

**Dan Warner**

---

**From:** Anne M. Bracker [annem@brackers.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 26, 2010 4:58 PM  
**To:** Dan Warner  
**Subject:** Northeast Sector Plan comments

Dear Dan,

I have read through most of the comments posted online regarding the Northeast Sector plan. This *has* to be a daunting task - trying to balance the rights of landowners to make their own decisions about land use vs. the responsible planning of the area for the benefit of the community as a whole. I can easily see both sides of the debate. Many people buy land in rural areas so they can get away from city life and enjoy rural living, but then object on the basis of over-population issues when someone wants to buy adjacent land for the same reason. I've heard that debate many times from my neighbors (I grew up in a rural area south of Lawrence). But what right does any of us have to decide if a family can sell off some agricultural land for development? On the other hand, I also shop at the Farmer's Market and enjoy locally grown foods and want to protect that sector of my community, too. There are important economic and environmental considerations for promoting agriculture. I surely don't have the answer to finding that balance, or even suggestions on determining the value of any criteria you may use as *you as a planner* attempt to find that balance.

I do, however, have a few brief comments as I look through the Northeast Sector 1st Draft.

1) Map 2-3 - Water Infrastructure Plan

This map does not accurately reflect the service lines for Jefferson County Rural Water District #13. GPS/GIS information should be available by now, as well as current detailed mapping of water transmission lines. Also, the RWD is currently installing some major capital improvements throughout the district which should increase service capacity in several areas included in the sector plan. Although any potential development would be considered very low-density residential (or lower) due to the minimum allowable lot size (3, 5, 10, and 20 acre lots according to current Douglas County zoning regulations), it would still affect several parts of the sector: drainage, transit, utility services, environmental factors, etc. When I was on the board of directors for Jeff RWD #13, I would hear about developments (both speculative and actively planned) in areas that surprised me, even though my family has owned a business near Teepee Junction since 1982 and I'm fairly familiar with areas immediately north of Lawrence. Encouraging utilities and developers in the sector to incorporate these factors into their own plans for maintenance and future growth areas would reinforce the overall plan for decades in the future.

2) In the appropriate future policy section, I would encourage adding an environmental section, primarily to address issues relating to agricultural chemicals (insecticides/herbicides) that might affect groundwater, as well as the effects from the Southern Star and Williams gas lines (i.e. how is the surrounding land affected in the event of a line break). I was on the RWD board for nearly a decade (I left the board just a couple of years ago, so my reference knowledge isn't too far out of date) and both issues were frequent topics of discussion as they might affect the land owners as well as the district's water supplies. MTBE was a considerable concern (i.e. leaks/spills when gassing up farm vehicles) of potential affects for many I spoke with, as well as the effects of petroleum hydrocarbons in general.

3) Has there been any consideration of how a green energy development might factor in to this plan? Does the plan encourage or discourage things like a wind or solar energy "farm" development? Those

uses don't really fit into the standard agriculture, industrial, or commercial uses. The current presidential administration is actively encouraging green energy sources, and although it's impossible to predict how it might affect the Northeast sector in the future, it should at least be considered during the plan development. It would be unfortunate if we couldn't take advantage of an opportunity to promote clean, green energy in our community because the sector plan neglected to consider the subject.

Thanks,  
Anne

Contact info for Jeff RWD13: 785-842-1502, fax 842-6315, [jeffrwd13@hughes.net](mailto:jeffrwd13@hughes.net)

**Anne M. Bracker (ext. 203)**

*"Therapy is expensive. Clay is cheap. The choice is yours."*

**Bracker's Good Earth Clays, Inc.**  
**1831 E 1450 Road**  
**Lawrence, KS 66044**

**TOLL FREE: 1-888-822-1982**

**LOCAL: 785-841-4750**

**FAX: 785-841-8142**

**<http://www.brackers.com>**

This communication contains proprietary business information and may contain confidential information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately destroy, discard, or erase this communication.



**To: Dan Warner**  
**From: Beth Johnson, Vice President Economic Development**  
**Subject: Northeast Sector Plan**  
**Date: April 15, 2010**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Northeast Sector Plan. As the economic and business development organization for Lawrence and Douglas County, we take great interest in developmental areas zoned or proposed for future growth of commercial and industrial property. In our quest to bring job opportunities and diversification of the tax base it is important that we understand the zoning regulations and allowable uses within each area. With that in mind, our comments center on the “agri-industry” designation.

