Agenda

Review Public Comment received on Draft Policy (published 6-11-24)
  - Public comment period
  - Open House feedback
  + Legal Review (required)
  - MMTC Study Session
  - HRC Study Session

Discuss changes to draft & finalize policy

Thank you!
A survey was available April 4 – April 19. 176 responses were received. The survey asked respondents to rank a set of ten values from 1-10 to help understand how they prioritize conflicting values. Results are as follows:

Priorities for **Brick Sidewalks**
1. Safety
2. Accessibility
3. Sustainability
4. Tradition
5. Charm
6. Uniqueness
7. Cost
8. Community
9. Equity
10. Efficiency

Priorities for **Brick Streets**
1. Safety
2. Sustainability
3. Tradition
4. Charm
5. Cost
6. Uniqueness
7. Accessibility
8. Community
9. Efficiency
10. Equity
A survey was available June 11- June 25

31 responses were received

The comments received focused on the following themes: General Support, Accessibility Concerns/Considerations, Historic Concerns/Considerations, General Brick Sidewalk Comment, and General Brick Street Comments.

The Open House had ~25 people in attendance and the most frequently asked questions related to the Brick Sidewalk Policy Applicability Map & Historic Districts.

Staff reached out to ELNA and OWL to offer “neighborhood chats” about the policy, but due to conflicting calendars and extreme weather these meetings were cancelled/declined.
LEGAL REVIEW

City legal staff reviewed the policy and proposed changes to provide clarity and consistent use of language. None of the edits made by legal included substantive changes in policy recommendations or substance.

Some of the specific changes included:

- the addition of “or stone” to Section 6.0, “Wherever existing brick or stone sidewalks remain in good condition, they should be preserved.” and

- The deletion of “City Forester” from Section 6.1 the Conditional Site Considerations after the subcommittee determined the subbase would be AB-3 and thus have less excavation needed.
Staff walked through the policy development process with MMTC and discussed various “policy highlights” relating to the sections in the policy which have received the most questions/ comments from the public.

Questions were asked relating to overlay districts, street maintenance, crossings, traffic speeds, cost comparisons, installation, and pavement condition. Staff provided answers and clarification to all questions.

No specific recommendations were provided.
Staff walked through the policy development process with HRC and discussed various “policy highlights” relating to the sections in the policy which have received the most questions/ comments from the public.

Questions were asked relating to construction standard versus inspection standards, city funding maintenance responsibility, how to assure street trees are protected and brick sidewalks being slick in wet / icy conditions and how to manage those situations. Staff provided answers and clarification to all questions.

See staff write up to review the recommendations provided by the commission and public at this meeting.
STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

BASED ON CONVERSATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC, MMTC, HRC, AND THE STAFF WORKING GROUP
Consider changing the name of the map to “Brick Sidewalk Permissive Map”

• Provides clarity for what the map is used for
Consider changing the boundary of the map

- Interest from community to have more permissive areas without the need to seek historic/overlay districts “quickly”. Especially East Lawrence & Old West Lawrence

- HRC recommended the area be widened & recognized the original townsite as a significant historic area.

- Implementation of the ADA Transition Plan would be more efficient/effective for priority routes in the areas we know have higher rates of transportation disadvantage populations & have existing brick sidewalks.

Staff recommends the addition of the Original Townsite area to the existing location criteria
ADA Transition Plan – Priority Map
Consider clarifying the language in Section 6.2 which provides an introduction to the historic natural stone material used as sidewalk in the ROW.

Draft policy intent was to allow any material which meets PROWAG standards to remain in the ROW –

- Policy clarifies that the material is not recommended, but it is permitted on a panel-by-panel basis.
- Continues to encourage use of historic pavers on private property.
INSTALLATION STANDARDS

Consider clarifying the language in Section 6.3 to highlight that 1/8” is the installation standard – Section 6.0 states sidewalks are held to PROWAG standards for inspection.

- Public feedback highlighted value of “sustainability”, in order to construct sidewalks which will last a long time and remain safe – they must be constructed below the maximum allowance of 1/4:”

- Brick Industry Association, Accessible Brick: Sand joints should be as small as possible, but not so small that sand cannot be swept into the joints. An appropriate sand joint size is between 1/16 in. (1.6 mm) and 3/16 in. (4.8 mm) wide

- Access Board best practice, set a tolerance range for construction... to meet standards as established.
  - Specifications include tolerance (1/16- 3/16), policy identifies standard (1/8”).
CALENDAR

Staff proposed public meetings & engagement activities

- Open House – Community conversation on values (April 4, 2024 – Carnegie Building)
  - Values survey 15-days (April 4 – April 19)

- Open House – Draft policy publication & education (June 20th @ Library)
  - 15-day Public Comment period (June 11 – June 25th)

- MMTC – Study Session (July 1, 2024)

- HRC – Review proposed policy, recommend map. (July 18, 2024)

- MMTC – Review proposed BS+S policy (August 5, 2024)

- City Commission – Recommend Approval of BS+S Policy (September 3, 2024)
THANK YOU

Visit www.lawrenceks.org/brick to stay up-to-date + view additional information