

## Bingham – Phase II Meeting

Thursday, September 8, 2011  
 South-Broadland Presbyterian Church  
 5:30-7:30pm  
 20 attendees

### **RECAP OF SITE TOUR FEEDBACK**

During the site tour, the district received feedback about community needs and reuses that could address community needs. Key things that the district has noted from the site tour discussion:

- *Concern about the cost to bring the building up to date + maintenance of building/grounds*
- *Concern that there has been interest in the site, but the district has turned them away*
- *Access/traffic has to be addressed as part of any proposal (traffic/congestion is already an issue with the use of the fields)*
- *Demolition would be supported for a good project*
- *Educational use/Housing (including senior + affordable)/commercial development/mixed use development would all be acceptable so long as they complemented the neighborhood*

Phase II participants confirmed that this was a good summary of the site tour feedback.

### **REUSE FEEDBACK**

The district has received multiple inquiries about Bingham – more so than any other site. The technical assessment also indicates that the site (with and without the building) has multiple reuse/redevelopment opportunities. The following summarizes the discussion during the Phase II meeting regarding reuse options:

Community feedback on **Commercial Use**:

- There was general consensus from community participants in support of commercial redevelopment of the site, but that any commercial development would need to address several concerns, including:
  - Traffic – impact on residential development (especially along Wyandotte)
  - Access – concern about how/where would be main access point to Wornall Rd (crossing the Trolley Track Trail, impacting traffic flow on Wornall)
  - Height, proximity, scale and design need to be a fit with the community
  - Buffers to the residential area are desirable
- The following additional concerns/comments were identified by one or more participant(s):
  - Trash
  - Noise
  - Light pollution

- There is already a lot of vacant office/commercial space – concern about adding square footage
- Historically, Kansas City lets developers do what they want (plans don't reflect the desire of the community)
- Don't need another pub
- Any commercial use at the site needs to complement/support 75<sup>th</sup> and Wornall hub
- There was mixed feedback on big box development. Some felt it was unrealistic at the site; others were open to well developed plan but scale/design would be an issue

Mixed use (commercial + residential) or residential are both viable reuses for the site and were supported by participants of the site tour. The following summarizes the discussion during the Phase II meeting:

Community feedback on **Mixed Use (Commercial + Residential) or Residential Only:**

- There was general consensus on mixed use or residential reuse of the site, including multifamily redevelopment
- Market rate residential was identified as the preferred type of residential reuse
- Participants indicated that senior housing would be an acceptable reuse as there is a lack of affordable senior housing facilities in the area; the area would be desirable since it is in walking distance of grocery/pharmacy/restaurants/shops
- Generally, affordable housing was also identified as an acceptable reuse although not all participants fully supported this reuse
- Concerns identified for commercial use would also apply to mixed use/residential

Participants at the site tour expressed a desire/need for community use of the grounds/building. The following summarizes the discussion during the Phase II meeting:

Community feedback on **Community/Recreational Use:**

- There was general interest/support from the participants for reuse of the site as playing fields, green space, community center with pool, fields, community garden; however, participants stressed concern about whether demolition of the building would be cost prohibitive. Participants were not supportive of the building remaining vacant for any length of time, and reuse of the grounds only was not a viable long-term option. In addition, access to the site/traffic would need to be addressed.
- A dog park was also mentioned, although it did not have the support of all participants
- Community use of the grounds, in conjunction with some private development was also identified as desirable

While the building was originally constructed for use as a school, the technical assessment suggests that **educational reuse** of the building is not the most viable reuse of the site (due to cost of rehabbing the building and the marketability/value of the site for other reuses). In the event a proposal for educational reuse was presented to the district, participants indicated that they would be supportive of an educational reuse of the site.

## DEMOLITION

For every site, the district is gathering community feedback on the possible demolition of the building. At the site tour, the participants were open to demolition. The following summarizes the feedback from the Phase II meeting:

Community feedback on **Demolition**:

- Participants were open to demolition of the building
- One participant expressed a feeling that the current state of the building is “destroying our neighborhood” and as such, demolition would be welcomed
- While participants were open to demolition, if a viable proposal were submitted that included rehabilitation of the building, they would like to see how the building could be redeveloped

## SOLICITATION PROCESS

The district has a few options available to it when it disposes of surplus property:

- Choose to sell or lease
- Use one of three methods to sell/lease (as required by state statute):
  - Market a property through a broker
  - Formal bidding process (award to highest bidder)
  - Negotiate directly with a community group/governmental agency

During the meeting, participants were asked to provide their feedback on the solicitation process. The following summarizes their feedback/comments.

Community feedback on the **Solicitation Process**:

- Use a broker to list/market the site; however, a proposal should also be submitted for the district/community to review and assess the project proposal
- Participants expressed a desire for the district to vet proposals to weed out projects that aren't viable. Community members desired to have an opportunity to review/weigh in on the remaining viable proposals
- The Tower Homes and Waldo Homes Associations, as well as the Waldo Business Association would be the district's main points of contact for coordinating with the community

**INTERIM USES/ACTIONS**

In the event the district doesn't receive viable proposals for Bingham, or if it takes several years, the district solicited feedback from the community on interim actions/activities.

Community feedback on **Interim Uses**:

- Can the Bingham parking lot be used when football/lacrosse teams are practicing/ playing games on the fields? Typically, the gate to the lot is locked. This would help relieve parking congestion/traffic on residential streets
- Keep grounds (outside of fields) groomed
- A community member also asked for an update on the status of all the materials stored within the Bingham building