After reading through the proposed draft as well as the industrial chapter of Horizon 2020, it is unclear the definition of “agri-industry”. Without a clear definition it is hard to determine what type of industry is allowed in the area. When will a definition be determined and who will provide that definition?

We receive many different business development inquiries each year and a definition is needed in order to determine what business use is allowable as one persons definition is not the same as the next. For instance, is a beef slaughterhouse acceptable since cows are an agricultural product? Or what about a company that manufacturers combine headers as a combine is essential in the harvesting of crops? Or what about a cold storage facility for the storage of fruits and vegetables that are harvested for distribution and consumption? These are but a few examples but very diverse in nature, hopefully, making the point that without a definition there is a potentially wide variation in interpretation of what is allowed in an “agri-industry” land use category.

We would also like to comment on the issue of changing the land use in this area in the Horizon 2020 plan from industrial to agri-industrial. The areas directly around the airport, especially to the south and west are ideal locations for industrial property. The land is flat, it is directly adjacent to the interstate, it has rail access, there now exists water and sewer service to the area and there is not a large concentration of residential uses within this area. Our region is in need of large industrial tracts that are adjacent to our transportation arteries and the property adjacent to the airport meets all the criteria.

As the Planning Commission considers these changes we would ask that take into consideration the limitations that would be created by placing a land use designation of “agri-industry” on properties with the Northeast Sector.

## CITIZENS FOR RESPONSIBLE PLANNING

April 15, 2010

Dan Warner, Long-Range Planner  
Lawrence-Douglas County Planning Office  
6 E. 6th Street  
Lawrence, KS 66044

Dear Dan,

We are writing to comment on the 1st Draft of the Northeast Sector Plan that has just been completed. It is apparent that you carefully considered much of the public input you heard and incorporated a great deal into this draft plan. Citizens for Responsible Planning is grateful for this effort.

We are going to try and order our concerns with reference to page, paragraph, or map numbers to hopefully facilitate easier understanding.

One of our initial concerns focuses on the economic development potential of the Lawrence Municipal Airport. CRP has consistently advocated for development of aviation industries on the airport property. The City is in process of bringing sized lines for water and sewer to support just such new aviation start-ups at the airport.

We request that consideration be given to the following suggested specific word revisions *identified in italics*:

Pg. 1-2 Paragraph #3 - Development shall not be permitted on steep slopes (15% or greater), regulatory floodplains or other environmentally sensitive areas, and *any designated historic sites, landmarks, and environs. No development shall compromise the future economic development potential of the Lawrence Municipal Airport and shall comply with all FAA regulatory standards.*

Pg. 1-6 Add to the list of documents:

- *FAA Regulations and associated maps - Wildlife Mitigation*
- *Runway Protection Zone Map and associated industrial restrictions*
- *Mayor's Task Force reports on Climate Change and Peak Oil*

Pg. 3-1 Add to: Due to the unique challenges to development, including:

- *FAA Regulations and Lawrence Municipal Airport Protection Zones*

Pg. 3-2 Industrial/Employment Use

- Support continued development of the Airport property for aviation-related businesses *as the primary industry for the planning area.*

Pg. 3-7 - #4 Infrastructure

Goal: Improve existing services for the area and recognize the infrastructure challenges posed by the unique characteristics of the area when considering development applications. The unique characteristics include:

- Relatively flat terrain
- Floodplain/stormwater challenges – Drainage Issues
- Township roads
- *FAA regulations - Wildlife Mitigation Zone*

Our second area of concern relates to the Capability Class 1 and 2 Soils in the Planning Area.

Pg. 2-17 Map references are incorrect. It appears that perhaps additional maps were added after text was completed.

Add referenced statement in place of: It is also generally believed that these soils are more permeable and assist in stormwater management.

Change to: *USDA/NRCS - Rossville Silt Loam - Properties and qualities- Capacity to the most limiting layer to transmit water. (Very high to High - .60" - 2.00"/hour) 80" of continuous silt loam profiles. These soils are highly permeable and assist in stormwater management.*

Pg. 3-6 Agricultural Economy

- Designate and support industrial/employment uses north of Highway 24/40 and west of the airport.

