets.
   e. Provide dimensions for the proposed drainage easement on Lot 1, Block One.
   f. Show and label the 100 ft ‘no build setback’ which is centered on the Southern Star gasline.
   g. Remove the proposed 15 ft landscape easement adjacent to the south side of Rock chalk Drive. Show a sidewalk along the south side of Rock Chalk Drive and along the east side of E 902 Road. Show sidewalks along both sides of all interior streets, and show Label the existing sidewalks those along the adjacent streets as ‘existing’.

Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:
http://www.lawrenceks.org/boards/planning-commission/agendas
Remove the grading changes which are shown within the Southern Star gasoline easement through Lot 1, Block Four. **Add a note that grading or other development activity within the Southern Star easement or setback will require Southern Star approval.**

Show dedication of right-of-way at the intersection of George Williams Way with Overland Drive and with Rock Chalk Drive to accommodate intersection improvements, per the City Engineer approval.

Commissioner Culver said he understood the need to plat the property preliminarily. He said he agreed with Mr. Gough’s statement that it may not be the most appropriate time to talk about East 902 Road and how that may or may not be the sole responsibility of the development. He was supportive of the plat but not as supportive of the condition of East 902 Road being the sole expense of the developer.

Commissioner Struckhoff appreciated the development group’s concerns about the costs and burden but felt it was appropriate under the development scheme and felt it was consistent with policies. He said this area was the retail future in Lawrence.

Commissioner Sands asked if there had been any interaction with KU Athletics about what would go west of the tennis area.

Mr. McCullough said staff had not had recent discussions with KU but that it was assumed something would develop.

Commissioner Kelly said he expected this development to be more pedestrian friendly. He said families would walk back and forth from the hotel use to Rock Chalk Park. He was supportive of sidewalk on both sides. He stated this was the preliminary plat and it allowed more time for changes.

Commissioner Britton felt they should stick to the preliminary plan and could make revisions if needed. He felt it would be harder to go back to the rule if an exception was made up front. He said he would support the motion.

Commissioner Carpenter was comfortable with the recommendations in the staff report.

Commissioner von Achen supported the motion.

Commissioner Sands said East 902 Road would support the development

Unanimously approved 10-0.
ITEM NO.  3  PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR MT. BLUE ADDITION; 2350 FRANKLIN RD (BJP)

PDP-17-00008: Consider a Preliminary Development Plan for Mt. Blue Addition, Lot 1 and Mt. Blue Addition No. 2, Lot 9 to accommodate a gun range and retail store, located at 2350 Franklin Rd. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects on behalf of Ace Self Storage LLC, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Becky Pepper presented the item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Ms. Leticia Cole, Paul Werner Architects, agreed with the staff report and was present for questioning.

PUBLIC HEARING
No public comment.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner von Achen asked staff about Lot 1.

Ms. Pepper said Lot 1 was developed as proposed under the previous planned development. She said there were some minor changes to correct and match what exists today. She stated they were not proposing any changes to existing Lot 1, other than the access and moving the trash.

Commissioner Sands asked if Planning Commission would see more on this project.

Ms. Pepper said yes, the final development plan would come back to Planning Commission.

Commissioner Britton said the property to the west was zoned Agricultural and Limited Industrial. He asked if it was part of any sector plan that had a future use set out for it.

Ms. Pepper said the Southeast Land Use Plan.

Ms. Stogsdill displayed the Southeast Land Use Plan Geographic Information System (GIS) layer on the overhead for Planning Commission to see.

Commissioner Willey asked if the reason for the 15’ setback waiver was because it fell under the regulations of the old code.

Ms. Pepper said the old code would have required a 30’ setback. She said under that condition there would not be enough space for parking on the north side which would put restraints on the site meeting parking requirements.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if the current code standard would apply.

Ms. Pepper said that was correct.
Commissioner Britton said this site did not have the same pitfalls as previous discussions about gun ranges and appropriate locations. He stated it seemed supportable.

Commissioner Sands expressed concern regarding Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements within gun ranges and said Planning Commission could look at further during the final development plan.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if the proposed gun range would also sell guns.

Ms. Pepper said the specialty store would be related to the gun range but she was not sure if there would be gun sales.

**ACTION TAKEN**

Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Britton, to approve the waiver from the front setback to permit the proposed off-street parking for Lot 9 to be located 15 ft of the north property line.

Unanimously approved 10-0.

Motioned by Commissioner Sands, Commissioner Willey, to approve the Revised Preliminary Development Plan for Mt. Blue Addition based upon the findings of fact presented in the body of the staff report and subject to the following conditions:

1.) Provision of a revised plan that includes the following notes and changes:
   a. Update Note 2.11 with the following note; “One March 15, 2017, the Planning Commission approved a waiver from the front setback requirements in Section 20-1008.5(F)(1) of the 1966 Zoning Regulation to allow the parking area to be setback 15 feet from Thomas Court right-of-way.”
   2.) Submittal of a revised stormwater drainage study with approval by the City Stormwater Engineer.

Unanimously approved 10-0.
ITEM NO. 4  TEXT AMENDMENT TO COUNTY ZONING REGULATIONS; LANDFILLS (MKM)

TA-16-00510: Consider a Text Amendment to Chapter 12 of the County Code, *Zoning Regulations for the Unincorporated Territory of Douglas County, Kansas* to add ‘Landfills’ to the enumerated list of Conditional Uses, provide a definition, and establish standards for the use. *Initiated by County Commission on 11/30/16.*

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Mary Miller presented the item. She two changes incorporated that were suggested by Mr. Matt Gough.

PUBLIC HEARING
Mr. Matt Gough, Barber Emerson, thanked staff for incorporating two of his three suggested changes. He said Chapter 10 of the Code would prohibit someone from taking clean fill from one place and dumping it on another spot on their property.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner von Achen asked if there was anything that required covering the dumped material.

Ms. Miller said there was a section of the County Code that prohibited dumping.

Commissioner von Achen asked if an individual could have a temporary landfill.

Ms. Miller said they could but it would require a Conditional Use Permit. She gave the example of a pond that a landowner may want to fill it. She said the primary reason for a Conditional Use Permit was to mitigate impact to neighbors.

Commissioner Britton asked if there was a requirement for paying for damage to a shared drive.

Ms. Miller said it was not something the County Zoning & Codes office had the authority to do.

Mr. Sean Reid, Director of Zoning & Codes, said new shared access drives were not permitted in the county.

Commissioner Britton inquired about Mr. Gough’s points in his letter regarding conflict between chapters.

Mr. Gough said every chapter of the Code integrates and it doesn’t matter who drafts it or enforces it.

Commissioner Kelly asked if there was any benefit in deferring to allow time for the public to review.

Mr. McCullough said there had not been a lot of public knowledge and that it would not harm the process to defer it.

Commissioner Britton suggested deferring to allow staff more time to look at Chapter 10.
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Commissioner Culver said he would support deferral to allow staff time to look at Chapters 10 & 12 to see if they could be better aligned. He wondered if monitoring and enforcement of these types of uses would be similar to other Conditional Use Permits or if they would have a different list of criteria and timing.

**ACTION TAKEN**
Motioned by Commissioner Britton, seconded by Commissioner Carpenter, to defer until April Planning Commission to allow the public more time to participate in the process and to allow staff more time to look at the language in the Code Chapters to see if there alignment was needed.

Motion carried 10-0.
ITEM NO. 5 TEXT AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT CODE; COLUMBARIUMS (BJP)

TA-16-00388: Consider a Text Amendment to the City of Lawrence Land Development Code, Articles 4, 5, & 17, regarding Funeral and Interment Services as defined in Section 20-1729. The requested amendment would allow Columbariums as Accessory Uses to established Religious Assembly Institutions. Submitted by Corpus Christi Catholic Church. Initiated by City Commission on 9/20/16. Deferred by Planning Commission on 1/25/17.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Becky Pepper presented the item.

PUBLIC HEARING
Ms. Courtney Shipley asked if the exception in the Kansas statute that religious organizations did not need to keep the same trust would be effective.

Ms. Pepper said it would be considered a cemetery corporation but the condition that they have a management or disposition plan.

Ms. Shipley inquired about the guidelines a church would follow if they wanted their own cemetery.

Ms. Pepper said it would be site planned and reviewed for how the church plans to maintain the cemetery through funding or a disposition plan.

Mr. Randy Larkin, staff attorney, said if a cemetery was in place and a church moved or dissolved there would be some type of plan of what to do with the cemetery. He stated there would be some type of trust fund to maintain it or some other situation where someone would have the responsibility to take care of the cemetery instead of it going to the City. He said it would be an approved plan and that the situation may be different for each cemetery.

Ms. Shipley expressed concern about trusts being cost prohibitive for non-profit organizations.

Mr. Larkin said the plan did not have to be a trust, just some type of assurance it would be maintained to protect the City.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Kelly inquired about what the “plan” for disposition would look like.

Mr. McCullough said the intent was to protect the City but the plan could be flexible.

Mr. Larkin said the plan could be something as simple as the church giving the property to the land next door and that person would mow and maintain it. He said the plan would be on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Carpenter was satisfied that his concerns had been addressed with this text amendment.

Commissioner Britton asked if a disposition plan was only required for cemeteries, not columbariums.
Mr. Larkin said the disposition plan was mostly connected to cemeteries but that it would depend on the situation. He said the City was not as concerned with columbariums since they were portable to some degree and there was a state procedure for disposing of the ashes.

Mr. McCullough said columbariums were primarily a civil issue, where cemeteries had a link to the City taking over if abandoned.

Commissioner Britton asked if the text amendment required cemeteries created after the effective date to be accompanied by a disposition plan but no requirement for columbariums to have something similar to that.

Mr. McCullough said that was correct.

Commissioner Willey inquired about the timeframe of the management plan.

Mr. McCullough said that would be part of the disposition plan and approving it with the site plan. He stated nothing would be 100% foolproof and that the City may still have to get involved if a cemetery is abandoned and not maintained with a 30 year old agreement. He said the management plan was to document that it was not the intent of the City to take on maintenance if it was abandoned.

Commissioner Willey suggested adding similar language for the requirement of a management plan for new columbariums.

Mr. Larkin said the language could be wordsmithed to meet the intent.

**ACTION TAKEN**

Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Carpenter, to forward a recommendation for approval the City Commission of the proposed amendment, TA-16-00388, to establish a use group for Columbariums amending Sections 20-402, 20-403, 20-505, and 20-1729, with the addition of “Passive Interment Improvements” to the condition regarding management and disposition plan (Section 20-505).

Commissioner Britton liked the language of management and disposition plan because it was vague enough to provide flexibility to address specific situations.

   Unanimously approved 10-0.
MISCELLANEOUS NEW OR OLD BUSINESS
Consideration of any other business to come before the Commission.

MISC NO. 1 MINOR SUBDIVISION VARIANCE FOR COKELEY ADDITION; SW CORNER OF W 31ST ST & OUSDAHL RD (MKM)

Minor Subdivision, MS-17-00071, variance request from the requirement to dedicate additional right-of-way for W 31st Street, for Cokeley Addition, a one-lot subdivision on approximately 2.9 acres located in the southwest corner of the intersection of W 31st Street and Ousdahl Road. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, PA for Jayhawk Acquisition, LLC, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Mary Miller presented the item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Mr. Brian Sturm, Landplan Engineering, said the small property would take an unnecessary hardship by dedicating the additional right-of-way. He said a 15’ utility easement would accommodate the existing and future infrastructure. He did not feel a right turn lane was needed in the area. He said the traffic study for Menards included this intersection and showed ample capacity for east bound right turn movements.

Mr. Paul Werner, Paul Werner Architects, said the staff report stated that since 2006 all right-of-way had been dedicated, but it had not. He said Menards had a 50’ right-of-way with a pedestrian easement. He did not feel it was fair to compare this small lot to the large apartment complex next door.

PUBLIC HEARING
No public comment.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Mr. McCullough said last month they looked at a situation at 31st & Iowa where there was a desire to maintain right-of-way on both sides. He said the City accepted a combination of right-of-way and easement on one side and recommended requiring it on another part. He said the city engineer likes to accommodate when an easement will help a development with setbacks. He said that was a judgement call by the city engineer on whether or not he believes everything needed can fit in the right-of-way. He said comparing Menards to this situation was like comparing apples and oranges. He said the city engineering was forecasting the potential for a right turn lane where right-of-way would eventually be needed.

Commissioner Willey asked in terms of a hardship determination when the applicant knew that the likely requirement would be a 75’ easement.

Mr. McCullough said it was a requirement of the City Code.

Commissioner Willey wondered if this was a surprise after the applicant started the development process.
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Mr. McCullough said the applicant submitted the variance request with the Minor Subdivision application so they had knowledge of it. He said he hoped there was a way to get the right-of-way that the City needs but help with some of the parking setbacks. He said there were other avenues to pursue to grant relief for the setback issues than reduce the right-of-way.

Commissioner Sands inquired about the concept plan for rezoning that Planning Commission saw last month.

Ms. Miller said it was in the staff report from last month.

Mr. Werner said the mini-storage facility would not need parking outside and that parking would be north of the building.

Commissioner Willey inquired about how far back the right turn lane would go and if it would impact the property to the west.

Mr. Werner said the turn lane would fit in the right-of-way now but not a sidewalk.

Mr. McCullough said if the City does not get the right-of-way needed and development is built in the right-of-way then the City would have to buy the right-of-way in the future, which would include buildings. He said there was a trigger in the plating process that if there is required right-of-way that the development has to dedicate it to the City because that is the first step of development.

Commissioner Kelly said he was struggling with which side of the street to match this site with. He said if a right hand turn lane may be needed in the future then there should have been 75’ setback down all of 31st Street.

Commissioner Willey inquired about the difference between a 50’ right-of-way plus 20’ pedestrian easement versus 70’ right-of-way.

Mr. McCullough said the pedestrian easement was mostly for a sidewalk. He said east of Ousdahl with Menards and the apartment complex there was a 75’ setback even though it did not have access off of 31st Street.

Commissioner Britton said it was rare for staff to recommend denial.

Commissioner Sands wondered what a traffic study for the area south would look like.

Commissioner Kelly said the City had technical experts and he struggled going against that.

Commissioner Butler said she would support the applicant.

Mr. Werner said this was a standalone lot and the only reason the City was getting a shot at more right-of-way was because the lots were being combined.

Commissioner Carpenter said he would support the staff recommendation.
Commissioner Sands said he would be in favor of deferring the item to hear from the City Engineer.

Commissioner Struckhoff said he was inclined to support the staff recommendation but wondered if a compromise could be met.

Commissioner Culver said it gave him pause that staff recommended denial. He said he would support a compromise for the staff and applicant to work out.

Mr. Werner said he was willing to continue working on it with staff.

**ACTION TAKEN**
Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Britton, to defer one month to the April Planning Commission to hear testimony from the City Engineer about the future design of 31st and Ousdahl.

**MISCELLANEOUS NEW OR OLD BUSINESS**
Consideration of any other business to come before the Commission.

**ADJOURN 10:39pm**
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
April 24 & 26, 2017
Meeting Action Summary

April 24, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.
Commissioners present: Britton, Butler, Carpenter, Culver, Kelly, Sands, Struckhoff, von Achen, Weaver, Willey
Staff present: McCullough, Stogsdill, Day, Larkin, M. Miller, Pepper, Ewert

GENERAL BUSINESS

COMMITTEE REPORTS
Receive reports from any committees that met over the past month.

Commissioner Culver said the Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Board met last week and was asked to approve a corridor for the critical rule in urban freight designations to submit to the Kansas Department of Transportation. He said the corridor identified was the west leg of the South Lawrence Trafficway.

EX PARTE / ABSTENTIONS / DEFERRAL REQUEST
- No ex parte.
- No abstentions.
ITEM NO. 1 TEXT AMENDMENT TO COUNTY ZONING REGULATIONS; LANDFILLS (MKM)

TA-16-00510: Consider a Text Amendment to Chapter 12 of the County Code, Zoning Regulations for the Unincorporated Territory of Douglas County, Kansas to add ‘Landfills’ to the enumerated list of Conditional Uses, provide a definition, and establish standards for the use. Initiated by County Commission on 11/30/16. Deferred by Planning Commission on 3/15/17.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Mary Miller presented the item.

PUBLIC HEARING
Mr. Matt Gough, Barber Emerson, said he represented the owner of Stonewall Farm. He said adopting this amendment was the right thing to do and that the County should regulate clean fill offsite. He showed on the overhead pictures of a clean fill site adjacent to the Stonewall Farm property. He said a clean fill site should require a Conditional Use Permit. He wanted some assurance that once this Text Amendment was adopted that there will be no more dumping at the site next to Stonewall Farms. He thanked staff and supported the Text Amendment.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Sands asked if excessive runoff counted as a nuisance.

Mr. McCullough said generally it would be a civil matter between property owners.

Mr. Sean Reid, County Zoning & Codes Director, said runoff would be considered a civil legal issue. He said he could determine if other county codes had been violated.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if current landfills would stop current activity.

Mr. Reid said he would like to have a chance to talk to legal counsel about that.

Mr. McCullough said it was a question that would need to be talked about.

Commissioner Carpenter wondered if County Commission could issue a moratorium on it.

Commissioner Sands asked if this would be allowed to continue until a Conditional Use Permit was applied for.

Mr. McCullough said that would need to be discussed with County Counsel.

Commissioner Britton thanked staff for working with Mr. Gough in making improvements to the language.

ACTION TAKEN
Motioned by Commissioner Britton, seconded by Commissioner Carpenter, to approve the Text Amendment, TA-16-00510, and forward to the Board of County Commissioners.

Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:
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Commissioner Culver said this text amendment would help going forward in defining uses to help protect some rural aspects of the county and allow property owners some rights. He encouraged County Commission to look at existing uses and make those work going forward.

Unanimously approved 10-0.
ITEM NO. 2  TEXT AMENDMENT TO COUNTY ZONING REGULATIONS; RADIO, TELEVISION, TELECOMMUNICATION, & MICROWAVE TOWERS (MKM)

TA-16-00511: Consider a Text Amendment to Chapter 12 of the County Code, Zoning Regulations for the Unincorporated Territory of Douglas County, Kansas to revise Section 12-319-4.31, Radio, television, telecommunication, and microwave towers, to bring the standards and definitions into compliance with State law. Initiated by County Commission on 11/30/16.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Mary Miller presented the item.

PUBLIC HEARING
No public comment.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Sands inquired about what defined a use for the tower. He said after a year of non-use it was required to be pulled down. He was concerned a tower may be used for something other than its intended use.

Ms. Miller said it would have to be used as a telecommunications or TV tower. She said if it was used as a fence post that would not count. She said it had to be used for the Conditional Use Permit that was approved.

ACTION TAKEN
Motioned by Commissioner von Achen, seconded by Commissioner Sands, to approve the proposed amendment, TA-16-00511, to revise Section 12-319-4.31 Radio, television, telecommunication, and microwave towers to update the definitions and standards for Wireless Facilities in compliance with recent State legislation and to create a new category 12-319-4.38 for Radio, Television, and Microwave Towers, and forwarding to the Board of County Commissioners.

Commissioner Britton asked if everything they were looking at was echoing the State law changes.

Ms. Miller said yes, that previous requirements conflicted with the State.

   Unanimously approved 10-0.
ITEM NO. 3 PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR ALVABET ADDITION; 1300 BLOCK RESEARCH PARK DR (SLD)

PP-17-00078: Consider a Preliminary Plat for Alvabet Addition, a 3 lot and 4 tract subdivision along the west side of Research Park Drive, located in the 1300 block of Research Park Dr. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Alvamar Inc and Mabet #1 #2 and Mabet #3, property owners of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Sandra Day presented the item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Mr. Brian Sturm, Landplan Engineering, said the primary driver behind this Preliminary Plat was to clean up some ownership lines and land titles. He said the property owners were in agreement with staff the recommendation.

PUBLIC HEARING
No public comment.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Willey inquired about open space.

Ms. Day said it was not a requirement but that the applicant could do.

Commissioner Willey asked who held the conservation easement.

Ms. Day said the property owner.

Commissioner Kelly asked staff to explain the difference between open space and conservation easements.

Ms. Day said an open space was a designation within the zoning code and would allow certain development to occur in the open space district. She said a conservation easement was explicit to that property and had specific restrictions.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if a conservation easement could be crossed to access a plat.

Mr. Larkin said a conservation easement would determine the terms of the easement itself and whether it could be crossed or not.

Mr. McCullough said in this case the conservation easement was likely more restrictive than any zoning.

ACTION TAKEN
Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Britton, to approve the Preliminary Plat for Alvabet Addition subject to the following conditions:

1. Revise general notes to remove duplication of note 8.
2. Revise general note to include maintenance responsibility for Tracts A & B.

Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:
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Unanimously approved 10-0.
ITEM NO. 4  RM12 & RS5 TO CS; .52 ACRE; 508 MICHIGAN (SLD)

Z-17-00087: Consider a request to rezone approximately .52 acre from RM12 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District & RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District to CS (Strip Commercial) District, located at 508 Michigan. Submitted by The Johnson Group, for Jesson S. Ross, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Sandra Day presented the item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Mr. Lance Johnson, The Johnson Group, was present for questioning. He thanked staff for their time on the rezoning.

PUBLIC HEARING
Mr. Bob Thurber, 1301 W 5th St, said the rezoning would change the zoning to match the land use that had existed for many years. He felt the rezoning would benefit the neighborhood by knowing what would be allowed. He felt it was good to have a distinction between residential and non-residential. He expressed concern about screening and future uses of the property.

Ms. Gina Graham, 1311 W 5th St, said she did not have any issue with the rezoning but expressed concern about noise and restrictions for future businesses on the property.

APPLICANT CLOSING COMMENTS
Mr. Johnson said he had no closing comments.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Ms. Day said the Commercial Strip zoning district allowed for a wide variety of land uses. She said the size of the property, amount of frontage, and existing improvements limited what could ultimately be developed there. She said there were some uses that may not be conducive being adjacent to a residential use, such as automotive uses or fast food with drive-thru. She said the property today was not conducive for a drive-thru restaurant. She said the property was somewhat self restricting through its current configuration. She said during the site planning process staff would look at the common property line in terms of buffering, fencing, and some amount of greenspace. She said as far as noise it was a bit more challenging. She stated there were certain requirements in the Code about noise but it could be mitigated through fencing and landscaping.

