

From: [Brett Glass](#)
To: [Matthew Cox](#); thebentandrusty@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Transparency studies
Date: Wednesday, January 20, 2021 10:22:40 AM

Mr. Cox:

This is interesting. All three of these articles quote from the same SINGLE person, whose opinions are unsupported by any actual quantitative research. There are no numbers to support the assertions made in these articles. And two of them even use the exact same photograph! What's more, one of the three even notes that transparency requirements are only appropriate for retail:

"...different window types, depths, and patterns contribute to the goal of continuous variety, which is more likely to be achieved when minimum transparency levels are not set too high.... to increase privacy for residents while maintaining an active sidewalk environment for pedestrians, consider pulling the building back from the street line slightly and planting in front of the building...."

As I said during the session, you are attempting to impose these fads upon our downtown - perhaps due to having been lobbied by builders who would profit from implementing them. The residents and businesses of downtown Laramie can and will oppose you, and will continue until you move on to a city with the featureless, lifeless, character-less urban environment you're attempting to promote.

I am in the process of organizing a group to oppose harmful initiatives such as this and speak with a unified voice to City Council. It is Council - enacting the will of the people - who should be making these decisions, not an irresponsible unelected bureaucrat.

--Brett Glass

At 09:48 AM 1/20/2021, Matthew Cox wrote:

Brett & Billie,

Below are links to a number of articles about transparency in buildings and have attached some as well:

- <https://urbanland.uli.org/industry-sectors/infrastructure-transit/eight-qualities-of-pedestrian-and-transit-oriented-design/?submitted=true>
- https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/planning/download/pdf/plans-studies/active-design-sidewalk/active_design.pdf
- <https://www.nar.realtor/blogs/spaces-to-places/urban-design-qualities-to-encourage-walkability>

There are many more articles, but please look over and reach out with questions if you have any. Also, feel free to send back articles or any publishing that negates the points made in these.

All the best,

Matthew Cox

Associate Planner
PO Box C, Laramie, Wyoming 82073
307.721.5344 : FAX 307.721.5248
www.cityoflaramie.org

ALL CITY OF LARAMIE ELECTRONIC CORRESPONDENCE AND
ATTACHMENTS MAY BE TREATED AS PUBLIC RECORDS AND
SUBJECT TO PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

From: [Matthew Cox](#)
To: [Todd Feezer](#); [Carron, Keith](#); [Derek Teini](#)
Cc: [Parker, Jessica](#); [Hembree, Tom](#)
Subject: RE: Metrohm
Date: Thursday, December 3, 2020 1:41:00 PM

Keith,

Thanks for reaching out with your questions.

Related to parking:

Parking will not be required for any residential use in downtown if these amendments are passed. The reason for this is to relieve a major cost burden for developers looking at bringing residential downtown or current building owners who wish to convert their upstairs to a residential use. Currently, parking is already very minimal for a residential use, sometimes only requiring ¼ of a parking space. This requires anybody looking to convert their building to residential or a developer looking to construct a new development, to use a portion of their land for parking rather than another unit, more retail space, more office space, etc. It ends up relieving developers, but also allows us to use our limited downtown land in its most efficient way. This does not relate to ADA spaces, these are controlled at a federal level. So, if a residential structure has a certain amount of units, they will still be required to provide their own ADA spaces.

As for commercial uses, parking is already not required for the downtown district per LMC Section [15.08.030.E.2.c.\(ii\).\(1\)](#).

Related to Stucco:

As for stucco and its historical significance. This is an amendment proposed by Main Street and is cited by the [Design Guidelines for Historic Downtown Laramie](#). I am unable to state what constitutes a historical building, but the original downtown Laramie did not find commercial buildings using stucco for their building material. Of course in more recent years, especially through the mid to late 20th century, stucco has been used on many buildings, but the main reason to propose this change is due to many building owners covering up original brick with stucco in order to delay improvement costs. In turn, this has led to buildings falling into disrepair and these costs fall onto the next owner, or in some cases, these costs are too great for another owner to take on and the building sits vacant or has a large tenant turnover, hurting our downtown economy. I would also like to point out that these stucco regulations are only in regards to street facing sides of buildings. So, for all buildings not on corners, this is only the façade of the building. Also, this can only be required through a Type 3 site plan in which a use would have to change quite drastically or for any new construction. If you'd like me to run through what triggers a Type 3 site plan, I'd be happy to have a phone call or send another email.

I encourage you to look through all of the amendments and reach out with anymore questions or concerns you may have.

All the best,

Matthew Cox

Associate Planner

PO Box C, Laramie, Wyoming 82073

307.721.5344 : FAX 307.721.5248

www.cityoflaramie.org

From: Todd Feezer <tfeezer@cityoflaramie.org>

Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 12:08 PM

To: Carron, Keith <keith.carron@metrohm.com>; Derek Teini <DTeini@cityoflaramie.org>; Matthew Cox <MCox@cityoflaramie.org>

Cc: Parker, Jessica <jessica.parker@metrohm.com>; Hembree, Tom <tom.hembree@metrohm.com>; Sarah Reese <sreese@cityoflaramie.org>

Subject: RE: Metrohm

Keith,

I cc'd the Planning Division on this email. They will provide the responses. We are happy to meet with you and your team also. Unfortunately Sarah Reese has left our employment.

Thanks,

Todd Feezer

Assistant City Manager

City of Laramie

P.O. Box C

Laramie, WY 82073

Office: (307) 721-5304

Fax: (307) 721-5211

Cell: (307) 421-3032

tfeezer@cityoflaramie.org

www.cityoflaramie.org

From: Carron, Keith <keith.carron@metrohm.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 11:23 AM

To: Todd Feezer <tfeezer@cityoflaramie.org>

Cc: Parker, Jessica <jessica.parker@metrohm.com>; Hembree, Tom <tom.hembree@metrohm.com>; Sarah Reese <sreese@cityoflaramie.org>

Subject: Metrohm

Hi Todd,

This was dropped off at my building yesterday by another business owner. How do I interpret the statement that – “Currently, no parking is required for any commercial use in the downtown.”? If I read this literally, it is saying that a commercial use building does not require parking. Secondly, this reads like nothing will be required without significant change use, but then it also reads as stucco is forbidden since it is not historical. Our building comes from 1948 and the photo below shows it as stucco from the time it was built. Who is to define what historical means?

Can you clarify what the statement about parking means and if we will be forced to change the front of our historical building?

Thanks,
Keith



ALL CITY OF LARAMIE ELECTRONIC CORRESPONDENCE AND ATTACHMENTS MAY BE TREATED AS PUBLIC RECORDS AND SUBJECT TO PUBLIC DISCLOSURE