This area is comprised of 100 % Capability Class 1 Soil - specifically Rossville Silt Loam. This approximately 40 - 50 acre area has a significant portion that falls within the airport runway protection zone and is adjacent to the Maple Grove Tributary - a major floodway in the planning area. This area falls well within the

Wildlife Mitigation Zone which creates concerns for any retention ponds for stormwater runoff mitigation. This area as mapped on 3-1 Future Land Use seems to be a poor choice for industrial development and contradictory to much language represented in this document. If this area progresses to development we would ask for a cost benefit analysis, recognizing that infrastructure to this development would require public funds and would bring into play the North Lawrence Drainage Study. We would also request that a record of Capability Class 1 and 2 soils lost to development be kept as a reference tool.

Additionally, the recent report from the Mayor's Climate Protection Task Force includes this recommendation: "In the interest of maintaining local food supplies, consider prohibiting the conversion of prime agricultural soils to alternate uses." The current draft of the Mayor's Task Force on Peak Oil contains this recommendation: "Develop and implement a plan to protect identified, priority agricultural resources -- particularly Capability Class 1 and Class 2 soils -- from uses that would degrade or deplete the critical agricultural resource base and/or impede conversion to or use for agricultural production." Proposed industrial use of this particular area thus seems contrary to emerging city policies.

Pg. 3-9, 3.2.1.4 Agri-Industry

We recommend that the current industrial areas be rezoned to comply with the proposed uses in this Sector Plan. We find the definition of "Agri-Industry" needs a more clear definition and should prohibit industrial manufacturing industries. We recommend that the Capability Class 1 and 2 soils around the intersection of Highway 24/40 and East 1500 Road and south to I-70 shall be protected for agricultural use and to improve storm water management. Urbanization of this area is contradictory with these purposes. We request the Neighborhood Commercial and Industrial and Agri-Industry area be reclassified for agricultural uses. We request that the following sentence be removed from the permitted uses within an Agri-Industry area.

~~*The Agri-Industry Use may or may not urbanize.*~~

The "snowflake" designation at Midland Junction was placed at that location prior to this Sector Plan Study. Therefore that designation was made prior to a complete understanding of the difficulties and challenges associated with this area.

- Pg. 3-2 Industrial/Employment Use
- Pg. 3-2 Commercial Use

In both of these references to Midland Junction it is stated that adoption of the Nodal Plan for the area should precede development. We request that this designation be removed from Midland Junction until such time as the Nodal Plan is adopted and the curve at Midland Junction can be made safer. Our argument for this comes from past observations that developers reference these designations as confirmation that development is encouraged in an area. This seems to be an unnecessary point of contention until a Nodal Plan can be completed. Chapter 7 of Horizon 2020 states that development in this area is not anticipated for more than 30 years.

We request that references to the extraction of sand, gravel, topsoil, etc. be removed.

Pg. 3-4 Item 2 - Environmental Resources

Goal: Consider the unique environmental resources of the area when reviewing development applications. Environmental resources include:

Sand, gravel, topsoil, etc.

We request that sand, gravel, topsoil, etc. be removed from the list of environmental resources. With all of the proposed reduced UGA well within the FAA 10,000' Wildlife Mitigation Zone no extraction process would be allowed that required any water containment feature. This is not a compatible use within the designated planning area.

Pg. 2-16 Paragraph #3 - 3rd Bullet

- The City should purchase parcels of land as necessary for use as dedicated ponding areas.

How can this be done and stay within FAA regulatory compliance?

Pg. 3-2 Policies – General – 3<sup>rd</sup> Bullet

Please strike "~~impervious surfaces~~" to avoid unnecessary confusion in understanding the intention of this policy.

In order to add greater depth of understanding in Section 2, we recommend identification of percentages of Class 1 and 2 soils within the planned sector.

Finally we would like to advocate for beginning study with Tom Morey, NFIP Coordinator to review implementation of No Adverse Impact Regulatory System.

Thank you for reviewing our concerns and comments. We continue to appreciate the public forum being given this process.