Commissioner von Achen inquired about the west half of the property being non-conforming

Ms. Day said there was a fair amount of history to the property. She said it went back to the early zoning codes where the district allowed for commercial use along the street for the front lots. She said the non-conforming use covered the property that fronted Michigan Street.

Commissioner von Achen asked if access, no matter what the use, would be from Michigan Street.

Ms. Day said yes.

Commissioner Kelly inquired about the other three properties.
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Ms. Day said she did not know anything specific about those properties. She said it was conceivable that a property owner in the future would want to make a similar request to rezone. She said 5th Street was the boundary line as it transitioned to residential.

Commissioner Kelly expressed concern about creating an island with the other three properties within the middle of commercial zoning.

Mr. McCullough said the issue was that it was an existing commercial use today. He said site planning and apply today’s standards could only improve the site and make the transition better.

Mr. Thurman asked if the gravel would have to be paved.

Ms. Day said that would be looked at during the site planning process.

Mr. McCullough said site planning process would require notice and the neighbors could be involved in that process.

**ACTION TAKEN**
Motioned by Commissioner Britton, seconded by Commissioner Culver, to approve the request to rezone approximately .52 acres, from RM12 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District & RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District to CS (Strip Commercial) District based on the findings presented in the staff report and forwarding it to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval.

Unanimously approved 10-0.
ITEM NO. 5A  COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT TO H2020; OREAD WEST RESEARCH PARK (SLD)

CPA-17-00135: Consider a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Horizon 2020, Chapter 7, to amend the boundary of the Oread West Research Park, related to rezonings Z-17-00079 & Z-17-00080 for the undeveloped properties north of Legends Drive and in the 1100 block of Biltmore Drive and Research Park Drive. Submitted by BG Consultants.

ITEM NO. 5B  IBP TO RS7; 25.4 ACRES; 1100 BLOCK BILTMORE DR & RESEARCH PARK DR (SLD)

Z-17-00079: Consider a request to rezone approximately 25.4 acres from IBP (Industrial/Business Park) District to RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District, located in the 1100 Block of Biltmore Dr. and Research Park Dr. Submitted by BG Consultants, for WE1929, LLC, property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 5C  IBP TO RM12D; 10 ACRES; 1100 BLOCK BILTMORE DR & RESEARCH PARK DR (SLD)

Z-17-00080: Consider a request to rezone approximately 10.0 acres from IBP (Industrial/Business Park) District to RM12D (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District, 1100 Block of Biltmore Dr. and Research Park Dr. Submitted by BG Consultants, for WE1929, LLC, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Sandra Day presented items 5A-5C together.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Mr. Jason Hoskinson, BG Consultants, said this was the perfect opportunity for infill and met the Comprehensive Plan.

PUBLIC HEARING
Mr. Tiraz Birdie, 5005 Legends Dr, expressed concern about townhomes built on Legends Drive becoming rundown and lowering the property value of the neighborhood. He wanted assurance of quality of construction.

Ms. Kristen Salmans, 1024 Summerfield Way, opposed the change in zoning. She said the greenspace was utilized every day by the neighbors and maintained by the residents.

Mr. Don Drickey, 1308 Morgan Ct, said he had maintained the pipeline easement along his property and enjoyed the greenspace. He wanted the greenspace preserved along the area to act as a buffer.

Mr. Charles Timmons, 1021 Biltmore Dr, said he was told by his real estate agent when he purchased the home that there was a 100’ easement to the south. He expressed concern about the buffer being reduced and felt it would be a detriment to his property value. He felt the City would be going back on what he was promised 20 years ago regarding the 100’ greenspace easement.

Ms. Jeanne Drickey, 1308 Morgan Ct, expressed concern about greenspace being lost.

APPLICANT CLOSING COMMENTS
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Mr. Hoskinson said he had gone through an extensive process to engage the public. He said he notified the surrounding neighbors and held a public meeting in February to present concepts and ideas. He said he was trying to be as transparent as possible. He said the quality of home building would be similar to Oregon Trail and slightly better than the surrounding neighbors. He said the townhomes would all be owned and the Homeowner Association would be set up to maintain that. He said he was looking to maintain some sort of buffer around the perimeter and that the development would also address some stormwater issues. He said the rezoning was the first step in the process and he would like to work further with the neighbors.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Kelly asked staff to respond to the 100’ easement that was “promised” to the neighborhood.

Ms. Day said she did not know of any recorded or dedicated easement for that space. She said she thought at one time Mr. Bob Billings may have met with property owners and neighbors about the expectation of streets connecting and what the industrial development would do. She stated there was never a plan or subdivision plat submitted. She said all of those conversations were verbal. She stated the old Code would have required a 40’ setback, not 100’.

Commissioner Kelly asked how wide the pipeline easement was.

Mr. Hoskinson said 66’.

Ms. Day said the City owned a little piece of the easement on the south side of Stone Creek Drive. She said it was typical that those types of easements would be transferred either as a tract or pedestrian easement to continue the connectivity.

Commissioner Sands asked if the stormwater main in the area could support the requested zoning.

Ms. Day said that would be part of the applicant’s requirement, to submit a sanitary sewer and drainage study. She said if there were downstream improvements that needed to be made it could be part of this development as well.

Commissioner von Achen said Venture Park catered to heavy industry and was not a substitute for West Oread Research Park. She said this area was zoned industrial in 2003 and she was not in favor of changing it to residential just because it hadn’t been developed fully. She said there was a recession and they were on the cusp of coming out of that recession. She did not want them to squander the property with residential when there could be a good research park in this area. She felt it would be hard to find another piece of property like this and she would not support the proposal. She said maybe in 10 years if it hasn’t developed yet then they could look at residential but felt it was a short-sided move at this time.

Commissioner Sands referred to the Golden Factors and felt all were except satisfying the neighborhood. He stated that an industrial area could present issues to the neighbors as well. He said an industrial area could potentially limit the walkability of the neighborhood. He said the land had been vacant a long time and he wasn’t sure if it was more appropriate to deny the rezoning and hope something else would come along or approve the rezoning to allow development now.
Commissioner Butler thanked the neighbors for their input. She expressed concern about the neighbors talking about being promised things and maintaining a space they did not own. She stated property owners had the right to develop their own property and she felt the rezoning was appropriate. She asked staff what uses could currently be built on the property under the industrial zoning.

Mr. McCullough said there were four zoning categories that had industrial in the name. He said Venture Park was in addition to and not a replacement of industrial. He said this site was an important development as well and slow to absorb. He said staff analyzed how much land that was left in the area versus the absorption rate. He said the lot inventory for single family was starting to decrease over time. He said the question was if they want to start replacing some of the commercial or industrial land for the higher absorbing rate of residential use with infill development.

Commissioner Willey said her initial reaction was that they should value industrial zoning but that this was a transition area in one way or another. She stated this was private property and had the right to develop. She said buffering could be looked at during the platting phase. She was in favor of rezoning as long as a portion of the industrial was retained.

Commissioner Kelly asked if there had been conversations with the school district about capacity. Ms. Day said no.

Mr. Hoskinson said he had not had direct conversations with the school district.

Commissioner Kelly inquired about the setback for IBP zoning. Mr. Hoskinson said IBP required a 40’ setback and RS7 required a 30’ setback.

Commissioner Kelly asked if they were talking about a difference of 10’ on the setback. Ms. Day said yes.

Commissioner Kelly said there was no record of a 100’ easement. Mr. Drickey said his neighbor had a copy of a document stating a 100’ easement was promised.

Commissioner Kelly said he was supportive of the idea of more residential and keeping some IBP. He felt the developer had some rights. He said he struggled with vacancy and developing property just because it was vacant, such as Bauer Farm. He asked if the applicant was interested in providing a planned overlay district.

Mr. Hoskinson regarding the question regarding working on some type of use in the boundary. He said Parks & Recreation was not interested in taking on the maintenance of more open space. He said he was in favor of working with staff and neighbors to find a good solution to meet concerns as best possible during the platting stage.

Commissioner Britton said changing the Comprehensive Plan required heightened scrutiny and if a change needed to be made there needed to be a compelling reason to do it. He stated industrial was tricky and they did not know where a business would want to locate. He said although they have
Venture Park this site was a unique option for industrial in the community and he would hate to see it disappear in a short-sighted decision. He was hesitant to jump at something in front of them that could prevent them from getting something more valuable to the community as a whole in the future. He stated industrial could potentially be worse for the neighbors. He asked how long this site had been identified as industrial in the plan.

Commissioner von Achen said 2006 was when the property was designated as IBP.

Commissioner Britton said he was leaning toward finding that this was not compelling enough to change the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Willey inquired about future land use maps.

Ms. Day said she did not know what the school district would have been planning for land use in this area. She said the applicant was requesting about 35 acres which would included approximately 120-130 total households.

Commissioner Carpenter said comparing this to Venture Park was not comparable.

Ms. Day said uses found in other office/commercial districts have found their way into the IBP district.

Mr. McCullough showed the future land use map on the overhead.

Commissioner Carpenter said if he were a resident living in that neighborhood he would gamble with residential over industrial. He said back when the plan was created the neighborhood was opposed to industrial and wanted residential.

Mr. McCullough said the KU’s Master Plan designates a research park that could relieve some of the tension in this area.

Commissioner Britton said if there was continued demand for residential stock he preferred infill versus sprawl.

Commissioner Kelly inquired about a planned overlay district.

Mr. McCullough said staff did not see the need for a planned development overlay. He said it could be an option to mitigate concerns but it was really an applicant decision to start over with a planned overlay.

Commissioner Culver said he struggled with this and was thinking about the long-term impacts. He said there was some advantages to allowing this to move forward and he could see it being a good long-term fit. He said he was conflicted but felt there was an opportunity for the applicant and neighbors to come together with a suitable solution. He said he was not opposed to changing the Comprehensive Plan in this scenario.

Commissioner Struckhoff said the applicant was willing to address some of neighbors concerns about buffer greenspace. He said he could support the application overall.

Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:
https://lawrenceks.org/boards/lawrence-douglas-county-metropolitan-planning-commission/
Commissioner Sands said he was leaning in favor of supporting this. He asked staff to mandate an additional 10’ of setback.

Mr. McCullough said the setbacks would come with the plat.

Commissioner Willey said she was not interested in further erosion of industrial lots after this. She said she was marginally in favor of the rezoning.

Commissioner Kelly encouraged the applicant to bring a plat forward fast. He said he supported infill versus sprawl. He said he was hesitantly leaning in favor of this.

**ACTION TAKEN on 5A**

Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Butler, to approve the Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Horizon 2020: Chapter 7: Industrial and Employment-Related Land Use revising Map: 7-1 Existing Industrial & Employment-Related Land Use, and recommends forwarding this Comprehensive Plan Amendment to the Lawrence City Commission with a recommendation for approval.

Commissioner Britton said he would vote against the motion because he would like City Commission to see there were concerns and hesitations with this. He felt if they change the plan they need to have a compelling reason to do so. He did not want to let this land sit vacant for very long. He hoped City Commission would bring their better sense of economic environment to this situation.

**Motion carried 7-3, with Commissioners Britton, Carpenter, and von Achen voting in opposition.**

**ACTION TAKEN on 5B**

Motioned by Sands, seconded by Commissioner Butler, to approve the request to rezone approximately 25 acres from IBP (Industrial/Business Park) District to RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District less that area adjusted to retain IBP zoning at the northwest corner of Research Park Drive and Legends Drive, subject to the submission and approval of a preliminary plat based on the findings presented in the staff report and forwarding it to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval.

Commissioner Willey asked if the area designated as IBP had boundaries.

Ms. Day said yes. She said it would tweak a little with the plat.

Commissioner Willey wondered if they should amend the motion to say the area of IBP should not be less than 5 acres.

Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Butler, to amend the motion to include language of 5 acres:

- to approve the request to rezone approximately 25 acres from IBP (Industrial/Business Park) District to RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District less that area, **of approximately 5 acres**, adjusted to retain IBP zoning at the northwest corner of Research Park Drive and Legends Drive, subject to the submission and approval of a preliminary plat based on the findings presented in the staff report and forwarding it to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval.

*Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:*
https://lawrenceks.org/boards/lawrence-douglas-county-metropolitan-planning-commission/*
Commissioner Britton said he would vote against the motion but did like the idea of 5 acres dedicated to industrial.

Motion carried 7-3, with Commissioners Britton, Carpenter, and von Achen voting in opposition.

**ACTION TAKEN on 5C**
Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Butler, to approve the request to rezone approximately 10 acres from IBP (Industrial/Business Park) District to RM12D (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District less that area adjusted to retain IBP zoning at the northwest corner of Research Park Drive and Legends Drive, approximately 5 acres, subject to the submission and approval of a preliminary plat based on the findings presented in the staff report and forwarding it to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval

Motion carried 7-3, with Commissioners Britton, Carpenter, and von Achen voting in opposition.
ITEM NO.  6  RSO TO RM32; .464 ACRE, 1816 & 1822 W 24TH ST (BJP)

Z-17-00083: Consider a request to rezone approximately .464 acre from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential-Office) District to RM32 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District, located at 1816 and 1822 W 24th St. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for Cherry Hill Properties LLC, property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Becky Pepper presented the item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
No applicant present.

PUBLIC HEARING
No public comment.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Sands asked if the building was vacant for 10 years.

Ms. Pepper said she believed so but could not say for sure.

ACTION TAKEN
Motioned by Commissioner Willey, seconded by Commissioner Struckhoff to approve the request to rezone approximately .464 acre, from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential-Office) District to RM32 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District and forwarding it to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval based on the findings of fact found in this staff report.

Unanimously approved 10-0.
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ITEM NO. 7A  PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR 902 STORAGE; 1700 BLOCK E 902 RD (MKM)

PP-17-00093: Consider a Preliminary Plat for 902 Storage, a one-lot subdivision containing approximately 11.63 acres, located in the 1700 Block of E 902 Rd. Submitted by BG Consultants, for Garber Enterprises, Inc., property owner of record.

ITEM NO. 7B  CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT; 902 STORAGE; 1700 BLOCK E 902 RD (MKM)

CUP-17-00092: Consider a Conditional Use Permit for a mini-storage facility, located on approximately 11.63 acres in the 1700 Block of E 902 Rd. Submitted by BG Consultants, for Garber Enterprises, Inc., property owner of record.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Mary Miller presented items 7A-7B together.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Mr. David Hamby, BG Consultants, was present for questioning.

PUBLIC HEARING
No public comment.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner von Achen said she would support this but was concerned about it being a gateway to the city. She wanted a little reassurance that landscaping would address concerns for the gateway.

Ms. Miller said the landscaping was spaced out to provide a more natural appearance. She said there were some constraints with the easement but that staff would work with the applicant on the landscaping.

Mr. McCullough said the architectural detail of the buildings would help as well.

ACTION TAKEN on 7A
Motioned by Commissioner Willey, seconded by Commissioner Britton, to approve the Preliminary Plat of 902 Storage subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall provide documentation from Rural Water District No. 1 and the Kanwaka Fire Department that an adequate supply of water is available for the needs of the development and fire protection for the mini-storage use.
2. Applicant shall provide a revised preliminary plat with the following changes:
   a. Addition of a note on the face of the plat that an Access Restriction Agreement, effective until property is annexed into the City of Lawrence, restricting access for 180 ft north of the subject property shall be executed and recorded prior to the recording of the final plat.
   b. Addition of a note that E 902 Road shall be improved to the City Limits to the south, to Kanwaka Township specifications per approval of the Township Trustee.

Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online: https://lawrenceks.org/boards/lawrence-douglas-county-metropolitan-planning-commission/
c. Addition of a note that an Annexation Agreement and Consent to Annexation shall be executed and recorded with the Final Plat.

Unanimously approved 10-0.

**ACTION TAKEN on 7B**
Motioned by Commissioner Willey, seconded by Commissioner Britton, to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a *Mini-Storage* use, subject to the following conditions:

1. The CUP shall be administratively reviewed every 5 years by the Douglas County Zoning and Codes Department.
2. A new septic system shall be installed prior to the operation of the use, per Health Department approval. The plans shall be revised, if needed, to provide additional area for the septic system.
3. Provision of a revised photometric plan which shows where the light levels reach the maximum amount permitted north of the lights along the north side of the driveway and the north side of the facility (0.2 foot candles).
4. Provision of a revised CUP plan with the following changes:
   a. Note the agreement between Westar and the property owner regarding the access drive within the 150 ft easement along the north property line and include the recording Book and Page number. If Westar is permitted shared use on this drive, the use should be limited to trucks that are no larger than a pick-up truck.
   b. Add the following note: “*No exterior storage will occur on the site. Any exterior storage would require a revised site plan and compliance with the exterior storage standards in Section 12-319-4.34 and may require an amendment to the CUP, depending on the scale of the exterior storage.*”
   c. Add ‘Manager’s Residence’ to the Proposed Buildings and note size of dwelling unit and location on the site.
   d. Note the height of the light poles on the plan.
   e. Revise General Note 3 as follows: “*E 902 Road will be improved to Kanwaka Township standards from Rock Chalk Drive to the drive for the storage facility. Improvements will include a 24 ft wide surface of 8 in. thick stabilized gravel (min.) with an annual dust palliative treatment paid for by the owner.*”
   f. Modify landscape plan to include a variety of trees and relocate the trees out of Westar’s easement.
   g. Label the size of the proposed water line and indicate Rural Water District No. 1 is the provider.
   h. Note that the proposed sign is not approved with this CUP and requires a separate permit from the County Zoning and Codes Office.

Unanimously approved 10-0.

**Recess at 10:10pm until 6:30pm on April 26, 2017**

Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:
[https://lawrenceks.org/boards/lawrence-douglas-county-metropolitan-planning-commission/](https://lawrenceks.org/boards/lawrence-douglas-county-metropolitan-planning-commission/)
Reconvene April 26, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.

Commissioners present: Britton, Butler, Carpenter, Culver, Kelly, Sands, Struckhoff, von Achen, Weaver, Willey
Staff present: McCullough, Stogsdill, Larkin, M. Miller, Pepper, Ewert, Kidney

BEGIN PUBLIC HEARING (APRIL 26, 2017):

EX PARTE / ABSTENTIONS / DEFERRAL REQUEST

- Ex parte:
  Commissioner von Achen said she received a call from Ms. Jane Eldridge about the loss of flexibility in using property in East Lawrence related to item 10.

- No Abstentions.
ITEM NO. 8 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Presentation of recommended Capital Improvement Plan.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Sheila Stogsdill presented the item. She stated several letters were received from Mr. Michael Almon with the 19th Street Neighborhoods Coalition after the communication deadline. She included presentation slides with his concerns regarding traffic intrusion.

PUBLIC HEARING
Ms. KT Walsh said the 19th Street Neighborhoods Coalition had legitimate complaints about traffic if East 19th Street was cut through. She wondered why Franklin road was never taken all the way to 15th Street.

Mr. Michael Almon, Brookcreek Neighborhood, expressed concerns regarding traffic, especially on 19th Street.

STAFF CLOSING COMMENTS
Mr. McCullough said Planning Commission’s role was to look at adopted plans and see if the projects within the Capital Improvement Plan met those plans. He said the appropriate time to address Mr. Almon’s concerns would be with the current amendment of Transportation 2040. He stated that next years Capital Improvement Plan may have another adopted plan included.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Britton said Mr. Almon raised some valid points. He inquired about objections to the Capital Improvement Plan.

Mr. McCullough said the request to the public through the Capital Improvement Plan process typically included projects the public wanted to add to the Capital Improvement Plan. He said Mr. Almon’s request was to remove things from the Capital Improvement Plan.

Commissioner Britton agreed with staff. He said Planning Commission was capable of looking at the list of projects and determining generally speaking if they were in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. He said he felt less capable of making a determination of the merits of one of the included projects.

Commissioner Kelly said he trusted the process in place and the Comprehensive Plan was made up of other plans to bring them together to form that plan.

Commissioner Struckhoff asked staff when the proper forum/review would be for traffic.

Mr. McCullough said the Transportation 2040 plan needed to be updated by March, 2018. He said the Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Board would approve it and it would then be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. He said specific issues get vetted out through that process.

Commissioner Struckhoff said what happens on the east end of 19th Street would impact what happens on the rest of 19th Street. He said 19th and Louisiana, especially between 23rd and 31st
Streets was woefully underbuilt. He said it was very difficult getting improvement in that corridor. He
said for now it was compatible with the plans but he did share concerns and welcomed further
discussion at the appropriate time.

Commissioner Carpenter echoed concerns about opening 19th Street. He encouraged those with
concerns to express them to City Commission and during the Metropolitan Planning Organization
Policy Board process. He said as written tonight it was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Sands inquired about the E 902 Road improvements.

Ms. Stogsdill said it was near Mercato.

Mr. McCullough said that was a citizen request not a City initiated project.

Mr. Bryan Kidney said currently that project was not recommended for funding in the Capital
Improvement Plan.

**ACTION TAKEN**

Motioned by Commissioner Britton, seconded by Commissioner Sands, to make a finding that the
projects included in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) are in conformance with the Comprehensive
Plan.

Motion carried 10-0.
ITEM NO. 9  PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR APPLIED ECOLOGICAL ADDITION; 1269 N 222 RD (MKM)


STAFF PRESENTATION
Ms. Mary Miller presented the item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Mr. Brian Sturm, Landplan Engineering, was present for questioning.

PUBLIC HEARING
No public comment.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION
Commissioner Willey felt this would be a benefit to the neighborhood and was in favor of approving the Preliminary Plat.

Commissioner Culver asked if there were any comments from Baldwin Planning Commission.

Ms. Miller said no.

ACTION TAKEN
Motioned by Commissioner Willey, seconded by Commissioner von Achen, to approve the Preliminary Plat of Applied Ecological Addition subject to the following condition:

1. The property owner shall obtain a driveway permit for the new access point on E 1260 Road from the Douglas County Public Works Office prior to the recording of the final plat.

