

Bobbie Walthall

To: Diane Stoddard
Subject: RE: Vermont Place correspondence

From: Bob Schumm [<mailto:schummfoods@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 11:20 AM
To: Britt Crum-Cano <bcano@lawrenceks.org>
Subject: Re: FW: Giving Our Town Away

Good morning Britt, With regards to the first question "will the land beneath the condos be leasehold or fee simple" that question has yet to be determined. I have stated many times that I have not done advance legal or engineering work because to spend a large sum of money on those services before I have a project approved by the governing bodies would be foolish. The legal work is estimated to be \$35,000. The engineering and architectural work is estimated to be \$450,000. Rest assured that the project will follow Kansas law regarding development and sales of condos. Also these condos have to be sold before the development can commence and the buyers are going to be informed purchasers that will demand security for their investments and hence the condo by-laws will be developed to their satisfaction. Second question "what plan does the developer have in place for common element replacements"? This answer is the same as answer number 1. The Home Owner Association rules and bylaws have yet to be drawn up. Once again these agreements must be satisfying to the new purchasers or they won't buy a condo unit. As far as the downtown becoming a "Duabi like joint", it wasn't too long ago that we fought to save downtown Lawrence from destruction from a cornfield mall. Since then, development has helped secure it from a slide into the abyss of underutilization and deteriorating vacantness. Cheers! Bob Schumm.

From: steven c. watts [<mailto:scajj@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 9:44 AM
To: Leslie Soden <lsoden@lawrenceks.org>; Stuart Boley <sboley@lawrenceks.org>; Matthew Herbert <matthewjherbert@gmail.com>; Lisa Larsen <llarsen@lawrenceks.org>; Mike Amyx <mamyx@lawrenceks.org>; Tom Markus <tmarkus@lawrenceks.org>
Cc: Bobbie Walthall <bjwalthall@lawrenceks.org>
Subject: Giving Our Town Away

Commissioners and City Manager:

We're giving our town away, right? Or has "that" already occurred as we see one phat cat "development" after another focused on only the monied.

Irrespective, relative to the LJWorld article of Nov. 7, 2017 found here: <http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2017/nov/06/lawrence-city-commission-review-tax-break-provisio/>

please establish who owns the land underneath the condo units? That is, is the "development" lease hold or fee simple?

Will an owner of a condo unit also own the land the condo is built on or will that land be owned by the "developer"? It's a pretty simple question but an important one. Condo's are pretty new to our part of the USA and aren't well understood. Those states where the condo is a common "thing" have discovered the numerous problems owners of said "condos" find themselves in. The most significant one is WHO OWNS THE LAND UPON WHICH THE CONDO UNIT(S) SITS??

It's a fair and critical question to ask the developer and have same explain why the development is "lease hold" if that's the case.....which I rather suspect it is..... Even if the "lease" is for 99 years.....SOMEBODY eventually confronts a significant problem down the road and it isn't the developer. The land will always stay in the developers portfolio to do with as same sees fit and the town will get the short end of the stick.

Too, what plans does the developer have in place for the creation of a separate account for common element replacements? I'm not referring to everyday maintenance items....I'm referring to items such as the roof; the plumbing; the elevator; BIG TICKET items.

Relative to the tax abatement or any incentive.....why do the wealthy need an incentive to purchase a fancy apartment in downtown Lawrence which is fastly becoming a Dubai like joint? Soon, "downtown" shall become "uptown" or "east side" and the only things down there will be bars and rich people apartments. The town doesn't need to aggravate the disparity by subsidizing fancy apartments for rich people. Vote down the tax incentive.

Steven C. Watts

Lawrence, Kansas

Bobbie Walthall

From: steven c. watts <scajj@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 10:54 AM
To: Leslie Soden; Stuart Boley; Matthew Herbert; Lisa Larsen; Mike Amyx; Tom Markus
Cc: Bobbie Walthall
Subject: If Lease Hold...

Commissioners and Mr. Markus:

If Bob Schumm, the "developer" for a mixed-use condominium project along Vermont Street in downtown Lawrence, turns out to be "developing" a lease hold condo project such that he shall continue to own the land underneath where the apartments are built:

Why does one guy get to be awarded a government based "incentive" when the only person benefiting is that same one guy? The Neighborhood Revitalization Act was not intended to benefit one individual and their personal financial portfolio.

If the property being developed turns out to be what is commonly referred to as "lease hold", you must vote no to maintain your integrity. A "YES" vote is a vote to line the pocket of one guy; his financial portfolio; and that of his heirs. Whenever the "lease" is up on those condos.....that same one guy and his heirs can do whatever they want with the land the "development" sits upon: The state of Kansas has no laws which address the matter near as I can find out.

Why does one guy not only get to line his pockets with other rich peoples' money but also gets a tax break to do so? Doesn't make any sense whatsoever. NONE. ZERO. NADA. Sorry.....but ya gotta vote "NO". This development isn't revitalizing anything but one person's bank account(s). It's bad for the town's "long haul".

Steven C. Watts
Lawrence, KS