Respectfully submitted,

Citizens for Responsible Planning Steering Committee

Barbara Clark

Chuck Marsh

Eileen Larson

Ellen Paulsen

Jerry Jost

Lane Williams

Margaret Farley

Mary Ann Stewart

Ron Schneider

Ted Boyle

April 12, 2010

Planning Commission and Commissioners,

This note is in regard to the North East Sector plan draft. I refer specifically to Section 3.1.

As owners of three agricultural tracts in the Northeast Sector plan, it seems to us the plan over reaches in having areas designated to be agri-serving, soil conserving. With those restrictions it can certainly reduce the market value of at least one tract of land that we own. We doubt investors will consider development with those limiting restrictions. Restrictions on land use generally limit economic development, which adversely affects job creation and property tax base.

We realize there are infrastructure issues that would need resolution before any industry could locate in the North East Sector. There is potentially land in the sector that many industries see appealing mainly because of interstate access and proximity to city utilities. With these restrictions the appeal for investors is taken “off the table”, which affects landowners in the area in reduced land value and could affect the community as a whole by discouraging economic development.

James E. and Dorothy Congrove

## Grant Township Comments on NE Sector Plan Draft dated March 12, 2010

Dan,

The Grant Township Board of Trustees wishes to provide the following comments on the Northeast Sector Plan draft dated March 12, 2010.

First, let me congratulate the authors on a concise yet thorough draft. I believe you've captured the majority of concerns of the participants and clearly and fairly documented the issues at hand.

Specific comments:

- 1) (Minor) Page 1-2, paragraph 1: "The planning area ... encompasses most of Grant Township..." I believe it encompasses all of Grant Township.
- 2) (Minor) Page 1-2, paragraph 3: "... access to paved roads ...". It is Grant Township's current policy to not pave any additional roads in the Township.
- 3) (Minor) Page 2-23, paragraph 1: "The Township also maintains a facility near Midland Junction where it stores and services equipment needed for road maintenance." (added text underlined)
- 4) (Minor) Page 2-23: KDOT also has a facility in the planning area – NE corner of Teepee Junction.
- 5) (Major) Page 3-2 General Policies: "Annex property in an orderly manner ..." The plan should recognize that annexation of existing commercial and industrial property in the planning area could remove a significant fraction (more than half) of the property tax base from Grant Township. The plan should suggest that renegotiation and reduction in the contract fee that the Township pays the City of Lawrence if and when this occurs. The current contract between the city and township includes language to this effect.
- 6) (Major) Page 3-2: Commercial Use. The plan should recognize and state more firmly the dangerous traffic situation on US-24-59 at Midland Junction.
- 7) (Major) Page 3-4: Floodplain: "... in flood hazard areas." Where are these areas identified?
- 8) (Major) Page 3-6 Agriculture Economy: The plan should identify and protect two established ag businesses in the planning area: Chestnut Charlie's orchard and Pinwheel Farms. Both of these businesses are in the area identified as Industrial areas on page 3-12 (I believe). Annexation and/or industrial development near these sites may prevent these established businesses from remaining economically viable.

9) (Minor) Page 3-12 DRAFT Future Land Use Map: The University of Kansas is establishing an experimental medicine garden just north of the Grant Township Community Center (Prairie Moon School) on E1600 Rd.

Rich Bireta  
Grant Township Trustee

**Dan Warner**

---

**From:** Paul J. Holmes [pjhrbj@swbell.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 23, 2010 1:15 PM  
**To:** Dan Warner  
**Subject:** NE plan draft

Dear Dan \_ I have reviewed your March draft. I like that it appears to be more receptive to industrial development west of the airport and along the highways. I am concerned (since I live on E1550) that the plan invites future interference in land use adjacent to the "KU field office". Your language is extremely vague. Anything deemed "protective " of the field office is ok.. This "field office" is all the land KU owns as I read your definition. Will this prevent me from expanding my residence? Hunting on my property? You know some people are really fanatical about nature and will use this language to object to just about anything adjacent landowners want to do with their land. Shouldn't we be governed by the same standards as everyone else in the NE sector?