Unanimously approved 10-0.

Complete audio & video from this meeting can be found online:
https://lawrenceks.org/boards/lawrence-douglas-county-metropolitan-planning-commission/
ITEM NO. 10 EAST LAWRENCE REZONINGS (BJP)

East Lawrence Rezoning of multiple properties to align the properties’ current use with the zoning districts that contain the appropriate density and intensity standards to support the uses, as identified in the interactive map available here: lawrenceks.org/pds/rezoning

The properties to be rezoned are in an area of the East Lawrence neighborhood, as identified on a map in the Staff memo, and generally bound by 9th Street to the south, Rhode Island Street to the west, various streets to the east but no farther than the alley between New Jersey Street and Pennsylvania Street, and the Kansas River to the north. This item will receive a hearing before the Planning Commission with notice to all affected properties and to owners within 400 feet of the affected properties. Initiated by City Commission on 12/6/16.

Z-17-00098: Consider a request to rezone 82 properties from RM24 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District to RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District.

Z-17-00099: Consider a request to rezone 22 properties from RM24 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District to RM12D (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District.

Z-17-00100: Consider a request to rezone 10 properties from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential-Office) District to RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District.

Z-17-00101: Consider a request to rezone 2 properties from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential-Office) District to RM12D (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District.

Z-17-00102: Consider a request to rezone 627 Connecticut from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential-Office) District to RM24 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District.

Z-17-00103: Consider a request to rezone 5 properties from CS (Strip Commercial) District to RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District.

Z-17-00104: Consider a request to rezone 738 Rhode Island from CS (Strip Commercial) District to RM12D (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Ms. Becky Pepper presented the item.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Brent Morrison, 812 Rhode Island, opposed the rezoning. He wanted the rezoning of his property to be denied. He said he was in the process of purchasing 816 Rhode Island. He felt the rezoning took away from the flexibility of the property.

Ms. KT Walsh, 732 Rhode Island, East Lawrence Neighborhood, thanked staff for their time. She said two different value systems were at play and that some people view the neighborhood as property and profit. She said the neighborhood was under development pressure. She wanted the character of the neighborhood to stay the same without increased density. She wondered how the City viewed “unrelated” when it came to foster children and the Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender, Questioning (LGBTQ) community. She felt that 816 Rhode Island should remain zoned RS5.
Ms. Kristin Morland, 737 Connecticut, expressed opposition to the rezoning. She said rezoning would not change East Lawrence and she did not feel it was fair. She felt there were other issues to spend time on and better ways to be productive, such as improving crumbling sidewalks and alley’s in East Lawrence.

Ms. Marci Francisco, 1101 Ohio, was in favor of the rezonings and felt properties should remain single-family.

Mr. Michael Almon, 1311 Prairie Ave, spoke in favor of the rezonings. He said the Brook Creek Neighborhood had been stabilized by RS7 zoning.

Ms. Pam Blackburn, 830 Connecticut, supported the rezonings. She said the goal was to keep the neighborhood as a family oriented neighborhood.

Mr. Jan Schaake, 800 New York, did not feel the rezoning was an appropriate category to best serve the neighborhood.

Mr. Timothy Morland, 737 Connecticut, was opposed to the rezonings.

Mr. Bob Johnson said owned the building on the south side of 8th Street and west side of Rhode Island. He wondered why those not wanting to be zoned couldn’t just opt out.

Ms. Phyllis Payne, 305 E 7th St, said her site would be excluded from rezoning because it had a commercial building. She supported the staff recommendation.

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Kelly asked staff to respond to public questions.

Mr. McCullough said staff evaluated the excluded requests. He said regarding the unrelated persons policy it would match the current policy and would not change how unrelated persons was defined in the Code.

Commissioner von Achen asked staff about the disadvantages with having property be non-conforming.

Ms. Pepper said the properties with a non-conforming use may not be able to rebuild that use if destroyed/damaged 60% beyond fair market value. She said obtaining a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals to remedy those non-conforming land use issues would supersede that and the property owner would be allowed to rebuild those land uses in the event it was destroyed.

Mr. McCullough said banks were looking at properties more carefully to make sure they were getting a legally permitted property. He said there were three ways to be non-conforming through lots, structures, and use. He said Accessory Dwelling Units were not allowed in RS5 zoning but that the few that existed would be registered as non-conforming. He said if damaged past 60% of their fair market value an Accessory Dwelling Unit could not be rebuilt.

Commissioner Culver asked if other options were considered such as overlays and guidelines.
Mr. McCullough said staff discussed with City Commission the zoning tool of Urban Conservation Overlay District. He said additional historic districts was a tool that could be used to preserve patterns and character of neighborhoods. He said downzoning to the existing use was a pretty powerful zoning tool. He said guidelines only spoke to the character and standards not the use.

Commissioner Kelly asked staff to respond to the written correspondence.

Mr. McCullough said Mr. Jim Slough challenged the notion that rezoning would reduce gentrification. He felt that rezoning would spur gentrification by the means that people would invest in larger homes and increase property values.

Commissioner von Achen asked according to the staff report there were 32 homes with licenses to rent out rooms.

Ms. Pepper said that was correct.

Commissioner von Achen asked about past instances of downzoning and the three year period.

Ms. Stogsdill gave two examples. She said in 2001 when the definition of family was changed from 4 unrelated to 3 unrelated for RS zoned properties. She said a few years later a portion of Old West Lawrence was rezoned from to RM to RS and the same three year period was offered to those properties.

Commissioner Kelly said residents like the uniqueness of East Lawrence and don’t want it turning into lots of multi-family spaces. He said the rezoning accurately reflected the neighborhood and seemed to be a good plan that listened to the community in preserving history.

Commissioner Britton said when pressure develops in the future for more multi-family there will be the opportunity to come back and revaluate. He felt the current proposal would set the area up to preserve the character.

Commissioner Struckhoff said the vitality of downtown depended on some density. He supported the preservation of the single-family nature of the neighborhood but also supported the preservation of the historic multi-family aspect as well. He was inclined to support the rezonings and felt it was a good starting point to plan for the future.

Commissioner Sands said he was in favor of the rezoning and did not see any of the Golden Factors being violated by this plan. He felt it would provide security to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Willey said she used to live at 837 Connecticut St and she loved the eclectic nature of the neighborhood. She felt the plan captured that character and she supported it. She said staff had been very responsive to individual owners and their vision for their property.

Commissioner Carpenter said the map represented what the neighborhood was. He said the neighborhood had struggled with pressures throughout history.

Commissioner Culver expressed concern about wholesale changes to an area and felt there was a lot of room for error. He said most issues had been addressed and mitigated on the front end but he felt it was difficult to downzone on a wholesale basis when it could take away rights from property owners.
owners. He said the occupancy limit could have a negative impact to an owner’s investment. He stated there was no perfect outcome for this but the positives outweighed the negative. He said he would support the staff recommendation.

Commissioner von Achen said high density residential was a good tool to prevent sprawl but that they need to be careful where they put it. She said this was a wonderful area of town and she wanted to be sure it stayed that way. She expressed concern about the occupancy being changed from 4 unrelated to 3 unrelated. She wondered if some people would not be able to afford to live in their house without 4 unrelated people living there. She said she would support the staff recommendation and generally liked what it would do. She felt more thought should be given to the occupancy rate and possibly providing a longer period of grace.

Commissioner Willey said there probably were not that many 4 bedroom houses in East Lawrence since many houses in the area were small. She said the market would be better at determining how many people live in a house.

Ms. Bonita Yoder, concerned about the impact of having two houses on one lot.

Mr. McCullough said lots with an Accessory Dwelling Unit being zoned to RS5 would create a legal non-conforming use. He said if it was destroyed past 60% of its fair market value then it could not be rebuilt.

**ACTION TAKEN on Item 10A**
Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Carpenter, to approve the request to rezone, Z-17-00098, 79 properties from RM24 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District to RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District and forward to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval based on the findings of fact found in the staff report.

   Unanimously approved 10-0.

**ACTION TAKEN on Item 10Bi**
Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Carpenter, to approve the request to rezone, Z-17-00099A, 21 properties from RM24 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District to RM12D (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District and forward to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval based on the findings of fact found in the staff report.

   Unanimously approved 10-0.

**ACTION TAKEN on Item 10Bii**
Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Carpenter, to approve the request to rezone, Z-17-00099B, 1 property from RM24 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District to RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District and forward to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval based on the findings of fact found in the staff report.

   Unanimously approved 10-0.
**ACTION TAKEN on Item 10C**
Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Carpenter, to approve the request to rezone, Z-17-00100, 10 properties from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential-Office) District to RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District and forward to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval based on the findings of fact found in the staff report.

Unanimously approved 10-0.

**ACTION TAKEN on Item 10D**
Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Carpenter, to approve the request to rezone, Z-17-00101, 2 properties from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential-Office) District to RM12D (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District and forward to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval based on the findings of fact found in the staff report.

Unanimously approved 10-0.

**ACTION TAKEN on Item 10E**
Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Carpenter, to approve the request to rezone, Z-17-00102, 627 Connecticut from RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential-Office) District to RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District and forward to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval based on the findings of fact found in the staff report.

Unanimously approved 10-0.

**ACTION TAKEN on Item 10F**
Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Weaver, to approve the request to rezone, Z-17-00103, 4 properties from CS (Strip Commercial) District to RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District and forward to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval based on the findings of fact found in the staff report.

Unanimously approved 10-0.

**ACTION TAKEN on Item 10G**
Motioned by Commissioner Sands, seconded by Commissioner Weaver, to approve the request to rezone, Z-17-00104, 738 Rhode Island from CS (Strip Commercial) District to RM12D (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District and forward to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval based on the findings of fact found in the staff report.

Unanimously approved 10-0.
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MISCELLANEOUS NEW OR OLD BUSINESS
Consideration of any other business to come before the Commission.

MISC NO. 1 STAFF MEMO REGARDING COKELEY ADDITION VARIANCE; SW CORNER OF W 31ST ST & OUSDAHL RD (MKM)

Receive Staff Memo regarding Minor Subdivision, MS-17-00071, variance request for W 31st Street, for Cokeley Addition, a one-lot subdivision on approximately 2.9 acres located in the southwest corner of the intersection of W 31st Street and Ousdahl Road. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, PA for Jayhawk Acquisition, LLC, property owner of record. Deferred by Planning Commission on 3/15/17.

STAFF PRESENTATION
Mr. McCullough said the variance issue that they saw last month was resolved.

ADJOURN 9:24pm
Planning Commission

Key Links

---

**Plans & Documents**

- Horizon 2020
- Sector/Area Plans
- Transportation 2040
- 2015 Retail Market Study

**Development Regulations**

- Community Design Manual
- County Zoning Regulations
- City Land Development Code
- Subdivision Regulations

**Online Mapping**

- City of Lawrence Interactive GIS Map
- Douglas County Property Viewer
- Submittals to the Planning Office

**Planning Commission**

- Bylaws
- Mid-Months & Special Meetings
- Minutes
- Planning Commission Schedule/Deadlines
The applicant has requested a revision to the conditions of approval and offers the following revised wording for Condition 3 (h).

**Proposed Revised Condition:**
"At the time of the final alignment of the trail, LMH and City of Lawrence Staff will discuss sharing in the cost and possible route through LMH property”.

Condition 3 (h) per Staff report:
Execution of an agreement to fund and construct shared-use path with phase 2 to install on-street parking spaces along Arkansas and Maine Streets.

Additionally, condition 3 (f) requires the plan to be revised to provide 123 bicycle parking spaces. The applicant has provided a revised plan, for staff review, that includes 86 total bicycle parking space. This represents 70% of the total required parking 1,222 spaces. Staff supports the proposed reduction so long as all spaces provided meet the APBP recommended rack design. Older racks will need to be replaced to meet these standards.

Other conditions have been addressed on the revised plan provided to staff. The revised conditions are reflected below.
Below are the conditions as the appear in the staff report with additional comment provided by staff based on drawings forwarded on May 19, 2017. Staff has not fully reviewed the revised plans. Conditions that have been met on the revised plan are noted in the summary below.

1. Approval of and publication of an ordinance to rezone 1.38 Acres from RS5 to H.
2. Prior to recording of the Institutional Development Plan with the Register of Deeds Office the applicant shall:
   a. Revise and resubmit a drainage study per city Stormwater Engineer’s approval.
   b. Provision of a stormwater pollution provision plan and a notice of intent approved by KDHE prior to construction site construction.
   c. Provide detailed plans for the construction of the parking lot and the installation of the pervious pavement per the approval of the City Stormwater Engineer.
   d. Submission of public improvement plans to the City for review and approval.

3. Prior to recording of the Institutional Development Plan with the Register of Deeds Office the applicant shall provide a revised site plan with the following notes and changes:
   a. Show 9 parking spaces located along Woody Park for clarification on the drawings. [Note shown on revised plan provided to staff dated 5/19/2017].
   b. Show sanitary sewer line extended to meet minimum City Code requirements for LMH property for 326 and 330 Michigan Street per the approval of the City Utility Engineer.
   c. Revise the landscape plan to include additional shrubs along the north and south property lines to screen the parking lot from adjacent residence. [Additional landscaping shown on revised plan provided to staff dated 5/19/2017]
   d. Revise landscape plan to include additional shrubs and ornamental trees along Michigan Street. [Additional landscaping shown on revised plan provided to staff dated 5/19/2017]
   e. Provision of a note that states Public Improvements Plan are required for review and approval for the following improvements: [Note shown on revised plan provided to staff dated 5/19/2017]
      i. Storm sewer
      ii. Sanitary sewer extension to 326 and 330 Michigan Street
      iii. Sidewalk improvements
      iv. Maine-Street Crosswalks.
   f. Provision of a revised plan to show the location of a minimum of 123 86 bicycle parking spaces, the distribution and type of bicycle parking spaces based on the APBP recommended rack design and number of bike parking at each bike parking location subject to staff approval.
   g. Provision of a revised plan to show a conceptual 10’ connection of a shared-use path from Sandra Shaw trail through Woody Park or around the Hospital Property to 2nd and Michigan with a note on the face of the site plan that the alignment may be modified by the pending MPO study. [Conceptual alignment shown on revised plan provided to staff dated 5/19/2017.]
   h. Execution of an agreement to fund and construct shared-use path with phase 2 to install on-street parking spaces along Arkansas and Maine Streets. Provision of a note on the face of the plan that states: “At the time of the final alignment of the trail, LMH and City of Lawrence Staff will discuss sharing in the cost and possible route through LMH property.”
ITEM NO. 1A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR LMH; W. 3rd & MICHIGAN ST (SLD)

SUP-17-00153: Consider a Special Use Permit/Institutional Development Plan for a new parking lot at Lawrence Memorial Hospital and a master plan for the Hospital uses, located at W. 3rd & Michigan St. Submitted by Landplan Engineering for LMH Board of Trustees and City of Lawrence, property owners of record.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Planning Staff recommends approval of Special Use Permit/Institutional Development Plan for Lawrence Memorial Hospital and related parking lot expansion and forwarding the request to the City Commission with a recommendation of approval, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of and publication of an ordinance to rezone 1.38 Acres from RS5 to H.
2. Prior to recording of the Institutional Development Plan with the Register of Deeds Office the applicant shall:
   a. Revise and resubmit a drainage study per city Stormwater Engineer’s approval
   b. Provision of a stormwater pollution provision plan and a notice of intent approved by KDHE prior to construction site construction.
   c. Provide detailed plans for the construction of the parking lot and the installation of the pervious pavement per the approval of the City Stormwater Engineer.
   d. Submission of public improvement plans to the City for review and approval.
3. Prior to recording of the Institutional Development Plan with the Register of Deeds Office the applicant shall provide a revised site plan with the following notes and changes:
   a. Show 9 parking spaces located along Woody Park for clarification on the drawings.
   b. Show sanitary sewer line extended to meet minimum City Code requirements for 326 and 330 Michigan Street per the approval of the City Utility Engineer.
   c. Revise the landscape plan to include additional shrubs along the north and south property lines to screen the parking lot from adjacent residence.
   d. Revise landscape plan to include additional shrubs and ornamental trees along Michigan Street.
   e. Provision of a note that states Public Improvements Plan are required for review and approval for the following improvements:
      i. Storm sewer
      ii. Sanitary sewer extension to 326 and 330 Michigan Street
      iii. Sidewalk improvements
      iv. Maine Street Crosswalks.
   f. Provision of a revised plan to show the location of a minimum of 123 bicycle parking spaces, the distribution and type of bicycle parking spaces (based on the APBP recommended rack design) and number of bike parking at each bike parking location subject to staff approval.
   g. Provision of a revised plan to show a conceptual 10’ connection of a shared-use path from Sandra Shaw trail through Woody Park or around the Hospital Property to 2nd and Michigan with a note on the face of the site plan that the alignment may be modified by the pending MPO study.
   h. Execution of an agreement to fund and construct shared-use path with phase 2 to install on-street parking spaces along Arkansas and Maine Streets.
**Associated Cases**
- Z-17-00158; RS5 to H (concurrent application with this SUP).
- See attached document for complete list.
- MS-17-00213; Minor Subdivision to combine lots along Michigan Street into the Hospital property related to the parking lot expansion.
- Maine Street Properties
  - 302 Maine: SP-14-00144; Parking Lot Addition
  - 316 Maine: SP-3-12-78; Medical Office Building
  - 320 Maine: SP-16-8-70; Dental Office Building

**Other Action Required**
- City Commission approval of rezoning and adoption of ordinance.
- Publication of rezoning ordinance.
- Approval of the Minor Subdivision and acceptance of the easements by the City Commission.
- Submission and approval of related public improvement plans for the parking lot addition.
  - PIP – Stormwater
  - PIP – Sidewalk
  - PIP – Sanitary Sewer extension
  - PIP – Maine Street Crosswalks
- Recording the Institutional Development Plan with the Register of Deeds Office.

---

**KEY POINTS**
- This project serves a dual purpose of being a master plan for the Hospital and a site plan for the parking lot expansion along Michigan Street.
- Main campus is not substantially altered by this application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED PRIOR TO PRINTING**
- Letter from Dennis “Boog” Highberger.

**ATTACHMENTS**
1. Area Map
2. Development Summary
3. Associated Projects List
4. Site Plan
5. Lawrence Loop Map

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

**Current Zoning and Land Use:**
RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District; H (Hospital) District and GPI (General Public and Institutional) District. Existing detached residences located along the east side of Michigan Street and Lawrence Memorial Hospital main campus. The GPI zoned property is the former location of the ambulance service. The building is now used for hospital storage.

**Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To the north</td>
<td>RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District, existing detached dwellings north of W. 3rd Street; RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District and IG (General Industrial) District, existing Mobile Village mobile home park north of W. 2nd Street extended; OS (Open Space) District, existing Woody Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the east</td>
<td>GPI (General Public and Institutional) District. Existing USD 497 maintenance building and Community Health Facility. RSO (Single-Dwelling Residential – Office) District. Medical Office uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Along the east side of Maine Street.
To the south
RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District; two residential homes along the east side of Michigan Street.

Along south side of W. 4th
RM12 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District; two tri-plex residences.
RMO (Multi-Dwelling – Office) District; Medical Office building.
RM5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District; detached residential uses.

To the west
Along the west side of Michigan Street.
RM12 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District; detached residence.
RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District; detached residences.

Staff Summary
The H (Hospital) District is a "Special Purpose District" intended to accommodate a hospital and accessory and related uses under common control and planning. This district is subject to a requirement to the provision of an "Institutional Development Plan" for all property contained in the district. The current district includes all of Lots 1 (Woody Park) and 2, Final Plat of Lawrence Memorial Hospital Addition. An application for a Minor Subdivision (Lawrence Memorial Hospital No. 2) has been submitted that will combine the existing hospital lot with the lots along Michigan Street if approved. This project also includes lots located along Maine Street that are being incorporated into the Master Plan but are not being replatted.

The purpose of an Institutional Development Plan is to provide a community vision for the long-term use and development of public institutional space and lands so that they are designed to be compatible with surrounding land uses and contribute to the neighborhood and character of the area in which they are located. (20-1307). Sites that includes more than 10 acres are processed following the same procedures as a “Special Use Permit.” A final step in the process is for the Institutional Development Plan to be recorded with the Register of Deeds Office.

The boundary of the plan includes all of the existing property zoned H (Hospital) District, adjacent public streets, area along Michigan Street proposed to be rezoned H District, and lots along the east side of Maine Street. The Maine Street properties are not currently zoned H. They however are being incorporated in the Hospital operations. The intent of the use of the properties on Maine Street is the relocation of certain Hospital administrative activities (staff) to the existing office buildings thereby freeing up space in the existing main Hospital facility and parking for other staff, patients and visitors.

The other purpose of this application is the expansion of a surface parking lot along Michigan Street (related rezoning application from RS5 to H). Prior to the expanded parking lot project the master plan for the Hospital must be updated.

Previous master plans for the Hospital have been approved including:
• UPR-6-7-93; LMH Master Plan
• UPR-4-4-06; Hospital Master Plan

This application assumes approval of the related rezoning request for 1.38 acres from RS5 to H (Z-17-00158).

Applicant’s Reason for Request: The Lawrence Memorial Hospital is short on parking during the normal business day. They have purchased more property and providing more parking for the employees and closer parking for the patients with this addition.
Review and Decision-Making Criteria (Land Development Code Section 20-1306(i))

This institutional development plan includes two specific elements; one, the overall master plan and two, the expanded parking lot along Michigan Street. The following findings include staff responses to both elements of the project.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant’s Response:</th>
<th>Yes. This proposed use and development will provide a buffer area between the hospital use and the existing single family residential.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master Plan:</strong> The project as submitted provides an accurate representation of the existing improvements and related hospital, medical office, and parking conditions of the facility. Section 20-1307 specifically requires that an Institutional Development Plan address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Access, planned for entire site with at least two points of access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Public sidewalks, provided along all street frontages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Bicycle lanes and recreation paths be planned and provided as part of the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Sports fields and large traffic generation activities be located away from RS zoned areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Exterior lighting may be prohibited between 10:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Parking facilities, designed to be shared among uses and incorporated with environmentally sensitive lands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Bus stops shall be included in the planning and development of a site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Lot Site Design:</strong> The proposed parking lot has been designed with the minimum setbacks from the public right-of-way and from the residential property (along the south property line) in compliance with the minimum standards for the District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parking lot proposes permeable pavers for the parking stalls with standard pavement for the access aisles. The conceptual use of the permeable pavement is acceptable to staff for this application. A detailed plan for the parking lot, installation and drainage support structures for the parking lot must be reviewed and approved by the City Stormwater Engineer. This requirement is reflected as a condition of approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed parking lot includes standard stalls and access aisle widths. The parking lot is designed as an expansion of the existing parking area to the east and will have one way circulation within the interior of the parking lot. There are no accessible parking spaces proposed within this parking lot area. All accessible spaces are located near existing building entrances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Finding** – This use complies with the applicable provisions of the Development Code.

