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The Troost Corridor Redevelopment Plan provides a strategic redevelopment and implementation framework for two key intersections along Troost Avenue in Kansas City, Missouri. The plan was funded by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development as part of an emphasis on sustainability planning for U.S. cities. The primary goal of the initiative is to create vibrant, connected and green places that are enduring, resilient and adaptable. The goal of this project is to provide a blueprint for implementation of two financially feasible catalytic redevelopment projects along the Troost corridor.

Numerous plans have been developed for Troost and its surrounding neighborhoods in the last 15 years. This corridor represents real and pervasive challenges for urban redevelopment. Troost has served as Kansas City’s racial and economic dividing line, reflected in a loss of population, businesses, stable neighborhoods, higher crime rates and closed schools. Despite significant negative factors, the community has organized to advocate for increased city services and infrastructure improvements, support higher quality development and recruit new uses and creative residents who have pumped new life into the urban character of this historic corridor.

Troost Avenue, from Admiral Boulevard on the north to 95th Street on the south is a continuous 13 mile major arterial street that includes the east side of downtown Kansas City, Missouri, midtown, the Brush Creek corridor, the University District and...
south Kansas City. The character of the corridor varies greatly - it has an urban development pattern based on a strong street grid and medium density in the area north of 63rd St. and a post World War II inner-suburban development pattern south of 63rd St. The corridor includes significant examples of Kessler’s historic Parks and Boulevards Plan for Kansas City, with 3 major parks nearby and 5 east-west boulevards. Troost Avenue has the highest transit ridership in the city and now supports the second MAX Bus Rapid Transit route in the city, called the Green Line.

For purposes of this planning effort, the corridor analysis focused on the area between 27th Street, at the edge of Hospital Hill and the Beacon Hill neighborhood on the north and 75th Street on the south. This area along the corridor exhibits the highest levels of distress in the form of overall physical blight, vacant properties and buildings, lower income levels and increased crime. The following two sections outline a summary of the existing conditions, and the demographic and economic data that provided the basis for the project’s market analysis (see Section 3 Market Analysis).
Troost Avenue is an urban corridor that has evolved from a healthy commercial streetcar route in the 1900’s with both single family and multi-family residences to one of the primary symbols in Kansas City of disinvestment and racial and economic segregation from the 1950’s to today.

This plan is not a wish list for unobtainable new development. It is deliberately focused on reinstituting and reinforcing the existing character and infrastructure of this historic street and infusing it with catalytic redevelopment proposals at two selected intersections. The planned redevelopment must support the continuing rebuilding efforts of the surrounding neighborhoods and provide a sustainable example of urban revitalization in a market-challenged area.

**Identified Project Goals**

1. Focus on two significant nodes along the corridor to establish feasible catalytic projects that will have a strong impact on guiding future redevelopment along the corridor.

2. Make recommendations with an emphasis on market analysis and economic feasibility in order to provide realistic opportunities.

3. Address the triple bottom line issues of **equity**, **economy** and the **environment**, and work with the community to determine the best strategic short-term and long-term recommendations for creating a sustainable development model for the corridor.
Despite a long history as a border between east and west, and black and white residents in Kansas City, Troost Avenue is slowly re-emerging as a place unto itself with a real identity beyond the past. These improvement efforts are driven by local leaders who see the future of Troost as part of neighborhood revitalization and rebuilding the local economy.

Recent public investments in transportation and infrastructure provide catalysts for private reinvestment and neighborhood revitalization. The corridor is anchored by large institutional land uses and major employers at Hospital Hill, the University District and the Landing/Brookside Campus of Research Medical Center. These institutions have a vested interest in the long-term sustainability of the neighborhoods on Troost.

The historical development pattern of the streetcar neighborhoods provide a basic urban structure that can be rebuilt and enhanced to create more walkable and transit-oriented development patterns. There are 20 neighborhoods between Hospital Hill (27th Street) and 75th street along the Troost corridor. These neighborhoods present a diversity of housing options including single-family and multi-family structures. Several historic districts are found west of Troost and historic landmarks are evident throughout the corridor.