Paul J. Holmes  
Phone: 409-835-5011, ext. 782  
Fax: 409-835-5729  
Home Phone: 409-899-2347  
Personal E-mail: [pjhrbj@swbell.net](mailto:pjhrbj@swbell.net)  
Work E-mail: [paulholmes@mehaffyweber.com](mailto:paulholmes@mehaffyweber.com)

**Dan Warner**

---

**From:** Kettle, Dean [kettle@ku.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 13, 2010 1:36 PM  
**To:** Dan Warner  
**Cc:** Monte Soukup  
**Subject:** FW: Commnets on Northeast Sector Plan

Hi Dan,

I missed something on my suggested rewrite of the previously mentioned paragraph - KU operates the field station but the land is actually owned by the KU Endowment Association. Therefore that first sentence should read "Kansas University ~~owns and~~ maintains the Kansas University Field Station (KSRKUFS) in the northeast corner of the planning area on land owned by the Kansas University Endowment Association."

Sorry for any confusion, but thanks for helping get things straightened out.

Dean

W. Dean Kettle, Ph.D.  
 Associate Director, University of Kansas Field Station  
 Kansas Biological Survey  
 2101 Constant Avenue  
 Lawrence, KS 66047-3759

Office phone: 785-864-1540  
 FAX: 785-1534  
 www.ksr.ku.edu

---

**From:** Kettle, Dean  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 13, 2010 10:55 AM  
**To:** Dan Warner  
**Cc:** Scott McCullough; Edward A. Martinko (martinko@KU.EDU); 'Monte Soukup'  
**Subject:** Commnets on Northeast Sector Plan

Dear Dan:

Below are comments, and a request for some changes, in one paragraph of the 1<sup>st</sup> Draft of the Northeast Sector Plan. These are mostly stylistic and otherwise serve to update material. The paragraph is found under section "2.5 Community Facilities" on page 2-23. Here are the changes we would like:

1. The name and acronym for our unit is Kansas University Field Station (KUFS), not "Kansas Field Station (KSR)." We've recently changed the name and acronym for the station and prefer the updates going forward.
2. Please use the name Fitch Natural History Reservation, not "Fitch Preserve."
3. There are actually 4 miles of nature trails on the Fitch Natural History Reservation and the adjacent McColl Nature Reserve, all of which are in Douglas County and within the planning area. Presently the paragraph describes only 2 miles of trails on the Fitch Natural History Reservation. Again, this is a relatively new development, but important for the document.

Below I have taken the existing paragraph and shown where to delete/insert words to implement these changes. I did this simply thinking that it would be more efficient for you to see how the changes might be implemented.

“The ~~KSR~~KUFS was established in 1947 and is the biological field station of Kansas University. Numerous research and teaching activities take place at the ~~KSR~~KUFS. Much of the ~~KSR~~KUFS is also located in neighboring Jefferson and Leavenworth counties and is not accessible to the public. However, the ~~KSR~~KUFS also maintains ecological reserves in the planning area that are accessible to the public. For example, the Fitch ~~Preserve~~ Natural History Reservation and the McColl Nature Reserve, located in the very northeast corner of the planning area, ~~has~~ have ~~2~~ 4 miles of self-guided nature trails that allow users to explore forest, grassland, stream, wetland, and pond areas.”

Please note that Ed Martinko, Director of the Kansas Biological Survey (the unit administering the KU Field Station) and Monte Soukup, Vice President for Property Management at KU Endowment, have been consulted in this matter and are copied with this email. Please contact me if you have any questions. We thank you and your colleagues for your efforts in getting the plan to this stage.

Sincerely,

Dean

W. Dean Kettle, Ph.D.  
Associate Director, University of Kansas Field Station  
Kansas Biological Survey  
2101 Constant Avenue  
Lawrence, KS 66047-3759

Office phone: 785-864-1540  
FAX: 785-1534  
[www.ksr.ku.edu](http://www.ksr.ku.edu)

**Dan Warner**

---

**From:** Nuts2sell@aol.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 15, 2010 1:29 PM  
**To:** Dan Warner  
**Subject:** Comment, Northeast Sector Plan

April 15, 2010

Re: Northeast Sector Plan;

Dear Mr. Warner:

As affected landowner, I am disappointed with the Northeast Sector Plan in some respects.

I wish to endorse the comments of the Citizens for Responsible Planning by letter dated April 15 on this issue. That citizens group has done an outstanding job illuminating the issues, problems, and inconsistencies, and I join in their recommendations.