2. WHETHER THE PROPOSED USE IS COMPATIBLE WITH ADJACENT USES IN TERMS OF SCALE, SITE DESIGN, AND OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS, INCLUDING HOURS OF OPERATION, TRAFFIC GENERATION, LIGHTING, NOISE, ODOR, DUST AND OTHER EXTERNAL IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant’s Response:</th>
<th>Yes. This proposed use in terms of scale and site design fit in the corner lot. The amount of green space that surround the proposed use help buffer the light and notice that could be generated by this use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master Plan:</strong> This finding is applicable to site design. The properties included in the master plan for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking lot Design:</strong> The proposed parking lot is an extension of the existing parking lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hospital includes all properties that include the Hospital and the accessory office buildings and proposed parking lot area that support the Hospital use.

Within the Pinckney Neighborhood there are several medical-office or medical related buildings. They may have affiliation with the Hospital but are not part of the main Hospital campus and are subject only to site planning. The properties that are included in this update include lots along Michigan Street for the proposed expanded parking lot as well as lots located along the east side of Maine Street that provide off-street parking and office space for Hospital related uses. The lots located on the east side of Maine Street are not currently zoned H (Hospital) District but are part of the campus.

The Community Health Building, located at 200 Maine Street, is a separate project and was developed and zoned before an Institutional Development Plan was required. Properties in the immediate area with GPI (General Public and Institutional) District zoning are subject to the same review process as the Hospital with regard to future improvements.

Located immediately to the east. The project includes a cross connection with the existing parking lot to allow free vehicular movement between the existing and new parking lot. Pedestrian sidewalks are extended through the new parking lot with connections to existing sidewalks throughout the site.

Other than providing parking there is no “use” associated with this parking lot. There are no inherent conflicts with the remaining residential uses to the north or west of the proposed parking lot with regard to operational characteristics. This parking lot will be lit and that will be a change for the residents in the immediate area. The proposed lighting complies with the minimum design standards.

**Staff Finding —** The proposed use is compatible with the adjacent uses in terms of size, massing, orientation, hours of operation and other external impacts as it relates to functions of the Hospital.
3. WHETHER THE PROPOSED USE WILL CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL DIMINUITION IN VALUE OF OTHER PROPERTY IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD IN WHICH IT IS TO BE LOCATED

| Applicant’s Response: | No this lot will not change the surrounding property value of residential uses. This development will provide a useful service to the surrounding community. |

| Master Plan:          | The purpose of the master plan is to provide a vision for the "long term use and development" to ensure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. "Providing this community vision for institutional buildings and sites also allows adjacent and nearby property owners to anticipate future non-residential development patterns and plan for the use and enjoyment of their property accordingly." |

| Parking lot Design:   | The proposed expanded parking lot will be integrated with the existing parking lot with both vehicular and pedestrian connections. The parking lot will not "generate" traffic. It is expected that the parking lot will be most utilized during business hours and shift changes since it is removed from the main entrance of the building. |

| This plan updates the boundary of the LMH campus and includes all existing development, the proposed Michigan Street parking lot expansion and the existing parking lot and office buildings located along the east side of Maine Street that are part of the Hospital operations. | As noted above the parking lot is being designed with a pedestrian connection that will extend the full length of the block face. This will provide visual continuity for the remaining residences along the east block face with the residential uses to the west. |
A future phase of the plan includes reconfigured angled on-street parking along Arkansas Street and Maine Street. Parallel On-Street parking is currently allowed. This parking arrangement may provide additional parking for the residential uses in the area.

The expanded master plan boundary along Maine Street includes existing office buildings and parking areas. Maine Street between W. 4th Street and W. 2nd Street is developed with non-residential uses. There is no impact on the surrounding properties from this change. The expanded parking lot along Michigan Street excludes two houses that will be surrounded by a parking lot. These two residences are currently adjacent to a parking lot to the south and east. They will be isolated along the east face of the 300 block of Michigan Street. However, this project includes the extension of a public sidewalk from W. 3rd Street south to connect to the existing sidewalk at the south end of the block. This will provide some connectivity to the remaining residences to the remaining residential uses to the west. The sidewalk provides direct connection to the corner crossing at 4th Street and Michigan Street.

**Staff Finding** – Substantial diminution of other property values in the area is not anticipated along Maine Street. The two remaining residences along the east side of Michigan Street may be impacted by being surrounded by a parking lot. The proposed parking lot design and landscaping will mitigate the impact of the change of use on the remaining residences.

4. **WHETHER PUBLIC SAFETY, TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES WILL BE AVAILABLE TO SERVE THE SUBJECT PROPERTY WHILE MAINTAINING SUFFICIENT LEVELS OF SERVICE FOR EXISTING DEVELOPMENT**

*Master Plan:* Within the context of the Master Plan two elements require public improvement plans. The proposed parking lot expansion will require public improvement plans related to work within the right-of-way. The future on-street angled parking will require public improvement plans.

The parking lot expansion will require the demolition of the existing residential structures and the relocation of existing utilities that must be coordinated with the utility providers. The applicant has been

*Parking lot Design:* Utility services are generally not required for surface parking lots other than electric service. Residential service lines that exist on site will be properly abandoned as the demolition process.
advised of these requirements. The cost of relocation of existing utilities is the responsibility of the developer. This includes gas, electric and phone services.

Adjustments and extension of sanitary sewer infrastructure is required to maintain service to the remaining residences, located along Michigan Street, not included in this development application.

**Staff Finding** – Adequate public facilities and transportation access is accommodated for this development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. WHETHER ADEQUATE ASSURANCES OF CONTINUING MAINTENANCE HAVE BEEN PROVIDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master Plan:</strong> If approved the Institutional Development Plan will be recorded with the Register of Deeds office as a public record of the improvements for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking lot Design:</strong> The proposed application provides an enforceable tool to address the use and continued maintenance of the expanded parking lot with regard to landscaping, exterior activity, and parking lot design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phases that include on street parking are subject to the submission and approval of public improvement plans prior to work within the right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate assurances of continued maintenance are inherent in the use and the Special Use Permit/Institutional Development Plan approval process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. WHETHER THE USE WILL CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant’s Response:</strong> <em>There will be no impacts to the natural environment.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master Plan:</strong> The properties included in the Master Plan are not located within the regulatory floodplain. With the exception of Woody Park, the properties are developed as part of an existing urban neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking lot Design:</strong> The land area included in the parking lot expansion part of the application request is not located within the regulatory floodplain. The lots are part of the developed urban fabric of the neighborhood. There are no natural environmental elements that are impacted by this proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Finding</strong> – This property is free from regulatory floodplain encumbrances. The project includes the use of permeable pavement to mitigate stormwater runoff that will result from the increase in pavement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. WHETHER IT IS APPROPRIATE TO PLACE A TIME LIMIT ON THE PERIOD OF TIME THE PROPOSED USE IS TO BE ALLOWED BY SPECIAL USE PERMIT AND, IF SO, WHAT THAT TIME PERIOD SHOULD BE

Master Plan: The Hospital use requires updates to the Institutional Development Plan for major development project. The function of the plan is to provide the community long term vision of development. By design the project requires public notice and input.

The project does include a phasing plan of sorts with the first phase of the project being the immediately proposed parking lot expansion along Michigan Street. Future improvements include on-street parking as shown on the plan that is subject to the submission and approval of Public Improvement Plans before construction in the right-of-way can proceed. There is no timeline for this improvement. Additional on-street parking shown along Arkansas Street and Maine Street will only be considered if there is still a need for parking for the hospital facility in the future.

It is not necessary to place any time limitation on the application.

Parking lot Design: The proposed parking lot expansion is for a static use. Unlike office and retail buildings where uses can change over time or intensity based on specific uses/tenants. The parking lot expansion will serve the hospital and affiliated uses located at 325 Maine Street. It is not necessary to place any time limitation on the application.

Staff Finding – Staff does not recommend a time limit on this application.

STAFF REVIEW
This Special Use Permit/Institutional Development Plan includes two elements; a master plan for properties controlled by Lawrence Memorial Hospital and a site plan for a parking lot expansion along Michigan Street. The following site summary and parking are provided for the entire Hospital Development. The site review Sections C-F addresses the proposed parking lot expansion.

A. Site Summary – Master Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Building: (SF)</th>
<th>Impervious Cover: (SF)</th>
<th>Pervious Cover: (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woody Park 201 Maine St.</td>
<td>2.47 AC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2, Block 1 LMH Addition + Michigan Street lots</td>
<td>20.79 AC</td>
<td>212,267</td>
<td>204,033</td>
<td>686,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 Maine St.</td>
<td>8,152 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 Maine St.</td>
<td>12,531 SF</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>9,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Maine St.</td>
<td>9,343 SF</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>6,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Access and Parking
Vehicular access to the Hospital Campus is provided from a variety of public and private street access driveways. Arkansas and Maine Street are the primary streets with direct access to the facility. The proposed parking lot expansion will front along Michigan Street but access from Michigan Street is not proposed. The new parking lot will have access from W. 3rd Street and from within the existing parking lot.

An additional driveway access is proposed from “Vacated Arkansas Street” as shown on the plan. No other access driveways are proposed. The driveway along the north side of the Hospital located between Arkansas Street and Maine Street is an active neighborhood throughway in addition to the public street network surrounding the hospital. The plan shows a new sidewalk located on the north side of the interior access way.

Non-Motorized Access/Connectivity
Public sidewalks are discussed in the body of the staff report as it relates to the expanded parking lot in the next section. During the review of this project staff noted that the Hospital property is located along the route for the Lawrence Loop. North of the Hospital property is the Sandra Shaw Trail (Outside for a Better Inside Trail). The trail currently terminates at the end of Maine Street. The MPO is in the process of conducting an alignment study for the Lawrence Loop ending at Sandra Shaw to Peterson Road. A 10’ Shared Use Path connection will likely need to cross the Hospital property, Woody Park or another alignment in the immediate area. The Plan shows a 6’ wide sidewalk along the north side of the access driveway on the south edge of Woody Park. The width and design of the sidewalk would not meet the requirement for the 10’ shared use path. The plan further notes this sidewalk as a “possible future” improvement.
Figure 3: Lawrence Loop

Connection of a shared-use path from Sandra Shaw trail through Woody Park or around the Hospital Property to 2nd and Michigan should be noted on plan. An agreement to fund and construct shared-use path adjacent to LMH should be included with proceeding with phase 2 to install the on-street parking spaces.

**Vehicular Parking:**
The following summary is provided for the Hospital and expanded office properties that are located on Maine Street. Off Street parking for a Hospital is based on the number of beds. However, Lawrence Memorial includes multiple operations including medical office uses that generate traffic outside of exclusively a hospital. Support uses such as pharmacy, laboratory and cafeteria uses are provided as well and are typically included as part of a hospital use.

**Table 1: Parking Summary Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Parking Requirements</th>
<th>Spaces Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Woody Park - 201 Maine Street Active Recreation – 1 youth play field. | Schedule D (site and use specific)  
5 or 1 bike space per 10 vehicle spaces whichever is greater | 9 spaces In ROW  
5 bike spaces recommended. |
| 302 Maine St. - SP-14-00144 Accessory Parking Lot LMH       | 1 space per 3 players + 1 space per coach.  
24 players/2 coaches = 10 spaces | 18 spaces  
2 bike spaces recommended. |
| 316 Maine St. - Office                                      | 3,216 SF = 11 spaces  
Per SP-3-12-78 = 19 spaces | 106 bike spaces recommended dispersed around entrances |
| 320 Maine St. - Office                                      | 1,254 SF = 4 spaces  
1,264 SF = 4 spaces | 17 spaces |
| Lot 2, Block 1 LMH Addition + Michigan Street lots - Hospital | 177 beds = 59 spaces | 106 bike spaces recommended dispersed around entrances |
| Emergency Room                                              | 24 beds = 8 spaces | 8 bike spaces recommended. |
| Out Patient (Medical Office)                                | 22,229 NSF = 75 spaces | 8 bike spaces recommended. |
The information provided by the applicant is intended to more accurately reflect parking demand for the hospital use and other medical related uses directly associated with this facility type. For example, a pharmacy (stand-alone drugstore) would be considered a Personal Convenience use per the Development Code and would require parking at a rate of 1 space per 300 SF. The parking reflects the commercial nature of the use with a smaller staff and high short term customer turnover. In this application a pharmacy while not providing customer service, employees account for a larger number of parking demand duration of the shift. This methodology is also applied to the laboratory use (Medical Office) and the maintenance staff needed to support the Hospital Use.

The applicant has used the Fast Order Food off-street parking standard for calculating the parking requirement for the Cafeteria. Within the neighborhood the cafeteria (Fast Order Food) use can be considered as an Eating and Drinking establishment. There is anecdotal evidence that the cafeteria is sometimes used separate from hospital services or in conjunction with services at an outpatient office within the facility.

There are multiple parking lots located throughout the Hospital campus. Some areas are for patient parking and some are restricted for staff. The Hospital also provides a valet service. Valet parking is not counted separately within this summary. The Valet parking is an operational activity offered to patients/visitors to the facility from the Arkansas Street building entrance.

**On-Street Parking**

A portion of Arkansas Street between W. 3rd Street and W. 4th Street was previously vacated. Angled parking was added. This project does not propose the vacation of any existing right-of-way surrounding the Hospital. On-street parking exists as parallel parking. The master plan shows future on-street parking with angled parking along Maine Street and reverse angled parking on Arkansas Street. This parking would require the submission and approval of public improvement plans.

The on-street parking along Arkansas Street north of W. 3rd Street and Maine Street north of W. 4th Street is proposed as a future improvement.

**Bicycle Parking**

Bicycle parking is required for this use. A Hospital requires parking at 5 spaces or 1 space per 10 vehicular spaces whichever is greater. This plan proposes 1,222 parking spaces (1,022 existing spaces). The minimum number of bicycle parking for this use is 123 spaces. The plan does not identify the location of bicycle parking anywhere on site. Staff recommends that bicycle parking be provided and distributed through the site and at the various locations and entrances around the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory</th>
<th>1/ 1.5 employees on largest shift</th>
<th>40 employees = 27 spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>17 employees = 12 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>20 employees = 14 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>1/ 100 SF customer service area + 1/ employees 5 or 1 bike space per 10 vehicle spaces whichever is greater</td>
<td>3,750 (38 spaces) + 22 employees= 60 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arkansas St. 23 parallel spaces – Existing 39 spaces
Maine St. 28 parallel spaces - Existing 34 spaces

Parking Provided Total: 1,222 Spaces [55 accessible spaces inclusive] [2 RV spaces] [82 on-street spaces inclusive]
campus. The parking summary above includes specific recommendations for bicycle parking throughout the development and at specific locations.

C. Design Standards
This section of the staff review focuses on the proposed parking lot expansion project located along Michigan Street.

**Site Design:** The proposed parking lot expansion is located on the southeast corner of Michigan Street and W. 3rd Street. The project assumes the approval of a concurrent rezoning request for 6 residential lots that would be demolished to facilitate the construction of the added spaces. Additionally, the existing parking lot to the east would be slightly modified to provide connection between the two areas.

Approximately 10-12 existing parking spaces will be removed in the existing parking lot to provide access aisle connections between the two lots and to Arkansas Street. The expanded lot is design with a one-way circulation and with pervious pavement that will reduce the impact of stormwater runoff from the added parking area. The proposed one-way circulation complies with the site design standards. The proposed pervious pavement is conceptually acceptable to the City Stormwater Engineer. Proper installation of the system is however required, a condition of approval is that the applicant provide engineering/construction details for the installation of the pervious pavement for review and approval by the City Stormwater engineer prior to the recording of the Special Use Permit/Institutional Development Plan with the Register of Deeds Office. There is no building permit required for the parking lot.

**Pedestrian accessibility:**
The proposed parking lot expansion includes the extension of public sidewalk along W. 3rd Street and the length of Michigan Street including the two residences that will remain. The project includes an interior pedestrian connection through the proposed and existing parking lot shown in figure 7.
The plan shows a new sidewalk along the north side of the access drive in the north portion of the development shown in figure 8. The plan notes states “Possible Future 6’ wide concerned sidewalk.” The project does not commit to the construction. The existing access drive is 25’ wide. The sidewalk would be located back of curb with no separation. The access drive is not a public street but is used for cut-through traffic and is blocked when the heliport is in use.

![Figure 6: New Sidewalk and Pedestrian connection shown in yellow.](image1)

![Figure 7: Future Sidewalk along north access drive.](image2)

D. Landscaping and Screening

**Street Trees:** Street trees are required along Michigan Street and W. 3rd Street. The plan shows the required minimum number of street trees along both public streets. The property is being replatted and will include a master street tree plan. The two street trees on W. 3rd Street are large mature ash with grade changes from the last parking lot construction. They are on the right-of-way and in poor condition. The city will schedule the removal of these trees over the summer as part of this project.

**Bufferyard:** A Type 3 Bufferyard is required along the H district that abuts an RS district. This standard applies to the parking lot expansion along the north and south sides of the project and along Michigan Street. The plan shows a 15’ buffer yard with dense landscaping along the south side of the expanded parking lot. This section of the parking lot immediately abuts an existing residence. The plan shows an appropriate number of trees and shrubs along this buffer. A narrower buffer yard also requires a fence, wall or berm. The plan does not show the use of a fence, wall or berm in this location. The site will be filled to raise the level of the parking lot to better match and tie into the existing parking lot. Staff recommends the applicant add additional vegetation to increase the screening of the parking lot from the residence rather than install a fence or wall.

The residential district is separated from the Hospital district by Michigan Street along the west property line and W. 3rd Street along the north property line. In addition to being buffer yards they
are also subject to perimeter landscape standards. The parking lot is setback 15’ from the property line consistent with the minimum Type 3 Buffer yard standard.

W. 3rd Street requires: 4 street trees for 125’ of frontage; 2 trees for perimeter landscaping; 8 trees as a Type 3 Buffer Yard. These numbers are not cumulative. Street trees may be counted toward the required perimeter and buffer yard requirements. This street segment also includes a new driveway that restricts area available for planting. Landscape along W. 3rd Street is layered with three street trees shown along the right-of-way and 4 trees located within the north section of the parking lot. In addition to trees, a buffer yard must be planted with shrubs. Along W. 3rd Street 19 shrubs are required. The plan shows only 5 shrubs. The minimum width of the buffer yard also should include a fence, wall or berm. None is proposed with this application. Additional landscape is recommended to offset the requirement.

![Figure 8: Recommended landscape along north and south property lines](image)

**Interior Landscaping:** The project includes interior landscape islands that exceed the minimum required amount of area. Landscape islands provide vehicular direction and provide an opportunity to create pedestrian connection from the public street to the parking lot along Arkansas Street. The plan shows the islands screened with a mixture of trees and shrubs.

**Perimeter Landscaping:** The north and west sides of the parking lot abut public streets and are subject to perimeter landscaping standards this includes trees as well as some form of continuous screening of parking lots. Both frontages are also subject to buffer yard standards discussed above. The plan shows continuous screening along parking spaces that abut/face the public right-of-way.

The plan shows 232’ of parking along Michigan Street at one tree per 25’, 9 trees would be required. A total of 8 trees are required along Michigan Street to meet this standard. Additionally, a Type 3 Buffer yard, 15’ wide, as proposed along Michigan Street requires 13 trees and 47 shrubs. The plan complies with the minimum street trees standard and the perimeter parking lot standard but does not comply with the buffer yard standard. Staff recommends the addition of ornamental trees and additional shrubs along Michigan Street.
Mechanical Equipment Screening: The expanded parking lot does not include any mechanical equipment that is subject to screening.

E. Lighting
The applicant has submitted a photometric plan for the area that includes the new parking lot. Other phases of the development previously approved included a separate review of off-street parking lot lighting.

Spillover lighting adjacent to residential may not exceed .02 foot candles at the residential lot line. Lighting spillover into public right-of-way may not exceed 3 foot candles. The proposed project complies with these design standards.

The project includes three new 20’ light poles. The proposed fixture must be directed down. This will be confirmed with the building permit and site inspection prior to final approval.

F. Floodplain
The property that is the subject of this development (parking lot expansion) is not located in the regulatory floodplain. A local Floodplain Development Permit is not required for this project.

G. Utilities
As noted several elements included in the project require public improvement plans. Plans related to the parking lot expansion project are required immediately. This includes the extension of the sanitary sewer to 326 and 330 Michigan Street. The City is exploring options with the applicant regarding the sanitary sewer extension and financing. The property at 326 Michigan Street is part of the housing inventory managed by the Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority. The property at 330 Michigan Street is owned privately.

The applicant has also indicated a desire for establishing crosswalks along Maine Street. A public improvement plan is also needed for this improvement. The applicant has been advised of this requirement.

Public Improvement Plans related to the future on-street parking may be deferred.

Staff recommends that a note be added to the face of the site plan that lists the improvements subject to public improvement plan review and approval.
CONCLUSION
This staff report was required to address two specific development actions; one, review of a Hospital Master Plan that impacts the surrounding neighborhood and two, provide a site plan review of a parking lot expansion.