24th to 47th street contains the most robust commercial activity and historic single-family neighborhoods. The neighborhoods built here are streetcar suburbs and were generally built prior to World War I. Setbacks and side yards tend to be small, though parcel widths south of this area start to grow slightly. This results in a density of about 6-10 dwelling units (DU) per acre, depending on the
specific neighborhood. While alleys may have been a part of the original design, most are no longer in use here or never existed. Most structures are multi-story with on-street parking and few garages (at least originally). This portion of Troost has some of the strongest elements of sustainable urbanism, including commercial street walls directly on the sidewalk and green infrastructure to help address water runoff and quality. New infrastructure such as sidewalks and street trees are also positive amenities for this area.

South of Brush Creek to about 63rd street, the pattern of development continues to change. Though these are still streetcar suburbs, built mostly between the two World Wars, setbacks and side yards have grown. Overall lot sizes increase as well, with detached garages starting to become the norm. While there is still on-street parking, there is a shift to driveway/rear/garage parking. Average densities also fall in this area, to about 6-8 DU/acre. The shift from an urban area designed for walking to one designed for the automobile becomes more clear south of 63rd Street.

Recent public investments in infrastructure and facilities on Troost including the MAX Bus Rapid Transit Line have begun to reinforce the corridor’s original walkable grid pattern. However, the corridor is severely hampered in terms of controlling land use and urban design by the existing commercial zoning. Numerous undesirable land uses are allowed “by right” one-half block deep along the entire corridor, resulting in overzoned and overbuilt commercial and retail buildings that have become blighted, vacant disincentives for rebuilding the neighborhoods behind them.
Kansas City’s historic Parks and Boulevards System is the longest intact urban landscape amenity in the United States. Several boulevards cross Troost Avenue, including Armour and Meyer Boulevards. The system provides an unusual level of public green space, beautification and design that supports the city’s efforts to become a more sustainable and climate-neutral city.

There are at least 17 different types of single family housing styles in the older, urban neighborhoods along Troost. The mix of housing styles varies by neighborhood following patterns based on the date of construction. The diversity of housing types is an asset for the corridor because it appeals to broader market segments. This diversity can be enhanced through housing rehabilitation as well as new infill construction that is sensitive to the neighborhood context.

Historic commercial buildings on Troost are a finite resource that are threatened by vacancy, blighted conditions and demolition despite their potential for reuse and their historical significance. The Green Impact Zone Historic Resources Survey and Plan (2010) recognized a variety of commercial structures on Troost between 39th and 51st Streets. Other surveys are warranted in order to provide a framework for the preservation and adaptive reuse of historic commercial structures.
Many buildings and uses have changed over the years and have affected the original fabric of the neighborhood. Properties on the northwest and northeast corners of the intersection are not well-maintained and have had problems with criminal activity. This, coupled with the higher crime rate affiliated with visitors to the Bainbridge Apartments one block to the west, detracts from the positive development activity in recent years along Armour and in Hyde Park and Squire Park neighborhoods. Attracting new investors and new development to the area is difficult in the existing environment. The neighborhoods continue to work hard to strengthen their stability and value, but require assistance from the city to resolve or remove problem properties.

63rd Street at Troost

South of 63rd Street significant changes are evident in the residential fabric surrounding Troost. In this area the typical grid-iron pattern of streets to the north is altered by street and development patterns more typical of the post-WWII era. The Landing is a 1960s commercial mall typical of post-WWII retail development.

It was design as an “open pedestrian mall” with one large anchor tenant, a central pedestrian corridor (which was later enclosed) and a large area of surface level parking. These types of developments met a larger, regional market, based on automobile-oriented development. For more details on the current status of The Landing, see the analysis of market conditions.
Infrastructure Conditions

Along the Troost Ave corridor, street conditions are good from Brush Creek north to 27th St, but are fair to poor from Brush Creek south to Gregory Blvd. At the Armour Blvd node, most of the streets are in good condition east of Troost Ave and in fair condition.
west of Troost. At the 63rd St node, streets are in fair condition both east and west of Troost.

Sidewalks are in fair to poor condition along Troost and good condition along Armour Blvd. Sidewalks are in fair to good condition along Troost and in poor to good condition along 63rd St. Approximately 50% of the intersections along Troost Ave have ADA pedestrian ramps. The ADA ramps at Armour Blvd are generally in the Troost Ave area. The 63rd St ADA ramps are west of Troost Ave.

There is street parking along Troost Ave at Armour Blvd, but no street parking along Armour Blvd, except at Tracy Ave and Forest Ave. At 63rd St there is no street parking along Troost Ave or 63rd St. Street trees exist along both sides of the Troost corridor, with sizes varying from new to mature. At Armour Blvd there are a few street trees along both sides of the street. At 63rd St there are only a few street trees east of Troost Ave, on the south side.