Because my wife and I owns a substantial parcel with development potential (or threat, depending on point of view), I make some additional comments.

We an acreage, potentially another Maple Grove Industrial Park, with US 24/59 frontage, proximity to I-70, and commercial development across the street. Our property is surrounded by similarly situated tracts whose owners have expressed no objection to their development. We are all low-lying properties, more or less, all in proximity to the Maple Grove East Branch tributary, outside the regulated flood plain but vulnerable, nonetheless. So long as the City of Lawrence has extended its Urban Growth Area boundaries to include US 24/59 all the way to Midland Junction, and so long as the policy for conserving Capability 1 and 2 soils is so inconsistent, development of our area is not precluded.

What we need is guidance, meaning clear and consistent signals from the Planning office and the City and County governing bodies. The question is, whether we should brace for development, and all the storm water drainage problems that accompany development, or whether we may expect to continue agricultural use unthreatened into the indefinite future.

This year and next we have to make capital investments in our facilities and equipment to keep up with growth. But should we throw good money away if the environment is going to change all around us? Knowing from experience how one development encourages the next one, we are feeling that we may be in the wrong location for a 100-year organic nut tree farm.

Drainage is the critical issue. We already have a substantial investment in chestnut trees, a species that cannot survive poorly drained soils. Already, with two wet years in a row we are experiencing long-standing water and are worried. Topography is not available; our drainage is solely percolation down through the soils to the water table, about 12' deep (river level). If neighbors create more pressure on the natural drainage of the soils, or if the embankment raising US24/40 at TeePee Junction suggested by the North Lawrence Drainage Study [NLDS], is implemented, or if anything else should increase the soil saturation or raise the water table, then I fear our orchard trees will begin to die from

phytophthora, or in the vernacular of tree growers, “wet feet.”

We share the concerns of North Lawrence residents to avoid flooding from storm waters draining from Maple Grove creek into their neighborhoods. But the solution proposed by the NLDS to hold back the flood at US 24/40 is potentially harmful to us, the upstream landowners. We were not consulted when that study was done.

So, if we continue down the agricultural path, and if development keeps its distance, well and good. But we fear we cannot remain agricultural while our neighbors place additional accumulating burdens on the drainage. Then we would have to look for other alternatives, not farming.

The draft Northeast Sector Plan lacks the consistent guidance and clear policy vision we need for the area. The most striking inconsistency is treatment of farm land. Your Plan gives lip service to conserving agricultural land but disregards it in fact.

The text purports to hold Capability 1 and 2 soils in high regard. But the map in fact designates the very best farm soils of the area for development. Between the zoning of the Airport property and the area southwest of the Airport and north of I-70 (known locally as the Pine Family Farm) are the biggest portion of the best quality Capability 1 soils. Specifically, that is identified on the soil maps as Rossville Silt loam. Almost all of this soil type that exists will be subject to development under your plan.

I can only assume that the novel “Agri-Industry” which is applied to the Pine Farm south of 24/40, is really “industrial,” and that the “Agri” half is unenforceably vague. At the April 7 meeting the Chief Planner indicated that the Agri-Industry designation contemplated uses that required “industrial” zoning and which were not allowed under “agricultural” zoning. The Chief Planner also admitted that “Agri-industry” is a non-statutory term which does not appear in the zoning or development laws. What a muddle! It sounds like agri-industry is a weak attempt at window dressing.

Another problem is the plan calls for “industrial” development north of US 24/40. In addition to violating the policy on Capability 1 soils, the NLDS and City Engineer have made it clear that upgraded drainage systems should precede development north of US 24/40. As I have commented before, drainage is the paramount concern here, for us and for North Lawrence residents. The airport and the Pine farms, if they develop, are bound to be substantial burdens upon the drainage in such a flat and permeable soil area. And all this development will sit upon the higher bank of Maple Grove East Branch—our farm is on the opposite side of this drainage, at a lower altitude. The planning attitude that these problems will be worked out later are not reassuring.