The immediate phase of development is the parking lot expansion along Michigan Street. A future phase includes reconstructed on-street angled parking along Arkansas Street and Maine Street. Specific public improvement plans are needed to accommodate the expanded parking lot as noted by the City Engineer in review comments to the applicant. Because the parking expansion does not include two remaining residences along the east side of Michigan Street sanitary sewer and other utilities are affected. The applicant is responsible for relocating the private utilities impacted by the project (gas, electric, phone, etc.). The applicant is working with City staff to address the extension of the sanitary sewer to the two remaining structures, one of which is part of the City inventory.

Pertaining to the Master Plan elements of the project two factors will need further evaluation. The completion of the Lawrence Loop from the termination of the Sandra Shaw Trail to Peterson Road is an immediate concern. The City has engaged engineering services to begin the process to identify a specific alignment. The terminating point is just north of the Hospital property. The City/Hospital is the largest landowner in the immediate area. Staff recommends the Hospital participate fully in developing and identifying an appropriate alignment and participate in the construction of the facility as a future improvement.

The other feature of the Master Plan is to provide assurance and predictability for the surrounding neighborhood. Incremental expansion of the Hospital is not recommended. Coordination of facility planning and improvements in the immediate area for related uses including the Community Health Building, Bert Nash and the Hospital are necessary to maintain the Character and unique features of the Neighborhood and protection of residential components of the neighborhood.
Table 1: Institutional Development Plan Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 Block 1 LMH Addition</td>
<td>Woody Park</td>
<td>2.470 AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 Maine Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2, Block 1 LMH Addition</td>
<td>LMH Main Campus</td>
<td>19.900 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 Maine Street</td>
<td>Garage/Ambulance Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 Maine Street</td>
<td>Emergency Room entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 Arkansas Street</td>
<td>Main Hospital Entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130 W. 4th Street</td>
<td>Group Home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 – 322 Michigan Street</td>
<td>Existing residences proposed as new parking lot</td>
<td>.901 Acres (39,253 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 Maine Street</td>
<td>Parking Lot -24 stalls [SP-14-00144]</td>
<td>.187 Acres (8,152 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 Maine Street</td>
<td>Office Building [SP-3-12-78]</td>
<td>.287 Acres (12,531 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Maine Street</td>
<td>Office Building</td>
<td>.214 Acres (9,343 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Street Lots</td>
<td>Future parking lot expansion</td>
<td>.892 Acres (38,866 SF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOSPITAL PROPERTY
201 Maine; Lot 1, Block 1, Lawrence Memorial Hospital Addition (2.470 Acres)

325 Maine; Lot 2, Block 1, Lawrence Memorial Hospital Addition (19.900 Acres)
- SP-2-2-71; Medical Office Building – [Incorporated into LMH Complex]
- SP-6-11-71; Maintenance Shop – 816 Maine Street
- UPR-8-4-74; ?????????????
- SP-5-13-75; Hospital
- SP-3-7-79; 1956 Hospital Wing Improvements
- UPR-1-1-81; Shelter house; 1120 W. 4th Street
- SP-5-31-85; Hospital Addition
- UPR-8-9-85; Satellite Receiver addition to LMH
- SP-11-97-89; Parking Lot Addition – west end of Woody Park
- SP-4-27-92; Parking lot addition
- UPR-6-7-93; LMH Master Plan
- SP-7-35-93; Parking lot Addition.
- SP-9-54-93; Hospital West Addition
- SP-2-12-94; West Wing Addition
- SP-5-30-95; Helistop
- SP-4-29-98; MRI Facility addition – Bad Link
- SP-8-51-01;
- UPR-7-06-02; Parking Lot Expansion
- SP-11-88-05; Storage Building Addition
- UPR-4-4-06; Hospital Master Plan
- SP-3-23-06; parking lot improvements
- SP-9-75-06; building and parking lot expansion
- SP-12-94-06; parking lot expansion
  - B-4-13-06; Parking reduction from 25’ to 15’ along Arkansas Street and 25’ front yard setback reduction.
- SP-12-95-06; parking lot expansion
- SP-6-41-07; Surgical Addition, 21,926 SF/15,348 NSF
- SP-1-5-08; Helipad temporary location
- SP-5-30-11; Temporary Kitchen location
- SP-5-36-12; Parking Modification
- SP-13-00335; Parking Lot Changes
- SP-15-00315; Oncology Parking Lot Changes

MAINE STREET PROPERTIES
- 302 Maine: SP-14-00144; Parking Lot Addition
- 316 Maine: SP-3-12-78; Medical Office Building
- 320 Maine: SP-16-8-70; Dental Office Building
A Landscape Plan for
LAWRENCE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL
Lawrence, Kansas

Plant Schedule
SUP-17-00153: Special Use Permit/Institutional Development Plan for a new parking lot at Lawrence Memorial Hospital and a master plan for the Hospital Uses, located at 3rd and Michigan St
Dear Members of the Lawrence Memorial Hospital Board,

I was recently disappointed to learn that Lawrence Memorial Hospital (LMH) is considering demolishing more housing units near the hospital in order to construct parking lots. I am writing to respectfully request that you reconsider this plan.

Lawrence already faces a serious shortage of affordable housing, and this project would contribute to that problem. Parking lots make poor neighbors, and increased surface parking will have a negative effect on the remaining housing units near the hospital. I understand that structured parking is expensive, but the University of Kansas and the City of Lawrence (which has a smaller annual budget than LMH) have figured out how to make it work, and I think that LMH can, too.

I understand that many factors must be considered in making a decision like this one, and if there is information that I am overlooking that affect this decision, I would appreciate it if you could share that with me. Thank you for your consideration, and thank you for your service.

Sincerely,

Rep. Dennis “Boog” Highberger

cc: Russell W. Johnson, CEO, Lawrence Memorial Hospital
    Leslie Soden, Mayor
    Stuart Boley, Vice-Mayor
    Mike Amyx, City Commissioner
    Matthew Herbert, City Commissioner
    Lisa Larsen, City Commissioner
    Tom Markus, City Manager

ec: Members of the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission
May 22, 2017
Via e-mail

Dear Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission & City Commission Members:

Members of Pinckney Neighborhood Association would like to comment on the expansion of Lawrence Memorial Hospital (LMH) parking on the block of 4th and Michigan Streets.

We have greatly appreciated the willingness of LMH to be forthcoming with their plans. They have attended several meetings this year and participated in vigorous Q&A sessions. LMH listened to our concerns about residential parking, acknowledged the need for additional parking, and presented several viable solutions to our association.

Pinckney would like to make sure that the parking lot expansion preserves a significant amount of the green space and that adequate drainage is provided. Also, in our last neighborhood meeting, concerns were raised about the lack of affordable housing in Lawrence and the potential negative impact of losing those properties in our neighborhood. We are aware that it is not the hospital's responsibility, but we would like to find a common solution with the city to replace the affordable housing that has been diminished by this plan.

Additionally, we strongly request that the City and LMH collaborate with businesses and organizations such as Bert Nash to find a viable long-term solution to address all parking concerns along and near the Maine Street business corridor in the Pinckney neighborhood.

We understand that there is a delicate balancing act to provide adequate parking while maintaining the neighborhood's integrity. Our hope is that LMH will continue to be a partner in projects that might affect our neighborhood going forward.
Sincerely yours,

Bart Littlejohn
President, PNA

cc: Lawrence Memorial Hospital [Russ Johnson and/or Janice Early]
May 19, 2017

Dear Members of the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission:

At your meeting on May 24 you will be considering the application from Lawrence Memorial Hospital for expansion of parking on property we own on the eastern side of Michigan adjacent to our existing lots. I wanted to offer important points for your consideration as you determine what is best for the community. Thank you in advance for your commitment to Lawrence and your support of LMH over the years.

- LMH is currently facing parking challenges with staff and customers parking on side streets and adjacent areas around the campus. We need to address this immediate need.
- LMH recently completed a strategic plan that recognizes the shift of services from inpatient care towards outpatient services. Among the implications this has for us is the need to move some outpatient programs in the future. We have already begun this planning.
- As we look to make outpatient/ambulatory services more accessible and convenient, moving some services from the hospital campus to other locations, we will reduce our parking needs.
- Healthcare, demographic, and market data tell us that the LMH campus is right-sized for inpatient care for many years. Our ambulatory services, at our other existing and new locations, will also serve the community well into the future.
- We have 111,000² of medical office space on campus which is completely occupied. We do not foresee additional parking needs on our campus from these buildings and we are exploring off campus options for growth of clinical space needed for physicians and services.
- A parking structure will cost over $30,000 per additional space gained while we are proposing to spend less than $5,000 for surface parking. We strongly believe the $2,850,000 saved can be better used on patient care and safety net services to those who need them.
- LMH has an ongoing relationship and commitment to the Pinkney Neighborhood. We worked with the neighborhood association in the development of the plan and the Association has expressed no objections. We will continue to work with them ensuring LMH is a good neighbor.
- To ease the transition for our neighbors in the affected homes, LMH has worked with them to provide advanced notice, find new housing, as well as providing financial assistance.
- LMH explored the possibility of moving the houses or donating them to organizations that could use them rather than demolishing them. Outside advisors informed us that
the structures will likely not survive an attempt to move them due to their construction and condition. In addition, the structures have issues that would have to be mitigated (lead paint, asbestos siding, mold).

With these considerations we believe the following:

- Changing health trends and our strategic plans will mean that after the addition of the proposed lot, the existing LMH campus will not need additional surface parking for many years (if at all).
- A parking garage would be unnecessarily expensive and spend capital that could be used more wisely on health care.
- We remain committed to being an excellent community partner. The additional parking will be completed in a manner that is attractive and the least impactful possible for the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter and the points above.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Russ Johnson, CEO

cc: Representative Dennis “Boog” Hightberger
    Leslie Soden, Mayor
    Stuart Boley, Vice Mayor
    Mike Amyx, City Commissioner
    Matthew Herbert, City Commissioner
    Lisa Larsen, City Commissioner
    Tom Markus, City Manager
Z-17-00158: Consider a request to rezone approximately 1.38 acres from RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District to H (Hospital) District, located at 302 Michigan St, 306 Michigan St, 310 Michigan St, 314 Michigan St, 318 Michigan St, and 322 Michigan St. Submitted by Landplan Engineering PA on behalf of Lawrence Memorial Hospital and LMH Board of Trustees, property owners of record.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the request to rezone approximately 1.38 acres, from RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District to H (Hospital) District based on the findings presented in the staff report and forwarding it to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval.

Reason for Request: Current zoning does not support hospital use. The subject property has been single family homes.

KEY POINTS
- The property is intended as a future parking lot as part of the Hospital campus.
- Properties are immediately adjacent to the Hospital property along the east (rear property lines).
- The proposed project is for the development of a surface parking lot.

ASSOCIATED CASES/OTHER ACTION REQUIRED
- SUP-17-00153; Institutional Development Plan and parking lot expansion.
- MS-17-00213; Minor Subdivision to combine lots into single Hospital campus.

PLANS AND STUDIES REQUIRED
- Traffic Study – Not required for rezoning
- Downstream Sanitary Sewer Analysis – Not required for rezoning
- Drainage Study – Not required for rezoning
- Retail Market Study – Not applicable to residential request

ATTACHMENTS
1. Area Map
2. Aerial maps of development over time

PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED PRIOR TO PRINTING
- No comment prior to publication of staff report.

Project Summary:
Proposed request is for the redevelopment of six existing platted residential lots as a future parking lot expansion for Lawrence Memorial Hospital. The properties are currently developed with detached residential homes that would be demolished to allow construction of a new parking lot. The purpose of the rezoning is to incorporate the property into the Hospital District. The project includes all but two lots on the east side of Michigan Street between W. 3rd Street and W. 4th Street. The following table provides a summary of the affected lots in the request and the lots that will remain residential along the east block face of the 300 block of Michigan Street.
Table 1: Property Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>W. Lawrence Subdivision Block 24</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Year built</th>
<th>Lot Area (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>74 Residence</td>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>6,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>76 Residence</td>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>6,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>78 Residence</td>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>6,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>80 Residence</td>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>6,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>82 Residence</td>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>6,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>84 + part of 86 Residence</td>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>8,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Part of Lot 86 &amp; 88 Residence to remain</td>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>6,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Part of Lot 88 &amp; 90 Residence to remain</td>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>10,476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. CONFORMANCE WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Applicant’s Response: Map 3-2 Lawrence future Land Use of Horizon 2020 this area is shown Low Density Residential. The surrounding area is shown Single Family Residential to the north and to the west and south. The east is shown as Community Facility (Public Semi-Public)

The land use map in Horizon 2020 shows the Hospital contained between Maine Street and Arkansas Street. Land uses to the west of the Hospital area are shown as low density residential. Chapter 5 concerns residential development and land use policies and recommendations. Chapter 10 addresses Community Facilities.

The plan noted an effort by the City and County to provide “new facilities for health agencies to serve the City and County population”. This effort resulted in the Community Health building located at 200 Maine Street that houses the Douglas County Health Department, Bert Nash, and the Visiting Nurses Association.

The plan defines a General Hospital as “an establishment with an organized medical staff of physicians, with permanent facilities including in-patient beds and acute care facilities, and with medical services including physician services and continuous registered professional nursing services – for not less than 24 hours of every day, for the purpose of providing diagnosis and treatment for patients who have a variety of medical conditions.” By definition a General Hospital includes multiple uses with demands for staffing as well as customer support for adequate parking.

The plan predominantly focuses on the need to protect and preserve the existing General Hospital facility as a viable economic community facility with respect to other applications for a similar use.

**Specific Community Facilities Policies Include:**

**Policy 1.1 Maintain Existing Facilities.**

- b. Maintain or upgrade existing facilities and services where necessary to serve existing development.

Other policies address vehicular circulation and access, pedestrian connectivity, bicycle access. The plan also establishes policies to support cooperative arrangement between public and private organizations and among various public sector providers to provide combined facilities. Design related policies are addressed with the Special Use Permit, a concurrent application to this rezoning request.

Principal land use strategies for addressing residential development are addressed in Chapter 5 Residential Land Use

Key among these policies is the following:

*The character and appearance of existing residential neighborhoods should be protected and enhanced. Infill development, rehabilitation or reconstruction should reflect architectural qualities and styles of existing neighborhoods.*

*Horizon 2020 recognizes the importance of neighborhoods as “building blocks of strong communities.” Neighborhoods include defined edges, an identifiable hub, mixed housing types, human scale and connectivity. Goal 3 Neighborhood Conservation specifically addresses recommendations for the protection of existing low-density residential neighborhoods.*

**Specific Residential Policies Include:**
Policy 3.2 Protect Existing housing Stock.
   b. preserve existing dwelling units.

Policy 3.5 Minimize Encroachment of Nonresidential Uses.
   Carefully consider and evaluate transition areas between different land uses with differing densities, building types and intensity of use to ensure compatibility of use.

This project is an assessment of preserving existing housing stock with the competing value of providing needed parking for an established land use in the neighborhood. The plan seems to recognize that some uses will compete with residential land use and therefore provides the direction to carefully consider encroachment of uses into residential areas. The Hospital has expanded west of Arkansas Street through previous improvement projects. If approved the Hospital would absorb all but two remaining residences along the east block face of Michigan Street.

**Staff Finding** - the proposed request is consistent with Horizon 2020 as it relates to supporting public facilities. Design standards that minimize impacts on surrounding areas and where land use transitions occur are addressed through other development processes and will be included in the review of the concurrent Special Use Permit application.

### 2. ZONING AND USE OF NEARBY PROPERTY, INCLUDING OVERLAY ZONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:</td>
<td>RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District to the north. Existing detached residences on individual lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS7 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District to the west. West side of Michigan Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H (Hospital) District to the south and east; existing surface parking lot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Existing Zoning**

**Figure 2: Existing Land Use**

**Staff Finding** - The property is adjacent to detached residential zoning to the north and west and Hospital zoning to the south and east.
3. CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD
Applicant's Response: These lots are adjacent to Michigan Street and 3rd Street then to single-family residential to the west and north. The area to the east is a parking lot but has been planned for hospital uses. The area to the south includes two single family homes and south of that is hospital uses.

The property is located in the Pinckney Neighborhood. The neighborhood includes a mix of residential uses and a core commercial area along W. 6th Street. Significant land uses in the neighborhood include Lawrence Memorial Hospital and the City’s Water Treatment Plant. Other public facilities that have been established in the neighborhood include Bert Nash, Lawrence-Douglas County Health Department, Visiting Nurses, Healthcare Access and the School District Maintenance Building. These uses are centrally located in the neighborhood.

Additionally, four historic district/properties have been designated within the neighborhood. Three are located in the southeast portion of the neighborhood. The other area is located at the far north end of the district along N. Michigan Street.

Within the Pinckney Neighborhood there are a variety of commercial zones that encapsulate the W. 6th Street corridor. Office uses are located along Maine Street south of W. 3rd Street and along W. 4th Street. These office uses are typically medical office uses. The building located at 1112 W. 6th Street is part of the commercial corridor but includes medical office use.

The neighborhood includes a mix of residential densities and housing types including detached, duplex and multi-dwelling residential uses. A mobile home park is located to the north of the hospital with an average density of 8 dwellings per acre. Residential blocks located on the south side of 4th Street range in density from 5.8 to 8.4 with mixed housing types within the blocks. The area located on the west side of the Lawrence Memorial Hospital includes both RS5 and RS7 zoning. The development pattern is uniformly characterized by detached dwelling on individual lots. Density in this area is defined as low density; less than 6 dwelling units per acre. A typical block in this area includes a density of 3.2 dwellings per acre. They are typically found on the west side of Michigan Street.

Staff Finding - Pinckney Neighborhood is an established neighborhood with a wide range of uses and housing types. The neighborhood includes large areas dedicated to specific public uses. The Hospital is a significant feature within the neighborhood and will continue to be so into the future.

4. PLANS FOR THE AREA OR NEIGHBORHOOD, AS REFLECTED IN ADOPTED AREA AND/OR SECTOR PLANS INCLUDING THE PROPERTY OR ADJOINING PROPERTY
The Pinckney Neighborhood Plan was completed in 1978. The HOP Plan focused on the W. 6th Street corridor and was completed in 2005. The southeast portion of the neighborhood was rezoned from RM (Multi-Dwelling) to RS (Single Dwelling) as part of the 1978 plan. The 2005 HOP Plan recommended rezoning of properties consistent with their land use.

The subject property was not part of the neighborhood rezoning efforts that changed some of the multi-dwelling district to a detached dwelling district in the 1980’s. The HOP Plan was intended to establish conformity of land use and zoning within a specific area of the neighborhood. One of the three primary goals of the HOP plan is: Promote district as a medical entryway and promote district

---

1 This use is being relocated to E. 23rd Street in the near future.
as a gateway to Downtown. However, the subject property is outside of the boundary included in the HOP Plan.

Maine Street and Michigan Streets are designated collector streets and provide direct access to main entrances of the Hospital facility. The proposed rezoning request is located along the east side of Michigan Street.

**Staff Finding** - Both the HOP and Pinckney Neighborhood plans are dated and do not fully reflect existing conditions of the neighborhood or existing land use. A review of applicable development policies for the neighborhood would be justified as a future planning effort.

5. **SUITABILITY OF SUBJECT PROPERTY FOR THE USES TO WHICH IT HAS BEEN RESTRICTED UNDER THE EXISTING ZONING REGULATIONS**

Applicant’s Response: *The use of the site for a parking lot is a suitable use for the site.*

The property included in this request is part of an established residential block within the neighborhood excluding the south 150 feet on the northeast corner of W. 4th Street and Michigan Street. These lots were previously redeveloped and incorporated into the hospital campus and constructed as a surface parking lot.

Since 1986 the 300 block of Michigan Street has been transformed from an exclusive residential use to a surface parking lot to support the hospital as demand for services and the facility has grown over time. As the hospital building as grown over time within the area between Maine Street and Arkansas Street, available parking has been reduced. The reduction in available parking within a particular footprint of the Hospital campus necessarily results in an expansion of the hospital boundary. Attached to this report is an exhibit that shows development of the area over time.

Development of surface parking to serve the hospital in the RS5 District is not suitable. Hospital related parking has previously expanded into this block leaving the remaining 8 residential homes. The request is for the rezoning of the six northern parcels along east side of Michigan Street. The proposed rezoning is suitable given the location of parking that already exists within this block.

Michigan Street, as a boundary (collector street), provides an edge to the limits of the Hospital related uses on the west side of the campus.

**Staff Finding** - The existing 300 block of Michigan Street/Arkansas Street has been slowly changed from a residential block to a surface parking lot for the Hospital. The current zoning is not suitable for the hospital parking lot planned for the area.

6. **LENGTH OF TIME SUBJECT PROPERTY HAS REMAINED VACANT AS ZONED**

Applicant’s Response: *The property has been used as single family homes.*

The property is not vacant. The residential uses included in the requested rezoning were built between 1955 and 1958. The property was zoned RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District in 2006 with the adoption of the Land Development Code. From 1966 to 2006 the property was zoned RS-2 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District.

**Staff Finding** - The property included in the request is developed with detached houses. The property has been zoned for low-density residential land use since 1966.
7. EXTENT TO WHICH APPROVING THE REZONING WILL DETRIMENTALLY AFFECT NEARBY PROPERTIES

Applicant’s Response: Approving this rezoning application will not adversely affect the neighboring properties.

The northeast corner of Michigan Street and W. 4th Street has previously been rezoned and developed as a surface parking lot as well as the entire west block face of Arkansas Street. The block between Michigan Street and Arkansas Street includes only 8 remaining residences. This application includes the north 6 lots, that if approved will be demolished to accommodate a future surface parking lot. Two residential lots will remain and they will be surrounded on the north, south and east by a parking lot. The long term viability of the lots for residential purposes is not expected. The areas to the west and north are intact residential blocks. Michigan Street provides a definite boundary of the Hospital related uses as does W. 3rd Street.

The provision of additional parking to serve the Hospital should benefit the neighborhood by providing more space for staff, patients and visitors who otherwise may be seeking parking on street.

**Staff Finding** - If approved, the request will result in only two remaining residential uses located on the east side of Michigan Street in the 300 block. Staff does not expect these properties to remain in the long term being surrounded by parking lot on three sides.