There is a high voltage transmission line along the east side of Troost, running the length of the corridor. The 8” water line from 27th St to 30th St was constructed in the 1880s. Major improvements in this area may necessitate replacing aging water lines. Storm and sanitary sewer types vary along Troost Ave. There is a mix of separate and combined sewers. Newly constructed stormwater best management practices (BMPs), a method of managing the quantity and improving the quality of stormwater runoff, are functioning north of the Armour Blvd node, between Linwood Blvd and 30th St.
SECTION 3: SUMMARY OF MARKET ANALYSIS

Initial market analysis was conducted during Fall 2012/Winter 2013 to identify two nodes with potential to serve as catalysts for the corridor. It revealed that virtually any node selected would require public/private partnerships—and infusion of public and private dollars and resources—in order to realize development of a sufficiently high quality to have a lasting, positive impact on surrounding areas. However, some nodes had greater market potential—thereby reducing the amount of public investment needed, increasing the amount of private dollars that public investment can leverage, or both—and two such nodes (Troost at Armour and Troost at 63rd) were selected.

The hurdles to realizing private investment at either location are therefore lower than they are in other places along the corridor. That said, a number of challenges or hurdles exist, not the least of which are the costs of site acquisition, assembly, remediation, and preparation for new development—which are far greater than those encountered on “greenfield” sites in suburban locales.

- **Apartments:** While affordability is generally considered a positive, problems arise in securing loans for new projects and maintaining existing projects when rents are depressed. The Troost Area (referred to as Midtown in the chart below, which displays data provided by REIS—an apartment rent research firm) has among the lowest rents in the Kansas City region. The two nodes selected have greater potential to achieve reasonable market rents than other...
locations along Troost, but incentives and tools are certain to be necessary to realize quality development. Fortunately, demand for quality affordable housing is deep, so to the degree incentives and tools are able to deliver units to the market, they are likely to be well-received.

- **Retail**: Retail options at Armour are somewhat limited, due to a lack of buying power in the area, an insufficient amount of traffic and access (cars and pedestrians) to attract significant spending from outside the area, and competition from existing retailers along Troost, Main Street, and other areas. Retail opportunities are better at 63rd, where there is greater traffic, visibility, and a sufficiently large site to accommodate a greater mix of retail anchors and inline retail.

- **Office**: Troost is not an established office corridor, so opportunities for conventional office are limited. However, as this analysis will detail on subsequent pages, there is reason to be optimistic about opportunities for medical office space in the corridor in upcoming years.

### Node One: Armour Boulevard & Troost

Current conditions at the intersection of Armour and Troost are such that buildings are in poor condition, storefronts are marginally occupied, and a number of vacant buildings and lots are present. Those conditions notwithstanding, the node has significant upside. Considerable momentum has been established along Armour as numerous historic buildings have been renovated or rehabilitated. The node has good access to transit, and many employers are nearby (something the apartments along Armour have been able to capitalize upon).

Several problem properties at and near the Armour Blvd. node create a negative image that discourages new development. Crime statistics related to calls at the Bainbridge housing complex on Harrison, the convenience store and the gasoline station on the northeast and northwest corners of Armour and Troost have reduced the quality of life for neighbors and have undermined their attempts to rebuild the community. A strategy to improve, remove or replace these problem properties will need to be part of a long range redevelopment plan.
Like much of Troost, relatively high-income neighborhoods lie to the west, with lower income neighborhoods to the west. But the case study of 18th and Vine has demonstrated that concentrated public investment at a well-designed node can lead to better-than-expected market returns in the form of high rents and stable occupancy. Trends in the health care industry could lead to a significant development opportunity at the Armour node, and a grocery anchor is already present, which could help to bolster new, “inline” storefront space seeking to draw from underserved markets to the east.

**Residential**

While demand for quality, affordable housing is substantial along Troost, it is unlikely that such products can be delivered to the market at rents that the market can afford without the help of incentives such as tax credits. Therefore, the key constraint to housing development will not be market demand, but the ability to secure tax credits. At 18th and Vine, significant policy and political efforts were made to secure low income housing tax credits to facilitate the development of roughly
150 mixed-income units over a period of five years. A similar effort is needed at Armour. If successful, roughly 300 mixed-income units might be delivered over a period of 10-12 years—with some portion of that coming in the next three, thereby greatly increasing the viability of market rate housing in a later phase. This could include an affordable senior housing component.