The City Engineer possesses 2-foot interval topographic maps of most of the planning area. Because the area is so flat, the resolution of your Map 2-11, “Contours,” is practically useless for determining how the storm water runs, or stands, around the proposed development areas. If the water from these developments, the Airport and the proposed Pine Farm industrial park, breaks to the east, it might be tolerable. If to the west and Maple Grove, it would be bad for us and for North Lawrence residents. Why not provide the best information available with the Plan so the public can be reassured and the public bodies can be well informed?

The highway frontage north of Lawrence in the agricultural floodplain is under considerable pressure to develop. To draw an arbitrary line on a map and say, “This far and no further,” is not so effective unless the line is backed up by some hard criteria that works with the facts on the ground. Maybe this plan would have more utility and credibility if the planners adhere more strictly to the principles this

community has by consensus approved: floodplain protection, no adverse impact, Airport/FAA concerns, North Lawrence Drainage Study recommendations, and last but not least, Capability 1 & 2 farm soils conservation.

I would be pleased if you could take these comments under consideration as well as the comments of the Citizens for Responsible Planning.

Yours,

Charles NovoGradac  
*Chestnut Charlie's*  
P.O. Box 1166  
Lawrence, KS 66044  
785 841 8505  
nuts2sell@aol.com

April 15, 2010

To: Douglas County Planning Commission/Do Co Planning Staff

From: Pine Family Investments Members

Roger C. Pine

Sue A. Pine

Brian D. Pine

Shawn Pine Bay

Dear Douglas County Planning Commission and Staff:

The members of Pine Family Investments **strongly oppose** Pine land being designated Ag-Industry. (What exactly is “Ag-industry”? What are the parameters? What are the uses? No definition or explanation is offered in the plan.)

We find it short-sighted for all planning purposes to designate the limited amount of city property as commercial/industrial without designating the immediately surrounding properties the same.

Pine Family Investments **strongly supports** Pine land being designated commercial/industrial matching the designations of all city property in the NE Sector Plan.

Sincerely,

Roger C. Pine

Sue A. Pine

Brian D. Pine

Shawn Pine Bay

## Dan Warner

---

**From:** Daniel Poull [dpjp8@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 15, 2010 10:59 AM  
**To:** Dan Warner  
**Cc:** Daniel Poull  
**Subject:** Northeast Sector Plan

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment upon the suggested planning for the Northeast Sector of Douglas County.

As I look at the proposed map, I think that it is a strong proposal for the protection of agricultural soils that are of real value to the citizens of Douglas County. Hopefully, all future planning at the City and County levels will adhere strictly to this map and keep these agricultural soils free of development. The citizens would benefit from placing these soils into a agricultural/conservation easement so that development is not an option.

Sincerely,  
Daniel Poull  
821 Ohio, Lawrence  
Sustainability Advisory Board  
Local Food Policy Council

My name is Maurice R. Woolsoncroft. My address is 1984 E. 1600 Road.

Excellent work has already been done on the Northeast Sector Plan and the Draft dated March 12, 2012. The details and many variables seem to have been accounted for. What I respectfully submit below is intended for use as an overview, and thusly should be titled PREFACE and included prior to the Table of Contents.

## P R E F A C E

Lawrence, Kansas has now been on the map of history well over 150 years. Through many hardships wrought by nature and by man the town has grown to become a highly respected city yet retaining a great respect for nature; as would be fitting since being located in an agricultural state.

The task we have now before us is all about land usage. In this regard let us keep foremost in our minds the nature of the land being considered. Secondly, let us not be unmindful or forgetting what our forefathers have reasoned for this land. The placement of major thoroughfares and railroads and airport was a well thought out process. It is natural for business and industry to be in near proximity to each. To have small business located along and South of highway 24 – 40 going East is natural. The same is true along and to the West of 24 – 40 going North. These various businesses should therefore reflect the rural heritage and needs in this Planning Area Boundary. Necessity dictates that food stores, gas stations, feed and supplies for tourists be of prime considerations. The businesses already located in this area testify to what is "Right for this area".

Our vision should be to use what Nature has provided, to enhance the quality of life for all who come into this Northeast Sector. Let us reason then-- What is drawing people into this area. What do they do here, and what can be done to build and enhance revenues.

The Kansas Riverfront Park is a tourist attraction. To walk a dog, play disk golf, run, walk, stroll and to just watch the river and wildlife. It also serves public with access to the River via a boat ramp.