Approval of the request primarily impacts the two lots not included in the request. It expands the Hospital district along the east side of Michigan Street. Staff recommends that Michigan Street be established as a boundary to protect the residential portion of the neighborhood west of Michigan Street.

8. THE GAIN, IF ANY, TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE DUE TO THE DENIAL OF THE APPLICATION, AS COMPARED TO THE HARDSHIP IMPOSED UPON THE LANDOWNER, IF ANY, AS A RESULT OF DENIAL OF THE APPLICATION

Applicant’s Response: Approval of this application will fill a need of the parking problem that for both the hospital and the neighborhood.

Evaluation of this criterion includes weighing the benefits to the public versus the benefit of the owners of the subject property. Benefits are measured based on anticipated impacts of the rezoning request on the public health, safety, and welfare.

The purpose of the request to rezone property from RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District to H (Hospital) District is for the future construction of a surface parking lot. The Lawrence Memorial Hospital is a public facility with significant community investment. Plans that group hospital uses and necessary support structures such as parking in a compact form are beneficial to the immediately surrounding neighborhood and to the community at large. By providing a compact development with off-street parking in nearby locations, the distance from parking to building entrances is lessened and made more convenient for employees and users of the Hospital, medical offices and related uses.

Lawrence Memorial Hospital has multiple facilities throughout the community but the primary use - Hospital - is located at 325 Maine Street. The building improvements today include not only the Hospital aspect but also administrative offices, medial offices, and out-patient services. Approval of the rezoning will allow the construction of additional surface parking for the Hospital and related uses at this location.
Denial of the request limits the opportunity to provide off-street parking near the Hospital. Excess parking is likely to be located on-street in the surrounding neighborhood.

**Staff Finding** – This zoning request provides a benefit to the community by providing additional off-street parking options for an intensive land use within the neighborhood.

9. **PROFESSIONAL STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The H District is a special purpose district intended to accommodate a hospital and accessory and related uses under common control and planning. This application is reviewed concurrently with the Special Use Permit/Institutional Development Plan for the Lawrence Memorial Hospital. Section 20-220 (f) requires the institution responsibility for the property within the H District to prepare and update an institutional Development Plan for all of the property contained within the H District when a Significant Development Project is proposed.

Section 20-220 (g) states that the H District should generally be expanded in logical increments that preserve an orderly boundary between the institution use and any adjoining residential uses. This application includes all but two residential lots along the east side of the 300 block of Michigan Street. Ideally these lots would have also been included in the request; however, they are not owned by the Hospital. If at some point in the future they can be acquired a similar zoning would be appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of the request for 1.35 acres from RS5 to H.

**CONCLUSION**

This request is considered in the context of an overall plan for the Hospital property as represented in SUP-17-00153. The plan provides both an overview master plan for the Hospital and provides specific detail for the immediate parking lot improvement.

Within the H (Hospital) District is a small area zoned GPI. It may be beneficial in the future to consider rezoning the parcel from GPI to H to create a uniform district boundary. This is not an immediate concern but has been identified in this review process.
Z-17-00158: Rezoning of approx. 4 acres from RS5 (Single-Dwelling Residential) District to H (Hospital) District, located at 302 Michigan St, 306 Michigan St, 310 Michigan St, 314 Michigan St, 318 Michigan St, and 322 Michigan St
May 12, 2017

Dear Members of the Lawrence Memorial Hospital Board,

I was recently disappointed to learn that Lawrence Memorial Hospital (LMH) is considering demolishing more housing units near the hospital in order to construct parking lots. I am writing to respectfully request that you reconsider this plan.

Lawrence already faces a serious shortage of affordable housing, and this project would contribute to that problem. Parking lots make poor neighbors, and increased surface parking will have a negative effect on the remaining housing units near the hospital. I understand that structured parking is expensive, but the University of Kansas and the City of Lawrence (which has a smaller annual budget than LMH) have figured out how to make it work, and I think that LMH can, too.

I understand that many factors must be considered in making a decision like this one, and if there is information that I am overlooking that affect this decision, I would appreciate it if you could share that with me. Thank you for your consideration, and thank you for your service.

Sincerely,

Rep. Dennis “Boog” Highberger

cc: Russell W. Johnson, CEO, Lawrence Memorial Hospital
    Leslie Soden, Mayor
    Stuart Boley, Vice-Mayor
    Mike Amyx, City Commissioner
    Matthew Herbert, City Commissioner
    Lisa Larsen, City Commissioner
    Tom Markus, City Manager

ec: Members of the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission
May 22, 2017  

Via e-mail

Dear Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission & City Commission Members:

Members of Pinckney Neighborhood Association would like to comment on the expansion of Lawrence Memorial Hospital (LMH) parking on the block of 4th and Michigan Streets.

We have greatly appreciated the willingness of LMH to be forthcoming with their plans. They have attended several meetings this year and participated in vigorous Q&A sessions. LMH listened to our concerns about residential parking, acknowledged the need for additional parking, and presented several viable solutions to our association.

Pinckney would like to make sure that the parking lot expansion preserves a significant amount of the green space and that adequate drainage is provided. Also, in our last neighborhood meeting, concerns were raised about the lack of affordable housing in Lawrence and the potential negative impact of losing those properties in our neighborhood. We are aware that it is not the hospital's responsibility, but we would like to find a common solution with the city to replace the affordable housing that has been diminished by this plan.

Additionally, we strongly request that the City and LMH collaborate with businesses and organizations such as Bert Nash to find a viable long-term solution to address all parking concerns along and near the Maine Street business corridor in the Pinckney neighborhood.

We understand that there is a delicate balancing act to provide adequate parking while maintaining the neighborhood’s integrity. Our hope is that LMH will continue to be a partner in projects that might affect our neighborhood going forward.
Sincerely yours,

Bart Littlejohn
President, PNA

cc: Lawrence Memorial Hospital [Russ Johnson and/or Janice Early]
May 19, 2017

Dear Members of the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Commission:

At your meeting on May 24 you will be considering the application from Lawrence Memorial Hospital for expansion of parking on property we own on the eastern side of Michigan adjacent to our existing lots. I wanted to offer important points for your consideration as you determine what is best for the community. Thank you in advance for your commitment to Lawrence and your support of LMH over the years.

- LMH is currently facing parking challenges with staff and customers parking on side streets and adjacent areas around the campus. We need to address this immediate need.
- LMH recently completed a strategic plan that recognizes the shift of services from inpatient care towards outpatient services. Among the implications this has for us is the need to move some outpatient programs in the future. We have already begun this planning.
- As we look to make outpatient/ambulatory services more accessible and convenient, moving some services from the hospital campus to other locations, we will reduce our parking needs.
- Healthcare, demographic, and market data tell us that the LMH campus is right-sized for inpatient care for many years. Our ambulatory services, at our other existing and new locations, will also serve the community well into the future.
- We have 111,000 square feet of medical office space on campus which is completely occupied. We do not foresee additional parking needs on our campus from these buildings and we are exploring off campus options for growth of clinical space needed for physicians and services.
- A parking structure will cost over $30,000 per additional space gained while we are proposing to spend less than $5,000 for surface parking. We strongly believe the $2,850,000 saved can be better used on patient care and safety net services to those who need them.
- LMH has an ongoing relationship and commitment to the Pinkney Neighborhood. We worked with the neighborhood association in the development of the plan and the Association has expressed no objections. We will continue to work with them ensuring LMH is a good neighbor.
- To ease the transition for our neighbors in the affected homes, LMH has worked with them to provide advanced notice, find new housing, as well as providing financial assistance.
- LMH explored the possibility of moving the houses or donating them to organizations that could use them rather than demolishing them. Outside advisors informed us that
the structures will likely not survive an attempt to move them due to their construction and condition. In addition, the structures have issues that would have to be mitigated (lead paint, asbestos siding, mold).

With these considerations we believe the following:

- Changing health trends and our strategic plans will mean that after the addition of the proposed lot, the existing LMH campus will not need additional surface parking for many years (if at all).
- A parking garage would be unnecessarily expensive and spend capital that could be used more wisely on health care.
- We remain committed to being an excellent community partner. The additional parking will be completed in a manner that is attractive and the least impactful possible for the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter and the points above.

Sincerely,

Russ Johnson, CEO

cc: Representative Dennis “Boog” Hightberger  
Leslie Soden, Mayor  
Stuart Boley, Vice Mayor  
Mike Amyx, City Commissioner  
Matthew Herbert, City Commissioner  
Lisa Larsen, City Commissioner  
Tom Markus, City Manager
ITEM NO. 2  A TO I-3; 26.995 ACRES; 1705 N 1399 RD (BJP)

Z-17-00155: Consider a request to rezone approximately 26.995 acres from County A (Agricultural) District to I-3 (Industrial) District, located directly east of 1705 N 1399 Rd. Submitted by Law Office of Dan Watkins on behalf of RD Johnson Excavating Company LLC, property owner of record.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends forwarding the rezoning request for approximately 26.995 acres from A (Agricultural) District to I-3 (Heavy Industrial) District to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation for approval based on the findings of fact found in the body of the staff report.

Applicant’s reason for request:
“To bring the subject property into conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and Southeast Area Plan, and to provide additional areas for the uses occurring on the contiguous properties owned by the applicant.”

KEY POINTS
- The request is intended to bring the existing land use on the subject property into compliance.
- The subject property is included in the Southeast Area Plan and the request is consistent with that plan, and Horizon 2020.

ASSOCIATED CASES
- SP-17-00156: A site plan for the RD Johnson Excavating Company located at 1702 N 1360 Road, 1705 N 1399 Road, and the subject property. This site plan is currently under review and will be considered by the Board of County Commissioners.

OTHER ACTION REQUIRED
- Approval of rezoning by Board of County Commissioners and publication of resolution.

PUBLIC COMMENT
No public comment was received prior to the printing of this staff report.
Project Summary:
The request for rezoning would take this property from County zoning A (Agricultural) District to I-3 (Heavy Industrial) District to allow for the proposed use, storage of excavation materials. The property owner, RD Johnson Excavating Company, LLC, also owns adjacent properties to the west and is currently using the subject property for storage of materials. As this use is not permitted in the A District, the rezoning request would bring the property into compliance.

The subject property is located east of the Lawrence city limits. RD Johnson Excavating Company, LLC also owns three adjacent properties to the west. Two of these properties are located in the county, and one property is located in with the city limits. Staff and the applicant discussed if it would be appropriate to annex the county properties. It was determined that, because the use does not require municipal services, the timing does not necessitate annexation at this time. Conditions requiring an agreement to annex will be included in the site plan report.

Figure 1. Subject property zoning and land use.
I. ZONING AND LAND USES OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

Current Zoning and Land Use: A (Agricultural) District; Storage of excavating materials related to RD Johnson Excavating Company.

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:

To the north: IG (General Industrial) District; East Hills Business Park.

To the south: A (Agricultural) District; The portion contains a rural residence and agricultural uses.

To the east: A (Agricultural) District; The southern portion contains agriculture uses and a rural residence.

To the west: I-2 (Light Industrial) District; Office and storage related to RD Johnson Excavating Company.

I-3 (Heavy Industrial) District; Storage of excavating materials related to RD Johnson Excavating Company.

A (Agricultural) District; Rural residence.

Staff Finding - As proposed the subject property will be uniformly zoned similar to properties located west and north of the property.

II. CHARACTER OF THE AREA

The subject property is surrounded by industrial uses to the west and north, and rural uses to the east and south. Figure 2 below provides information on the existing industrial uses in the area.
Staff Finding - The area is characterized by the industrial land uses, agricultural uses and rural residences. The industrial zoning requested for the subject property would be compatible with the character of the area given the existing industrial uses.
III. SUITABILITY OF SUBJECT PROPERTY FOR THE USES TO WHICH IT HAS BEEN RESTRICTED

Applicant’s Response:
“The Subject Property is well suited for I-3 designation. As indicated in the Southeast Area Plan, areas in close proximity to E. 23rd Street/K-10 Highway are recommended for industrial uses geared toward materials transportation.”

The property is currently zoned A District which permits agricultural uses as well as other low intensity uses in the County. At present, the subject property does not include an agricultural use. The property contains a nonconforming use, storage of excavation materials. The intent is to continue to use the property to store materials. Rezoning the property to the I-3 District would correct the existing nonconforming use and bring the property into compliance.

The property is located in close proximity to other industrial uses. It is also included in the Southeast Area Plan and planned for future industrial land use.

Staff Finding - Based on the proximity to other industrial uses, and the future land use identified in the Southeast Area Plan, the property appears to be suitable for industrial development.

IV. LENGTH OF TIME SUBJECT PROPERTY HAS REMAINED VACANT AS ZONED

Staff Finding - This property has been zoned for agricultural use since 1966 when the County adopted zoning regulations for the unincorporated areas of the County. The subject property is undeveloped. Previous to the property's current state, the majority of the property was covered by a wooded area, with an agricultural use along N 1360 Road. Aerial photos indicate that the wooded area was cleared at some point between the years of 2003-2006, however no development occurred on the site at that time. The agricultural use also ceased to exist. Aerial photos also show that the property has been used to store materials since at least 2012.

V. EXTENT TO WHICH REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS WILL DETRIMENTALLY AFFECT NEARBY PROPERTY

Applicant’s response:
“Nearby properties will not be detrimentally affected. The proposed uses match the predominant uses to the west. No new access drives will be established at the subject property and standard setbacks and screening will limit visual impact to rural neighbors.”

Rezoning to the I-3 District would allow for the continued use of storage of excavation materials. The use is an open use with exterior storage with truck traffic to move the material to and from the site.

Rezoning the property will not detrimentally affect the nearby properties that contain industrial uses. The proposed rezoning could detrimentally impact residential uses to both the south and east of the subject property. However, other industrial uses have existed within the general area of the residences for a number of years.
**Staff Finding** - It is not anticipated that rezoning this property for industrial use will have an adverse effect. Introduction of an industrial use will require buffering from the adjoining residential and agricultural land uses along the east and south sides of the subject property. A site plan application for the subject property and the two adjoining RD Johnson properties was submitted concurrent with the zoning application. The site plan is under review and will be presented to the Board of County Commissioners for approval.

**VI. RELATIVE GAIN TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE BY THE DESTRUCTION OF THE VALUE OF THE PETITIONER’S PROPERTY AS COMPARED TO THE HARDSHIP IMPOSED UPON THE INDIVIDUAL LANDOWNERS**

Applicant’s response:

“Approval of this rezoning request will provide for the expansion of vital products and services offered by the applicant. Expanded operations for the Applicant’s recoverable materials programs is beneficial to the County and a range of local industries.”

Evaluation of these criteria includes weighing the benefits the denial of the rezoning request would provide for the public versus the hardship the denial would impose on the owner of the subject property. Benefits are measured based on the anticipated impacts of the rezoning request on the public health, safety and welfare.

Approval of the rezoning request corrects the nonconforming use of the property, storage of excavation materials, and brings the property into compliance.

The property owners to the east and to the south may be negatively impacted by rezoning the property. The County zoning regulations require site plan approval for development on industrially zoned property. Buffering adjacent land uses can be achieved to the maximum extent possible through the use of greater setbacks, and landscaping and/or screening materials to minimize any potential negative effects the development of the property might have upon these adjoining properties.

**Staff Finding** - There are no detrimental impacts associated with the approval of the rezoning anticipated on nearby properties.

**VII. CONFORMANCE WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

Applicant’s Response:

“This rezoning request brings the Subject Property into conformance with the Southeast Area Plan, which projects Industrial Uses for the Subject Property. The Subject Property also meets the criteria indicated in the Comprehensive Plan for new industrial areas.”

Chapter 7 of *Horizon 2020* provides guidance for future industrial development within Douglas County. One location identified for future industrial development is the Southeast Industrial Area, shown in Map 7-2 (Figure 3). The Plan states “the area consists of general industrial land uses and it is anticipated this area will experience increased industrial development”. The Plan recommends more intense industrial uses in the area east of Franklin Road, north of N 1360 Road, west of E 1750 Road, and south of E 23rd Street. The subject property is located within the area planned for more intense industrial uses.
The subject property is located within the boundaries of the Southeast Area Plan, which is incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan in Chapter 14. Map 3-1 of the Southeast Area Plan shows the Future Land Uses for the areas included in the Plan and identifies the subject property for industrial uses.
Staff Finding – The request for I-3 zoning is consistent with chapter 7 of Horizon 2020, and the Southeast Area Plan. The proposed rezoning is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and is compliant with the area plan.

VIII. PROFESSIONAL STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends approval of the request to rezone approximately 26.995 acres from County A (Agricultural) District to I-3 (Industrial) District as it is the appropriate zoning district for the subject property.
Z-17-00155: Rezoning of 26.95 acres from County A (Agricultural) District to I-3 (Industrial) District, located directly east of 1705 N 1399 rd.
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ITEM NO. 3 PRD TO RM15; 8.566 ACRES; 2115 EXCHANGE CT (KES)

Z-17-00157: Consider a request to rezone approximately 8.566 acres from PRD (Planned Residential Development) District to RM15 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District, located at 2115 Exchange Ct. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for Southwind Capital LLC, property owner of record.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from PRD (Planned Residential Development) District to RM15 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District and forwarding it to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval based on the findings of fact found in the body of the staff report.

REASON FOR REQUEST
Applicant’s Response:
“The property is currently zoned PRD and was part of a bigger tract that has since been sold, and rezoned to RM15. An RM15 zoning would seem to make more sense than a PRD for this property.”

KEY POINTS
• The property is located at the southwest corner of K-10 Highway and O’Connell Road and is currently zoned PRD (Planned Residential Development) District.
• PD zoning requires submittal of a Preliminary Development Plan with the rezoning application.
• The proposed density will remain the same and this rezoning will not increase the maximum density. The existing and proposed zoning allow for 15 units/acre density.
• As currently zoned, the property has remained vacant since 2006. The Planning Commission granted an extension to the approved Final Development Plan in 2007 for a period through 2008.
• The rezoning will align the remaining portion of the PRD with the zoning district to the south.
• The proposed rezoning will allow development consistent with the residential nature of the area and fit within the goals of the comprehensive plan, the current Land Development Code and the intentions of the Final Development Plan that was approved in 2006 as well as allow the proposed use to better fit within the City Code.

ASSOCIATED CASES

FDP-08-13-05 Final Development Plan; Fairfield Farms Multi-Family; Southwest corner of K-10 Highway and O’Connell Road. Planning Commission approved on January 23, 2006. (Expired in 2008.)

OTHER ACTION REQUIRED
- City Commission approval of rezoning request and adoption/publication of ordinance.
- Submission and administrative approval of a site plan.
- Application and release of building permits prior to development.

PUBLIC COMMENT
N/A

Project Summary
The property is currently zoned PRD (Planned Residential Development) District. A rezoning request to the RM15 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District is requested to bring the remainder of what was once a larger tract into the same zoning district as the southern portion of the development area. Adjacent zoning to the west is RM12D and the requested rezoning would be compatible with this residential area. The request complies with the Comprehensive Plan land use projections in the area. The area remains residential and the maximum density of 15 units/acre will remain the same. The RM15 zoning district permits a one-step, administrative site plan review process.

Properties in the surrounding area of the property are zoned CO (Commercial Office), RM15 (Residential Multi-Dwelling) and RM12D (Residential Dwelling Duplex) and are developed with Multi-Dwelling Senior Living structures and Residential Duplex Dwelling structures. The zoning map in Figure 1 illustrates the zoning and land uses of the area. The senior living structures are newly completed just to the south of the subject property.

Per Code, a Preliminary Development Plan must be submitted with any rezoning request to the Planned Development Overlay. The previously approved development plan has expired. A
concept plan for the proposed use related to this rezoning request proposes similar multi-family structures to those that were approved in the previous Final Development Plan that has since expired. (Figure 2)

**REVIEW & DECISION-MAKING CRITERIA**

1. **CONFORMANCE WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

   Applicant’s response: "RM15 and PRD zonings are essentially the same density and use, therefore it would conform with H2020."

   This property is currently zoned PRD under an approved Final Development Plan in compliance with the current goals of Horizon 2020 and the urban growth projections for the subject area. No change in density or character of development is proposed.

   **Staff Finding** – The proposed rezoning does not change the overall character of development in the area and the request is in conformance with the residential land use recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan.

2. **ZONING AND USE OF NEARBY PROPERTY, INCLUDING ANY OVERLAY ZONING**

   Current Zoning and Land Use: PRD (Planned Residential Development) District; Undeveloped.

   Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:

   To the west: RM12D (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District; Residential Duplex units.

   To the south: RM15 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District; Multi-Dwelling Senior Living units.

   To the east: CC200 (Community Commercial Centers) District; Undeveloped pad sites.

   To the north: CO (Office Commercial Development) District; Undeveloped pad sites.
Staff Finding – The subject property is adjacent to properties zoned for residential and commercial land uses. The commercially zoned properties are currently undeveloped. The proposed rezoning is compatible with the zoning and land uses, existing and approved, in the area.

3. CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD
   Applicant’s Response:
   "To the south of the subject property is multi-family zoned RM15; to the west are duplexes, to the north is K-10 highway; and to the east is vacant."

This area is currently developed as a Multi-Dwelling Residential neighborhood with undeveloped Commercial land uses to the north and east.

Staff Finding – This property is south and west of an undeveloped area designated for low intensity commercial office uses. Multi-dwelling residences are located around the subject property. The proposed rezoning would result in a development that is compatible with the character of the area.

4. PLANS FOR THE AREA OR NEIGHBORHOOD, AS REFLECTED IN ADOPTED AREA AND/OR SECTOR PLANS INCLUDING THE PROPERTY OR ADJOINING PROPERTY

The rezoning request is not changing overall development plans for the area, the character of the neighborhood or impacting adjoining property.

Staff Finding – The rezoning request is compliant with plans for the area. The request is a change from a Planned Development Overlay District to RM15 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District. The RM15 District permits similar density and housing types as previously approved on the expired Final Development Plan.

5. SUITABILITY OF SUBJECT PROPERTY FOR THE USES TO WHICH IT HAS BEEN RESTRICTED UNDER THE EXISTING ZONING REGULATIONS

Applicant’s response:
"It is suitable for multi-family under the current and proposed zoning regulations."