The case study of Armour is also instructive for Troost, since roughly 360 market rate units were rehabbed or renovated over the past 10 years, making use of state and federal historic tax credits, as well as a property tax abatement. There are several buildings in the node that would make excellent candidates to continue this momentum. Historic buildings should therefore be maintained in the node in order to make use of these programs. Since fewer historic buildings are in place than along Armour, it is conceivable that all could be renovated or rehabilitated within a period of 10-12 years.

With a critical mass of housing units in place, market rate opportunities for more apartment and/or for-sale townhome development would likely be present—probably at a scale of two to three stories, with wood frame construction.

---

**Medical Office**

While the study area is not marketable for conventional office space, it is an excellent location for medical office expansion for the following reasons:

- **Growing Demand:** As job projections show, the health care industry is growing due to increasing demands for health care services. This creates additional space needs for medical office space.

- **Retail-based Services:** Interviews with health care administrators across the country reveal that competition has increased for ambulatory/outpatient services that are provided outside the context of traditional hospitals. Patients/consumers have expressed a preference for smaller, easily-accessed facilities with convenient parking and easy wayfinding. This has caused health care providers to seek ways to relocate some of their services from the interiors of hospitals onto areas with street frontage.
• **Preventative Care:** The new Affordable Health Care for America Act (AHCAA) will have broad implications for the provision of medical space in coming years. The act places great emphasis on preventative care as a means to reduce health care costs nationally. Health care providers recognize the need to for early screenings and the provision of wellness services as a means of preventing disease before it occurs. Given consumer demand for more retail-friendly services, this will heighten the need for storefront or retail-friendly primary care and ambulatory services.

• **Consumer Growth:** Another outcome of the AHCAA is low-income households, which have historically been more likely to be uninsured, will now receive subsidies for insurance. As a result, low- and moderate-income neighborhoods—such as Kansas City’s east side neighborhoods—now provide a new avenue of revenue for health care providers. Locating new, consumer-friendly medical space in underserved neighborhoods is almost certain to be part of health care providers’ growth strategies—making the Troost corridor an ideal location for more outpatient service providers.

Per Development Strategies’ analysis, the Kansas City market (Missouri side only) stands to add 1.4 million square feet of medical office space. Locating 40,000 square feet near Troost and Armour would represent a three percent capture of that growth.
Retail

The condition of retail near Troost and Armour is generally poor (high vacancy, poor physical appearance) with the exception of the Save-A-Lot store, which is considered fair. Three retail strategies were considered for Armour and Troost:

- **Serve the immediate neighborhood**: While this has merit in that it would not involve competing directly with retailers to the west, there simply is not enough buying power nearby to support a substantial program.

- **Art galleries**: Becoming a preferred destination for art galleries by offering low rents is an excellent urban revitalization strategy. As rents increase in Crossroads and on Main Street, galleries will seek new, affordable locales. However, this is more of a long-term strategy, since ample space is available in Crossroads and rents continue to be low.

- **Look to the east**: While neighborhoods to the west are well-served by retail, neighborhoods to the east of Highway 71 are underserved. By serving more neighborhoods to the east, more buying power can be tapped and a retail strategy begins to emerge.

Using this latter strategy, the following retail program is supportable:

- Expansion of the existing grocery store (Save-A-Lot) by 10,000 square feet
- Addition of a discount general merchandise store, such as a “dollar store” of up to 5,000 square feet
- Approximately 10,000 to 15,000 square feet of inline retail and restaurant tenants; ideally included in this mix are stores and/or restaurants that celebrate Troost’s authentic ethnic and cultural heritage.

This strategy is dependent on the ability to provide quality spaces at relatively low rents of $12 per square foot. Such a strategy will require use of New Markets Tax Credits, Historic Tax Credits, or other incentives.

**Armour Boulevard and Troost Market Program**

The above analysis yields the following program over a period of 10 to 12 years:

- Mixed-income housing: up to 300 units
- Historic building rehab: up to 300 or 400 units (depending on supply)
- Medical facility/clinic: 40,000 square feet
- Retail: maintain existing grocer plus 25,000 to 30,000 square feet of additional retail
Node Two: 63rd Street & Troost

There are several ways in which the 63rd and Troost node compares and contrasts with Armour and Troost. Like the Armour location, a stark differentiation exists between the high home values on the west side the low values on the east side. Also, transit access is good and several large employers are nearby.