At the opposite end of this Northeast Sector Plan is now a newly created destination which is a Scenic Overlook of the landscape and 6 mile view to the city of Lawrence. The mental health benefits of hiking, bicycling, and being within this amazing "Ozark-like setting and letting the mind soar into the realms of Nature are beyond price. The KU Field Station frequently has public events and promotes use of trails through this scenic space, which is most unusual for being hilly. Naturally wildlife is abundant.

The various concerns and considerations in this main body of work reflects the desire to avoid the usual suburban sprawl which co-mingles apartment buildings and businesses into this particular land area which by nature's creation is not conducive for such purposes because of the flood plain.

To avoid all future expansions of human inhabitation is also unrealistic. There are at least two very desirable locations for countryside hotels and apartment buildings. One location is on the Dick Wise property located East of 1600 Road and North of 1900 Road. This location has room for yet another golf course and amenities. The second location is on the Janeway property located East of 1500 Road and North of 2000 Road. The Janeway property still can boast of a large Stone home which could be incorporated into a future scheme. Apartment buildings of appropriate height would not interfere with the views from the scenic overlook.

Besides the agrarian and small business future, it therefore seems reasonable to utilize this area for the visitors and tourists. In fact, the Office of such is located at the old Union Station which is the Gateway from North Lawrence into this Northeast Sector.

There is one other prospect, heretofore, not mentioned. The historically significant residential land of the First Governor of Kansas. On the first high ground NE of Lawrence, KS on the West side of 1600 Road, just to the North of the Jefferson Co. Rural Water District plant and across from the Red Brick School building now known as "The Oaks", one can still see the overgrown driveway entrance.

Dr. Charles Robinson was the first Gov. of the State of KS. His term was from Feb 9, 1861 to Jan 12, 1863. His records are in the Historical Society in Topeka. Among his accomplishments are: appointments of the first justices of the peace and probate judges. The administration was involved in the sale of initial State bonds; capital relocation; freighting to Colorado Territory; criminal matters; protested elections; relations with the federal government; impeachment proceedings; Indian affairs; the sale of the territorial capitol at Leecompton, Kan.; legislative matters; military affairs; relations with Missouri; public documents; public lands; and resignations.

It is well known that a movie was made there with well known stars. Yet I believe it shows on the map as just KU Endowed land. This man bequeathed much of the land that we now call KU Endowed land here in the Northeast Sector. His residential property is prime for tourist revenues. Many possibilities exist for this land. It could be home of an amusement park, such as used to exist in North Lawrence. Also it is about half-way between the Riverfront park and the Scenic Overlook. Parks and parkland have become a necessity in modern life. This is what exists here. We need only to improve the roads and beautify what exists, by proper and prudent trimming of roadside trees and spraying weeds at bridges and culverts and, signage for No Dumping / Littering. Tourism = Revenue.

To have within 6 miles of Downtown The Riverfront Park, the Scenic Overlook and the Tourist Center and possible Governor's Park is a tremendous asset. Let progress be made therefore on the roads in this area. Excellent Gravel roads are what is needed. Currently we have mud, most of the mild-climate months. The roads should be great for walking and bicycling year round and a speed limit posted at 45 MPH. This area is already designated as The KU Bicycle Route.

Future growth and movement also could be improved with a Bridge across the Kansas River on 1600 Road. Then should occur more utilization of the Airport and of the Grant Twp. School building, which in turn will create more revenues.

Advertise this district as a tourist destination for walkers, bicyclists, and others who appreciate the wide open spaces affording views of our rural heritage – mostly yet undisturbed. Altho it seems common to us, it is a rare thing for most metropolitan areas. Let us therefore take pride not only in our Lakes and Rivers, but also in our Parks, Overlooks, Agricultural and Ranch lands and these "Ozark type" hills and woods.

Tourists and local owners in this area need: Food and Groceries, Feed for livestock and wildlife, Supplies for bicyclists, hikers, walkers which could be found in a "quick shop". Tourists also like to buy things like Antiques and souvenirs. We even have the locations for future Appts or Hotels. To maintain this equilibrium it may be desirable to set limits of 10-20 acres per new home. Also any flood plain land near the airport could be used as soccer fields, swap meets, etc.

THANK YOU!