Staff Finding – The property is well suited to the uses to which it is restricted under the existing zoning regulations. The proposed rezoning does not change the permitted uses. The Land Development Code adopted in 2006 includes many of the site development standards previously only found in the Planned Development regulations. This allows development with increased landscape and buffer yards in conventional (RM) zoning districts without reliance on PD overlays.

6. LENGTH OF TIME SUBJECT PROPERTY HAS REMAINED VACANT AS ZONED
   Applicant’s Response:
   "The property has never been developed."

The Planning Commission approved a Final Development Plan for this property on January 23, 2006. On May 21, 2007, an extension to this approved Final Development Plan was granted by the Planning Commission and approval was extended to January 2008. The Final Development Plan approval has expired. The property has not been developed.
**Staff Finding** – The property has been vacant as zoned since the Final Development Plan was approved in 2006.

### 7. EXTENT TO WHICH APPROVING THE REZONING WILL DETRIMENTALLY AFFECT NEARBY PROPERTIES

Applicant’s Response:
"As the density would remain the same as the current zoning allows, we see no detrimental effects on nearby properties.

As noted earlier, the property is surrounded on the west and south with Multi-Dwelling Residential zoned property which is partially developed. The residential development of this property would be similar to, and compatible with the adjacent land uses. To the east and north, the property is adjacent to property zoned for commercial office uses. This commercially zoned area is currently undeveloped.

**Staff Finding** – The RM15 zoning is compatible with the nearby properties and the previously approved Final Development Plan. The rezoning would allow for a proposed use that would be similar to the nearby uses and should have no detrimental effect. Future development is subject to site plan approval.

### 8. THE GAIN, IF ANY, TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE DUE TO THE DENIAL OF THE APPLICATION, AS COMPARED TO THE HARDSHIP IMPOSED UPON THE LANDOWNER, IF ANY, AS A RESULT OF DENIAL OF THE APPLICATION

Applicant’s Response:
"Since the property has been vacant since it was annexed into the city, it would benefit the city for the property to be developed for many reasons such as tax revenue."

Evaluation of these criteria includes weighing the benefits to the public versus the benefits of the owner of the subject property. Benefits are measured based on the anticipated impacts of the rezoning request on the public health, safety and welfare.

The proposed rezoning is not changing the allowed use of the property in a manner that would be detrimental to public health, safety and welfare. The proposed rezoning allows the developer to retain a similar density and streamline the site plan review process.

**Staff Finding** - Approval of the rezoning request will allow multi-dwelling residential development similar in intensity and compatible with the uses proposed on the previously approved Final Development Plan. The Land Development Code was adopted to encourage development in conventional zoning districts with increased landscape and bufferyard standards. There would be no gain to the public health, safety, and welfare through the denial of the rezoning request.

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

This staff report reviews the proposed rezoning request for its compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and the Golden Factors, and for compatibility with surrounding development. The rezoning request is compliant with the Comprehensive Plan and the Golden Factors and would be compatible with surrounding development. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request.
Z-17-00157: Rezoning of approx. 8.566 acres from PRD (Planned Residential Development) District to RM15 (Multi-Dwelling Residential) District, located at 2115 Exchange Ct.
## PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT
### Regular Agenda – Non-Public Hearing Item

**ITEM NO. 4  FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR MT BLUE ADDITION; 2350 & 2400 FRANKLIN RD (BJP)**

**FDP-17-00185:** Consider a Final Development Plan for Mt. Blue Addition, Lot 1 and Mt. Blue Addition No. 2, Lot 9 to accommodate mini storage units and a gun range and retail store, located at 2350 & 2400 Franklin Rd. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects on behalf of Ace Self Storage LLC, property owner of record.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN:
Planning Staff recommends approval of the Revised Final Development Plan for Mt. Blue Addition based upon the findings of fact presented in the body of the staff report and subject to the following conditions:
1. Execution of a Site Plan Performance Agreement.
2. Provision of mylar and recording fees.
3. Submittal of an Erosion Control Plan for review and approval by the City Stormwater Engineer.

### KEY POINTS
- The subject property was previously platted as Lot 1 (2400 Franklin Road) and Lot 2 (2350 Franklin Road) of A Final Plat of Mt. Blue Addition. In 2000, A Final Plat of Mt. Blue Addition No. 2 was approved, at which point Lot 2 became Lot 9.
- The property was included in the previous Preliminary Development Plans for the Mt. Blue Addition PID, with the original PDP being approved by the City Commission in 1997. As the development began prior to the adoption of the 2006 Development Code it is being processed under the requirements of the pre-2006 Code.
- The Preliminary Development Plan was revised to accommodate a gun range and retail store on Lot 9. The Preliminary Development Plan was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on March 15, 2017, and was approved by the City Commission on April 18, 2017.
- The Final Development Plan is in substantial conformance with the approved Preliminary Development Plan.

### FACTORS TO CONSIDER
- Compliance with the 1966 Zoning Code for Planned Developments.
- Conformance with Horizon 2020.

### ASSOCIATED CASES/OTHER ACTION REQUIRED
**Associated Cases**
- PDP-17-00008: Preliminary Development Plan for Mt. Blue Addition, Lot 1 and Mt. Blue Addition No. 2, Lot 9 to accommodate a gun range and retail store, located at 2350 Franklin Road. The Preliminary Development Plan was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on March 15, 2017, and was approved by the City Commission on April 18, 2017.
Other Action Required
- Recording of Final Development Plan with the Douglas County Register of Deeds.
- Submission and approval of building permits prior to construction.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A: Proposed Final Development Plan
Attachment B: Traffic Impact Study

PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED PRIOR TO PRINTING
1. None

GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning and Land Use:</th>
<th>PID (Planned Industrial Development) District; Lot 9 – vacant; Lot 1 – mini storage, office/retail.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:</td>
<td>To the north and east: PID (Planned Industrial Development) District; Wholesale, Storage, and Distribution, Light, and vacant land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To the south: GPI (General Public and Industrial Use) District; Douglas County Jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To the west: A (Agricultural) and I-1 (Limited Industrial) Districts; rural residence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF REQUEST
The subject property contains approximately 6.3 acres and is located at the northeast corner of E 25th Street and Franklin Road. The subject property includes 2400 Franklin Road (Lot 1) and 2350 Franklin Road (Lot 9). The property has been part of the Mt. Blue PID since its inception. The original plan was approved under the 1966 Zoning Code; as such the development is being processed under the requirements of the pre-2006 Code, with the exception of landscaping requirements associated with Lot 9. To facilitate efficiency, staff determined that the landscaping standards in the current Development Code, Article 10, should be used for landscaping requirements.

The original plan showed Lot 1 to be developed with mini storage, office, and retail; however, the plan did not include development for Lot 9. The proposed FDP revision accommodates the development of Lot 9 with a gun range and related retail store. The Owner indicated that the retail will include guns and related merchandise. The development will also include a classroom for safety and other related classes. The original Mt. Blue Preliminary Plan permitted uses in Use Group 13—Automotive Services; Retail Sales; Other. An indoor gun range is not specifically listed under Use Group 13; however, the Planning Director determined that an indoor gun range was a similar use to other recreational type uses permitted in that use group. Recreational examples permitted in Use Group 13 include ‘Skating Rink, Commercial’, and ‘Baseball Park, Commercial’. Given this, a determination was made by the Planning Director that an indoor gun range would be a permitted use under the ‘Similar Use’ category of the use group.
STAFF ANALYSIS
CONSISTENCY WITH APPROVED PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The applicable Development Code for this application is the 1966 Zoning Code Section 20-1013(b) that states:

(b) A plan submitted for final approval shall be in substantial compliance with the plan previously given preliminary approval. Modification by the landowner of the plan as preliminarily approved may not:

(1) Increase the proposed gross residential density or intensity of use by more than five percent or involve a reduction in the area set aside for common open space, open air recreation area or non-encroachable area, nor the substantial relocation of such areas; nor,

(2) Increase by more than 10 percent the total floor area proposed for non-residential or commercial uses; nor,

(3) Increase by more than five percent the total ground area covered by buildings nor involve a substantial change in the height of buildings.

The Preliminary Development Plan was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on March 16, 2017, and approved by the City Commission on April 18, 2017. The proposed Final Development Plan is consistent with the approved Preliminary Development Plan with the exception of a minor change to the site. The proposed Final Development Plan adds a 1,125 square foot patio. This area was shown as green space in the recently approved Preliminary Development Plan. This modification represents a 2% increase in the amount of impervious surface area for Lot 9.

SITE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot 1</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use:</td>
<td>Mini Storage, Office/Retail</td>
<td>Mini Storage, Office/Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area:</td>
<td>229,125 sq ft</td>
<td>229,125 sq ft</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Building:</td>
<td>44,172 sq ft</td>
<td>44,172 sq ft</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pavement:</td>
<td>127,890 sq ft</td>
<td>127,890 sq ft</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Impervious Area:</td>
<td>172,062 sq ft 75%</td>
<td>172,062 sq ft 75%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pervious Area:</td>
<td>57,063 sq ft 25%</td>
<td>57,063 sq ft 25%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot 9</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use:</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Use Group 13 – Similar Use/Indoor Gun Range and Retail Sales (Participant Sports &amp; Recreation, Indoor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area:</td>
<td>47,160 sq ft</td>
<td>47,160 sq ft</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMMON OPEN SPACE

The common open space for the Final Development Plan will be provided through the landscaping along the street frontages and within parking lot area. Dwelling units are not proposed in this development.

### PARKING SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Vehicle Requirement</th>
<th>Vehicle Required</th>
<th>Vehicle Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/150 storage units + 3 adjacent to leasing office</td>
<td>271 units/150 = 2+ 3 = 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>Mini Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1/300 sq ft floor area</td>
<td>5,985 sq ft/300 = 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1/200 sq ft floor area</td>
<td>3,000 sq ft/200 = 15</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Required for Lot 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADA (76-100 spaces = 3 auto &amp; 1 van )</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor Gun</td>
<td>1/500 sq ft floor area*</td>
<td>12,375 sq ft/ 500 = 25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 9</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADA (1-25 spaces = 1 van)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Parking group 15 is being used for the Indoor Gun Range associated with Lot 9. Staff determined this parking group was appropriate due to its alignment with the current Development Code. The parking requirements in Parking Group 15 are the same requirements that would apply to the gun range if it were being developed under the current Development Code (An indoor gun range would be classified as a Participant Sports & Recreation, Indoor use under the current code, which requires parking be calculated at 1 space per 500 square feet of customer/activity area).

A waiver from the 30’ front setback for parking along Thomas Court was approved by the Planning Commission on March 15, 2017. The Final Development Plan shows the parking area for Lot 9 setback 15’ from Thomas Court right-of-way. The pre-2006 code did not provide setback requirements for parking areas. In this situation, the front setback requirement of 30’ would be applicable under the pre-2006 code because Lot 9 is a corner lot. The 15’ parking
setback aligns with the current Development Code and will result in a development that is consistent with current development patterns.

ACCESS
The City Engineer determined that access to Franklin Road (an arterial street) should be removed, and access provided to Lot 9 from Thomas Court. The Final Development Plan proposes a new access drive from Thomas Court, as well as extending the drive aisle for Lot 9 south to share access to Franklin Road with Lot 1. This access provides the opportunity for shared parking should the need arise. The trash storage area for Lot 1 will be relocated to accommodate this access improvement.

LANDSCAPING
Lot 1 is included in the Final Development due to the extension of the drive aisle to provide Lot 9 access to Franklin Road. The location of the trash storage area is also updated on the Plan. No other changes are proposed to Lot 1; therefore, the landscape requirements pertain only to Lot 9.

The required street trees, perimeter parking lot landscaping, and interior parking lot landscaping are provided with this plan, as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscaping</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees</td>
<td>1 per 40 ft of street frontage</td>
<td>Franklin Road: 189.42 ft / 40 = 5</td>
<td>Franklin Road: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Court: 230.81 ft / 40 = 6</td>
<td>Thomas Court: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Parking Lot</td>
<td>40 sq. ft. for each parking space</td>
<td>40 X 25 parking spaces = 1,000 sq ft landscape area</td>
<td>3 trees &amp; 9 shrubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>1 tree and 3 shrubs per 10 parking spaces</td>
<td>25 parking spaces / 10 = 3 trees &amp; 9 shrubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Parking Lot</td>
<td>1 shade tree per 25 ft. of parking lot frontage</td>
<td>Continuous row of evergreen shrubs</td>
<td>29 evergreen shrubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>along r-o-w PLUS wall, berm, or continuous hedge of evergreen shrubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIGHTING
The Final Development Plan does not propose new lighting. A note on the Plan indicates that any parking lot lights installed in the future will be done so per city code.

CONCLUSION
The proposed Final Development Plan as conditioned complies with the Zoning Regulations under the original development code.
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Introduction

This 7 Step Traffic Impact Analysis for the proposed building and parking lot improvements for the Gun Range development in Lawrence, Kansas, has been prepared in accordance with the City of Lawrence's Traffic Impact Study Guidelines: Ordinance 7650 (Code Chapter 16, Article 29/Chapter 20, Article 9). The proposed 1.08 acre site will improve the existing vacant lot by adding a 11,875 sq ft indoor shooting range. Within the building, 4,000 sq ft will be used for a specialty retail area. The surrounding storage facility and commercial offices to the north and south as well as the 15 acre farm to the west will remain unaltered. The parking for the proposed development will include 21 spaces surrounded by curb and gutter including 2 accessible spaces and 2 bike parking spaces. The current access driveway on Franklin Road, 50 ft south of Thomas Court, will remain in use and a new access driveway is proposed off of Thomas Court located 140 ft east of Franklin Road. Analysis of the projected volumes of traffic to be generated by this proposed development are as follows: the AM peak hour yields approximately 31 vehicles per hour (vph) while the PM peak hour yields approximately 24 vph. Since the maximum volume is less than 100 vph for the peak hours, this 7 Step Analysis satisfies the City of Lawrence’s Development Code and a more detailed Traffic Impact Study will not be required to be performed. The analysis of the proposed development does not indicate that there would be any appreciable change in traffic volumes as a result of this project.
STEP 1: Specific Development Plan and Land Uses

The proposed development plan for this site includes the construction of a 11,875 sq ft shooting range building at 2350 Franklin Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66046. The parking surface will be improved to include 19 typical spaces, 2 accessible spaces, and 2 bicycle spaces. The site will include new curb, new landscaping, ease of maneuverability for large trucks, dumpster enclosure, and ADA accessibility. Below is an image of the proposed site layout. Abutting the property to the south is a storage and office facility which is being redeveloped separately as part of the Mt. Blue PID, Phases I and II. Across Thomas Court to the north is a moving and storage facility. Across Franklin Road to the west is an unincorporated agricultural farm.
STEP 2: Land Uses Shown in Horizon 2020 for the Proposed Development

As shown in the Horizon 2020, The Comprehensive Plan for Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County Amendment 12/13/16, the land use for the site is Industrial, specifically Office Research Industrial/Warehouse/Distribution. The site is currently a vacant lot. The proposed land use is Commercial. The Gun Range development is within the incorporated city limits. The flood map for the selected area is number 20045C0179E, effective on 09/02/2015, did not show the site within the 500 year flood zone.

STEP 3: Functional Classification of the Public Streets Bordering the Site

As shown in the Transportation 2040 developed by the Metropolitan Transportation Plan of Lawrence and Douglas County, the functional classification of the surrounding streets are as follows:

- E 23rd Street/N 1400 Road/K-10 - Principal Arterial
  - Speed limit of 55 mph to the west of Franklin Road and 65mph to the east of Franklin Road
  - Average daily volume was 31,100 vehicles in 2012
- E 25th Street/N 1360 Road - Major Collector
  - Speed limit of 35 mph
- E 25th Terrace - Major Collector
  - Speed limit of 35 mph
- Franklin Road - Local Road
  - Speed limit of 35 mph
- Thomas Court - Local Road
  - Speed limit of 30 mph

There are no known programmed improvements or future planned improvements for any of the roadways listed above in the region directly surrounding the Gun Range development site.
STEP 4: Allowable Access to the Development

Most traffic headed to the site will most likely come via E 23rd Street/N 1400 Road/K-10 since the land to the south of the site is largely undeveloped. 25th Terrace/N 1360 Road is designated as a bike route which provides accessibility to the site, and bicycle parking is proposed at the site to encourage ridership. The City of Lawrence Bus Route 1, Downtown to East Lawrence, includes Franklin Road and already provides access to the site.

STEP 5: Current Public Street Characteristics Adjacent to the Site

The two roadways adjacent to the site are Franklin Road and Thomas Court. Franklin Road is a two-lane local roadway with a 35 mph speed limit. It is 26 ft wide between the edges of pavement and has a curb and gutter system, sidewalks on both sides of the street, and “No Parking” signs along both sides of the street. It connects E 23rd Street/N 1400 Road/K-10 to E 25th Street/N 1360 Road and extends to E 25th Terrace. Thomas Court is a two-lane local roadway with a 30 mph speed limit that connects to Franklin Road but ends in a Cul-de-Sac. It is 24 ft wide between the edges of pavement and has a curb and gutter system and a sidewalk on the northern side of the street. The intersection of Franklin Road & Thomas Court is 420 ft away from the nearest arterial which is E 23rd Street/N 1400 Road/K-10 and there are no sight obstructions for sight distance issues at the intersection.

STEP 6: Proposed Access Compared with AASHTO Criteria

There are two access driveways for the proposed development. The current access driveway on Franklin Road, 50 ft south of Thomas Court, will remain in use and a new access driveway is proposed off of Thomas Court will be 140 ft east of Franklin Road. The proposed access points to the site meets AASHTO criteria and the City of Lawrence Access Management Guidelines. The 140 ft distance between the proposed access point and the intersection of Franklin Road & Thomas Court exceeds the 50 ft minimum requirement. The driveways will both have an throat distance of 50 ft which also meets the requirements of Access Management Guidelines. The
access points will not require a left-turn or right-turn auxiliary lane due to the low volume of generated traffic. There are no sight obstructions or sight distance issues at the driveway intersections. A shared parking lot connection to the businesses to the south is not feasible due to the 6 ft high retaining wall between the properties.

**STEP 7: Estimate of Trips Generated by Existing and Proposed Development**

The existing site has a 409 sq ft building and is vacant, therefore the existing traffic is negligible. For evaluating traffic impacts from new land developments, transportation engineers typically utilize the Trip Generation Manual (9th Edition) published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The 9th Edition is the most current manual and covers a diverse assortment of commercial, residential, industrial and specialty types of land developments. Since ITE data for a shooting range is unavailable, a substitute ITE category and ITE code was used. It was assumed that the 432 (Golf Driving Range) would be a good comparison since there are similar lanes in which a person performs a solo activity. The Gun Range development will provide 10 shooting lanes. Also, the 4,000 sq ft retail area within the building was categorized as ITE Code 826 (Specialty Retail Center). The 10 lanes and 4 thousand sq ft (ksf) of retail was then multiplied by their ITE Average Trip Generation Rates to determine the increased traffic volumes. Volumes were calculated as follows for the daily total and the AM and PM Peak Hours on a typical weekday:
### ITE Trip Generation Manual (9th Edition) Generation Rates and Directional Distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITE Land Use 432 (Golf Driving Range)</th>
<th>Average Trip Generation Rate</th>
<th>Total Traffic</th>
<th>Traffic Entering</th>
<th>Traffic Exiting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Total</td>
<td>13.65 vpd/unit</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td>0.40 vpd/unit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>1.25 vpd/unit</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE Land Use 826 (Specialty Retail Center)</td>
<td>44.32 vpd/unit</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Total</td>
<td>6.84 vpd/unit</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td>2.71 vpd/unit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These volumes are very low and will not significantly change the traffic patterns of the local street network. By-pass traffic will not be generated by these land use categories.

### Summary

Analysis of the projected volumes of traffic to be generated by this proposed development are as follows: the AM peak hour yields approximately 31 vehicles per hour (vph) while the PM peak hour yields approximately 24 vph. As the maximum volume is less than 100 vph, this 7 Step Analysis satisfies the City of Lawrence’s Development Code and a more detailed Traffic Impact Study will not be required to be performed. The analysis of the proposed development does not indicate that there would be any appreciable change in traffic volumes as a result of this project.

### Appendix I - Exhibit Map
FDP-17-00185: Final Development Plan for Mt. Blue Addition, Lot 1 and Mt. Blue Addition No. 2 for mini storage units and a gun range and retail store located at 2350 &2400 Franklin Road
TO: Lawrence Douglas County Planning Commission

FROM: Sandy Day, Planning Staff

Date: May 24, 2017

RE: Extension request for PP-2-1-12 North Lawrence Riverfront Addition

PP-2-1-12: Consider a Preliminary Plat for North Lawrence Riverfront Addition, located at 401 North 2nd Street. This subdivision includes variances related to block length, right-of-way dedication for N. 2nd Street as a principal arterial, and connection of a local street to an arterial street. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for North Mass Redevelopment, LLC, Douglas County Kaw Drainage District, City of Lawrence, Kaw River Estates, LLC, HDD of Lawrence LLC, D & D Rentals of Lawrence LLC, Jeffrey W. Hatfield, Exchange Holdings LLC, Loosehead Investments LLC, and Riverfront Properties of Lawrence LLC, property owners of record.

Attachments: A—Location Map
B—Extension Request
C—Staff Report PP-2-1-12
D – Preliminary Plat Drawing
E – Development concept map from Traffic Impact Study

This preliminary plat was originally approved unanimously by the Planning Commission on July 22, 2015. The project includes two specific variances and one condition.

Variances:
1. Approved a block length in excess of 800’.
2. Approved a reduced right-of-way dedication for N. 2nd Street as a principal arterial street.

Condition:
1. Provision of a revised drawing to include access around tower per staff approval.

The applicant provided a preliminary plat that met the single condition of approval on September 29, 2016.

The preliminary plat was considered along with multiple rezoning requests to consolidate properties into a single district and extend the CD District north of W. 6th Street. The related rezoning requests were also approved and are subject to the condition that specific design
guidelines shall be submitted and approved (by the Planning Commission) prior to publication of the zoning ordinances.

Preliminary Plats are valid for a period of 24 months. This Preliminary Plat is set to expire on July 22, 2017. The applicant has requested an extension of the approval.

Section 20-809 (J) of the Land Development Code outlines the procedure for approving an extension for a preliminary plat.

1. The applicant must make the request prior to the expiration date to the Planning Director.
2. The request shall be placed on the next available Planning Commission agenda with proper notice.
3. If a final plat has not been submitted, approved and recommended within this 24 month prior or within an extension period, a preliminary plat must be resubmitted to the Planning Commission, reviewed and considered by the planning Commission in accordance with applicable review criteria for a preliminary plat.

The contract for purchase of City owned properties and rights-of-way was recently extended by the City Commission in April 2017. There have been no changes to the surrounding area or subdivision regulations that would impact this preliminary plat.

Staff recommends extension of the approval for 24 months.
PP-2-1-12: Extension request for a Preliminary Plat for North Lawrence Riverfront Addition, located at 401 North 2nd street
From: Paul Werner [mailto:paulw@paulwernerarchitects.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:36 AM
To: Scott McCullough
Subject: North Lawrence- North Mass Development - PP#

PP-2-1-12

This preliminary plat is scheduled to expire this summer....

Per our discussions with the city - and the contract, etc...... it would seem there is no reason to let this expire.

I would ask for a 2 year extension - or something that ties to the Final plat, or actually closing on the ground.

I would tell you that I anticipate submitting a revised PP this year,... so that will give everyone another look at something - but don’t want to run the risk of this expiring.

Does that seem reasonable...

Thanks

Paul Werner
Paul Werner Architects
123 W 8th, Suite B2
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
(785) 832-0804
(785) 832-0890 fax
PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT
NON PUBLIC HEARING ITEM
Public Hearing on variance only

PC Staff Report
7/22/15

ITEM NO 6: PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR NORTH LAWRENCE RIVERFRONT ADDITION (SLD)

PP-2-1-12: Consider a Preliminary Plat for North Lawrence Riverfront Addition, located at 401 North 2nd Street. This subdivision includes variances related to block length, right-of-way dedication for N. 2nd Street as a principal arterial, and connection of a local street to an arterial street. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for North Mass Redevelopment, LLC, Douglas County Kaw Drainage District, City of Lawrence, Kaw River Estates, LLC, HDD of Lawrence LLC, D & D Rentals of Lawrence LLC, Jeffrey W. Hatfield, Exchange Holdings LLC, Loosehead Investments LLC, and Riverfront Properties of Lawrence LLC, property owners of record.

VARIANCE RECOMMENDATION:
1. Staff recommends approval of a block length in excess of 800’.
2. Staff recommends approval of reduced right-of-way dedication for N. 2nd Street as a principal arterial street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat for North Lawrence Riverfront Addition subject to the following condition:

1. Provision of a revised drawing to include access around tower per staff approval.

Reason for Request:
Purpose of this application is to clarify property ownership boundaries as a preliminary development step and position the property for transfers of land ownership as development of the property is planned. Existing development is intended to remain in the interim.

KEY POINTS
- Platting required as pre-development step.
- Easements and rights-of-way serving existing development will remain in the interim.
- Unused or undeveloped right-of-way will be vacated through this subdivision process.
- Current ownership includes both public and private property owners.

SUBDIVISION CITATIONS TO CONSIDER
- This application is being reviewed under the Subdivision Regulations for Lawrence and Unincorporated Douglas County, effective Jan 10, 2012.
- Section 20-810 Subdivision Design Standards
- Section 20-813 (g) Variances

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A: Preliminary Plat
Attachment B: development concept from TIS
Attachment C: North Lawrence Improvement Association boundary map
ASSOCIATED CASES/OTHER ACTION REQUIRED

Associated Cases:

Note: Zoning has been approved by the City Commission May 1, 2012 subject to approval and adoption of design guidelines. The design guidelines have not yet been approved.

- **Z-12-29-11**: Consider a request to rezone approximately 1.38 acres from IG (General Industrial) and CS (Commercial Strip) to CD (Downtown Commercial), located at 401 & 415 North 2nd Street. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for Exchange Holdings LLC, property owner of record.
- **Z-12-30-11**: Consider a request to rezone approximately 2.14 acres from IG (General Industrial) to CD (Downtown Commercial), located at 0 & 100 Lincoln Street and 151 & 100 Perry Street. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for D&D Rentals of Lawrence, LLC, property owner of record.
- **Z-12-32-11**: Consider a request to rezone approximately .83 acres from IG (General Industrial) and CS (Commercial Strip) to CD (Downtown Commercial), located at 409 & 501 North 2nd Street. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for Jeffrey Hatfield, property owner of record.
- **Z-12-33-11**: Consider a request to rezone approximately .34 acres from OS (Open Space) and CS (Commercial Strip) to CD (Downtown Commercial), located at 300, 311, & 317 North 2nd Street. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for Riverfront Properties of Lawrence, LLC, property owner of record.
- **Z-12-34-11**: Consider a request to rezone approximately 1.61 acres from IG (General Industrial) to CD (Downtown Commercial), located at 139 Perry Street, 505 North 2nd Street & 141 Maple Street. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for HDD of Lawrence, LLC, property owner of record.
- **Z-12-35-11**: Consider a request to rezone approximately .55 acres from IG (General Industrial) to CD (Downtown Commercial), located at 133 Perry Street. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for Kaw River Estates, LLC, property owner of record.
- **Z-12-36-11**: Consider a request to rezone approximately 1.38 acres from IG (General Industrial) to CD (Downtown Commercial), located at 600 North 1st Street, Block 3. Submitted by Paul Werner Architects, for Abfield Investments, property owner of record.

Other Action Required:

- Submittal of final plat for administrative approval and recordation.
- City Commission acceptance of dedication of easements and vacations of existing right-of-way as depicted on the on the Final Plat.
- Submittal and approval of public improvement plans and provision of means of assurance of completion shall be submitted prior to the recording of the Final Plat.

PLANS AND STUDIES REQUIRED

- **Downstream Sanitary Sewer Analysis** – The understanding of the Department of Utilities is that this preliminary plat is only related to existing utilities at the site. Therefore, the Department of Utilities has no comments related to this submittal. For future improvements to the site, additional comments will be applicable. Per Administrative Policy 76, a downstream sanitary sewer analysis is required as part of this project. Sanitary sewer model results were provided to Landplan Engineering on September 24, 2014.
- **Drainage Study** – A comprehensive drainage study is required for the future development of this area. The existing storm sewer network will not handle any additional stormwater runoff. All stormwater runoff generated by additional impervious surfaces will need to be collected and pumped straight to the Kansas River.
- **Traffic Study** – Accepted by Staff. Additional review of a traffic study may be needed as development details are made available for this project.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**
None received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Area: 16.116 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Right-of-Way (acres): No new right-of-way proposed. Preliminary Plat proposes to vacate existing right-of-way for streets and alley and dedicate instead access easement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Proposed Lots: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot size 16.116 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum lot size 16.116 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average lot size 16.116 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developable area 16.116 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning and Land Use: Existing zoning includes CS (Commercial Strip) District, IG (General Industrial) District and OS (Open Space) District. – Pending approval of CD (Downtown Commercial). Existing improvements include manufactured homes and commercial businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the north; north of Lyon Street: OS (Open Space) District; existing Riverfront Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the east; east of the railroad tracks north of Lincoln Street: IG (General Industrial) District and CS (Commercial Strip) District; existing automotive sales and services and contractor shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the east; east of N. 2nd Street south of Lincoln Street: CS (Commercial Strip) District; existing parking lot. IG (General Industrial) District; manufacturing use. GPI (General Public and Institution) District; Union Pacific Depot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the south: OS (Open Space) District; existing Riverfront Park and River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the west: OS (Open Space) District; existing levee and Riverfront Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REVIEW
This property is proposed to be platted as a single lot for the purposes of establishing a defined boundary between the levee and the development parcel. Existing access and utilities will be retained through easements. Interior right-of-way is proposed to be vacated through this development.

This property is located in what is generally known as North Lawrence. However, the mapped neighborhood boundary begins along the east side of N. 2nd Street, excluding this area. The area located along N. 2nd Street between the river and Highway 70 is an existing commercial and industrial corridor.

The property includes multiple ownership including property owned by the City of Lawrence and the Kaw Drainage District. A separate map attached highlights the location of the publically owned parcels within the boundary of the preliminary plat. The developer has executed an agreement with the city to acquire certain properties to facilitate development.

Zoning and Land Use
This property currently includes multiple zoning districts. Zoning has been approved for CD (Downtown Commercial) zoning but is not effective at this time. The CD zoning was approved subject to a condition regarding the development and approval of commercial design guidelines. At this time, the guidelines have not been developed or approved; therefore, the CD zoning status is pending. The applicant desires to complete the land consolidation phase of the development while
the design guidelines are being developed. Design guidelines for the redevelopment of this property would be considered by the Planning Commission as a future agenda item.

Existing land uses include commercial and residential uses. Attachment E highlights the location of existing structures on the property. Much of the existing property is vacant.

Two significant structures are “Johnny’s” located on the northwest corner of Locust Street and N. 2nd Street and the “Gaslight” building located on the southwest corner of Locust Street and N. 2nd Street. The intent of the development is to retain these two buildings. The locations of the buildings frame the intersection and provide an entry to the development. Most, if not all, of the remaining structures will be demolished prior to redevelopment of the site. There is no timeline for redevelopment of the property.

The levee (Riverfront Park) is also a significant land use within the immediate area of the subject property. This feature marks the western boundary of the development area and is intended to be significantly incorporated into the redevelopment of the site.

A related land use of this property is the regulatory floodplain. Much of the property is protected by the levee. However, a small area is designated in zone AH. This floodplain will require consideration in future development applications as the project advances. The applicant has been working with City Staff regarding stormwater requirements for this project. Easements shown on the preliminary plat are intended to accommodate the existing development. Prior to redevelopment of the site; easements will be revised through a new subdivision plat of this property.

**Lot Design**

This property is proposed, at this time, as a one lot subdivision with interior access and utility easement. The lot fronts along N. 2nd Street along the length of the east property line. The irregular shape of the lot is a function of the levee, railroad right-of-way and existing highway/street configuration. Long term plans include future subdivision of the property. At this time the purpose of the subdivision plat is to establish clear and distinct boundaries to accommodate development planning.

This project retains existing easements that provide water and sanitary sewer service to existing development. Public streets and alleys are proposed to be vacated. The proposed Preliminary Plat complies with the minim lot design standards for subdivisions. However since the property is proposed as a single lot the block length exceeds 800 feet. The overall block length, measured across the length of the property is approximately 2,000 feet. Section 20-810 (d) (2) of the Subdivision Regulations states:

> Block length for Local Streets within the City of Lawrence shall not exceed 800 feet in length (centerline to centerline of streets) unless the subdivider demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that:

> a. There are pedestrian Ways at intervals of 700 feet or less, replacing the connection that would exist as a sidewalk along the street; and

> b. The proposed block must be greater than 800’ in length because physical conditions preclude a block length of less than 800 feet. Such conditions may include, but are not limited to, topography or the existence of natural resource areas such as jurisdictional wetlands, floodplains, wildlife habitats areas, steep slopes or woodlands.
The block length of the street frontage of N. 2nd Street is 792.89’, excluding the 95.46’ that overlay with the railroad right of way.

![Figure 3: Block Length Exhibit](image)

The green line in the above graphic highlights the street frontage used for measuring block length. The red line highlights that segment of the street right-of-way that overlaps with the railroad right-of-way. It is in that north 95’ that the street continues north through an underpass. Conservatively, to comply with the subdivision regulations, a variance is needed regarding block length.
VARIANCE NO. 1: Block length in excess of 800 feet per Section 20-810 (d).
The standard for the required block length assumes intersecting streets but allows for pedestrian easements. This property is uniquely shaped as a factor of the Kansas River, levee system, railroad right-of-way and location of N. 2nd Street/Highway 24/40.

Criteria 1: Strict application of these regulations will create an unnecessary hardship upon the subdivider.

The purpose of this application is to consolidate multiple parcels into a single lot to facilitate future redevelopment. Existing improvements will remain with access easement providing interior circulation. At this time access easements are provided between N. 2nd Street and the interior of the site. Separately dedicated pedestrian easements are not included at this time. It is anticipated that the property will be re-subdivided in the future when development plans are more refined. The dedication of any pedestrian easements would not necessarily be meaningful.

There are no existing pedestrian facilities in the area other than the levee trail located in Riverfront Park. No changes to that trail or the boundaries of the levee are proposed to be altered with this application.

STAFF FINDING: Strict application of the regulations would result in dedication of easements that may or may not be useful with the future development plans. General access circulation is retained though access and utility easements.

Criteria 2: The proposed variance is in harmony with the intended purpose of these regulations.

This design standard is intended to provide pedestrian access and connectivity as part of a development or redevelopment project.

The intent of this Preliminary Plat is to combine multiple lots into a single lot to facilitate redevelopment of the property. This is an interim development application to accommodate the applicant’s desire to define the development boundaries and retain existing development in the interim.

STAFF FINDING: Granting this requested variance from the required block length is not opposed to the purpose and intent of the regulations and does not impact this design principle.

Criteria 3: The public health, safety, and welfare will be protected.

The current frontage for N. 2nd Street is unchanged with this application. As future development plans are refined additional connections and pedestrian facilities will be provided.

STAFF FINDING: Granting this requested variance from the required block length will not harm the public health, safety or welfare. These public aspirations will continue to be protected though the planning of corridor improvements and future re-subdivision of this property.
Streets and Access
This property includes a number of existing public streets and alleys though not all have been constructed. The following table summarizes the affected streets within the boundary of the preliminary plat.

Table 1: Street Vacation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Street and Alley Vacation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Locust Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maple Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perry Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lincoln Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Massachusetts Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• N. 1st Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Various alleys located south of Maple Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vacation of the right-of-way for these streets will provide more buildable area as the property is redeveloped. Access to structures will be retained with internal access easements as shown on the attached exhibit.

Access to Bowersock Dam, Riverfront Park and the KP&L tower are located at the south end of the property. Access to these facilities must be maintained. The access easement, as proposed, provides connectivity but much of the access is obstructed by the KP&L tower. The easement will need to be adjusted to comply with this design requirement. This requirement is reflected as a condition of approval.
This project includes an additional access to N. 2nd Street at the north end of the bridge. Across from Elm Street. The design intent is for a “right-out” only and for use by emergency responders as needed. Access to the site is complicated by the location of the existing railroad corridor along the eastern side of the property. Maple Street is not sufficiently north of the Locust Street intersection to provide street separation to function as a viable second point of full access. Intersections farther north would require crossing over or under the existing rail corridor. These options for various reasons are not feasible. To off-set the creation of a new at-grade rail crossing, multiple existing at-grade crossings must be eliminated. There are no reasonable candidates for at-grade crossing closures in the immediate vicinity of this proposed development. Bridging over or tunneling under the rail corridor is economically infeasible at this time.

This fact limits the property to one full access point at the intersection of Locust Street and N. 2nd Street. This intersection was recently reconstructed. No intersection improvements are proposed at this time.

N. 2nd Street provides the primary access to this area. N. 2nd Street is a designated as a principal arterial street. As such, N. 2nd Street requires 150’ of right-of-way to comply with the subdivision design guidelines. Right-of-way along this corridor varies widely from 130’ to 80’ between the north end of the bridge and the south side of the overpass. This project does not include the dedication of any new or additional right-of-way along N. 2nd Street. There are no plans to widen the right-of-way along this street segment.

Per section 20-810 (E), local streets should not intersect with arterial streets. As noted N. 2nd Street is an arterial Street. Locust Street, however, is a local street. The Subdivision states:

*Local Streets generally should not intersect Arterial Streets. The Planning Commission, with The City Engineer’s recommendation, may approve a new connection of a Local Street to an Arterial Street:*

a. Where it finds that such connection is part of the best traffic solution for the new Subdivision; and

b. Where the Subdivider will add turn lanes or other Improvements recommended by the City Engineer to the Arterial Street to minimize the impact of the connection on the functioning of the Arterial Street.

In this application the existing Locust Street intersection is an existing condition. Additionally, the applicant proposes to vacate the west leg of the Locust Street intersection making it an access
drive. Early plans included retaining the west leg of the intersection as a public street, therefore requiring the variance as advertised. The secondary access discussed previously would also be an access drive rather than a public street. The City Engineer has accepted the proposed design. City Staff will continue to review access and interior circulation as site development plans are made available.

**VARIANCE NO 2: Reduction in the width of right-of-way from 150’ to variable as required for a Principal Arterial Street (N. 2nd Street) per Section 20-810 (e) (5).**

The standard for the required right-of-way width changed in 2006 from 100’ to 150’. The 150’ of required right-of-way is more applicable to new greenfield development rather than existing corridors. There are no plans to widening this segment of the corridor.

N. 2nd Street is a developed corridor with an existing bridge structure crossing the Kansas River at the south end and a railroad underpass located north of the Locust Street intersection. These two features are fixed. The city owns property on the east side of this segment of the corridor.

**Criteria 1:** Strict application of these regulations will create an unnecessary hardship upon the subdivider.

The purpose of this application is to consolidate multiple parcels into a single lot to facilitate redevelopment. Existing buildings are located along the east property line of the property and are intended to remain. Widening the right-of-way would result in these building encroaching into public right-of-way. The buildings would need to be either demolished or relocated outside of the right-of-way to avoid the encroachment. This location change of existing buildings is considered to be a material loss to the historic context of the immediate area.

**STAFF FINDING:** Strict application of the regulations would limit the owner’s ability to retain existing development along N. 2nd Street.

**Criteria 2:** The proposed variance is in harmony with the intended purpose of these regulations.

This design standard was adopted in 2006 with the Land Development Code. The wider right-of-width accommodates street design with boulevards, multiple lanes and amenities that may or may not exist along developed street segments within the community. Similar variances have been granted for other projects located along developed urban corridors designated as arterial streets.

The intent of the preliminary plat is to combine multiple lots into a single lot to facilitate redevelopment of the property.

Section 20-810 (e) (1) provides general design criteria for streets. Subsection iii states "Arterial and collector streets shall be laid-out, arranged and designed in accordance with any adopted Major Thoroughfares Map or corridor plan." N. 2nd Street is identified as a Principal Arterial Street and is an existing street.

**STAFF FINDING:** Granting this requested variance from the required right-of-way is not opposed to the purpose and intent of the regulations and does not impact this design principle.

**Criteria 3:** The public health, safety, and welfare will be protected.

The current width for N. 2nd Street is variable. The current right-of-way is an existing condition of the corridor.
**STAFF FINDING:** Granting this requested variance from the required right-of-way will not harm the public health, safety or welfare. These public aspirations will continue to be protected through the planning of corridor improvements.

**Public Space and Green Space**
Several properties within the project boundary are owned by the City of Lawrence or the Douglas County Kaw Drainage District. The development group has executed a development agreement with the City and the Drainage District that allows for land transfers to sell the properties. These properties are located adjacent to the levee that is also part of the Riverfront Park. There is an existing trail along the riverfront that also provides vehicular access to the levee as needed.

The area at the south end of the project represents the lowest level of the site making the levee trail accessible. This accessibility will need to be maintained. Additionally, the KP&L tower located at the south end will also remain. The Preliminary Plat, as proposed, shows access to the public levee trail aligned with the tower. As noted earlier this access will need to be adjusted.

Early review comments from the Parks and Recreation Department indicated a recommendation to retain city properties as open space. Additionally, landscape treatment along the N. 2nd Street corridor should be designed and installed in a manner that is compatible with the adopted landscape plan along N. 2nd Street. Redevelopment of this property will include changes in ownership and the transfer of City owned parcels to the development group. Development of the site must include appropriate landscape treatment of the N. 2nd Street corridor and non-motorized connections between the levee path and the development.

Figure 8 shows the existing access to the levee trail at the south end of the subject property. Access is accommodated through tracts of land owned by the City of Lawrence. The existing KP&L tower is proposed to remain in the redevelopment plans for this property. Access to the tower, levee and Bowersock Dam must also be maintained.

Figure 9 shows existing public open spaces that have been enhanced by the City along the east side of N. 2nd Street. Similar and/or complementary landscape treatments will be expected along the corridor as the site redevelops.
Figure 8: Location of existing buildings located on the northwest and southwest corner of Locust Street and N. 2nd Street.

Utilities and Infrastructure
At this time all existing utilities will be retained and maintained within easements to serve the existing development. The applicant has been working with city staff to define specific requirements that will be applicable to redevelopment of this property in the future. Expectations include providing adequate easement or right-of-way to accommodate a looped water line for two points of feed to the system. Existing utility lines will be replaced when the property is redeveloped. The applicant has been advised that the water lines must be replaced. Similar infrastructure improvements will be needed for the sanitary sewer service for this property with redevelopment. A future development application will require a full downstream sanitary sewer analysis as part of the submission application documents.

Easements and Rights-of-Way
Redevelopment of this property will include additional subdivision plat applications that will further revise and refine easements and interior right-of-way as applicable to support the intended design, building placement and necessary access. Access to N. 2nd Street will remain at Locust Street and will remain as the primary entrance into this development.

Conformance
With the exception of the variances noted above, the proposed preliminary plat complies with the applicable subdivision regulations.
Please note: I am in strong favor of this addition. I believe it will bring to the East Gateway entry to Lawrence a presence needed to help revitalize the City's established river connection and expand the downtown vibrancy so needed.

I am also strongly in favor of the completion of the walking loop by connecting East Lawrence /North Lawrence and Pickney neighborhood with two pedestrian/bicycle bridges over the Kaw River. One starting from the North end of New York St. spanning to Walnut St Levee and one from the Riverfront Addition to Burcham Park trail.

I believe this would be of major benefit for citizens and visitors alike.

Thank you for this consideration.

Randy S. Warren
216 Lincoln
Lawrence, Is.

785-230-3063