Yet market-based opportunities at 63rd are better. For one thing, home values are much higher to the west as the Brookside neighborhood is among the most sought-after in the Kansas City region. Retail fares better as well, since visibility and access are better. While the Landing Mall is not performing well (it is 73 percent occupied), its $12 per square foot rents are something to which Armour and Troost can aspire. Therefore, while incentives are almost certainly necessary to realize quality redevelopment at Troost and Armour, market-based opportunities are at Troost and 63rd are stronger—particularly with respect to retail—and thus the financial "gap" that the public sector would have to accommodate is likely to be less.

Residential

Unlike Troost and Armour, for-sale housing is likely to be highly marketable at the site, following a recovery of the for-sale market, and provided an urban neighborhood (in the form of a new urbanist community, traditional neighborhood, etc.) can be established. Attempts at infill in previous decades (the original Citadel development, for example) may have been more successful if they had provided a more urban product. With home sales ranging from $180,000 to $350,000 just to the west of Troost, this location is analogous to the Gaslight Square single family redevelopment project at the edge of the Central West End neighborhood in St. Louis. In the Kansas City market, suburban products such as Arborwalk and New Longview, in Lee’s Summit provide the quality and character of housing that is likely to be marketable at this location. Dense single family uses and townhomes are possible at prices of $130 to $145 per square foot, provided total price points generally range between $160,000 and $225,000. Absorption of 15 to 20 units a year is reasonable, once the housing market makes a fuller recovery.

Apartments using wood-frame construction are possible at the site. Market rate units should be priced below those at Longfellow Heights and The Founders, perhaps at $1.15 per square foot (per month) for one-bedroom units and $0.90 per square foot for two bedroom units. If a strong sense of place is created, rents could increase 10 percent. One to two phases, spread out over two to four years, could total 200 to 300 units.

Office

Similar to Troost and Armour, this node will benefit from access to a previously untapped market for health care services and increasing consumer
demand for “retail-based services”. Unlike Armour, this site has better vehicular access and visibility and an adjacent hospital. Roughly 40,000 to 80,000 square feet of space could be devoted to medical office space. While several medical office facilities have significant vacancy in the area, this study finds this to be attributable, in large part, to the functional obsolescence of those buildings, as well as a reflection of the lower rates of health care coverage among low and moderate income households. It is anticipated that this dynamic will change as more people are covered under the AHCAA program.

**Retail**

Contrary to Troost and Armour, the best retail strategy at 63rd is to reduce overall square footage and improve quality. The retail market is oversupplied, as evidenced by the 73 percent occupancy rate at The Landing, which has 216,000 square feet and dated in appearance. That said, the site is highly accessible and visible, and the occupancy of outlots and smaller shopping centers along Troost is a testament to the local economy, which can obviously sustain some amount of retail. Rather than have a large space with a low occupancy, a 120,000 square foot retail center would be “right-sized” and could likely achieve higher annual lease rates of $16 per square foot.

**Retail Tenanting**

Strategically, serving the undersupplied markets to the east yields the greatest opportunity to fill retail spaces. Many existing retailers in the shopping center, including an off-price retailer, apparel stores, and several casual restaurants, could be held over.

Two big opportunities loom large for anchors. First, general merchandise stores are in short supply. A junior department store, one that sells off-price retail goods (i.e., Marshalls, T.J. Maxx) would make an excellent anchor tenant that could serve markets to both the east and west. Similarly, Old Navy would make an excellent junior anchor at this site. Lastly, an existing grocer in the market area might be persuaded to relocate to such a visible interchange. In this way, space could be reduced and quality could be improved.

**63rd and Troost Market Program**

The above analysis yields the following program over a period of 10 to 12 years:

- For Sale Housing: 15-20 units per year, following a housing market recovery
- Apartments: 200 to 300 units (depending on supply)
- Medical Facility/Clinic: 40,000 to 80,000 square feet
- Retail: reduce square feet, improve quality, and improve design standards.
Nuisances and Shared Parking

It is noteworthy that in order to market the node to residents, medical office users, and quality retailers, certain uses likely need to be removed due to the negative image that they often lend to communities. These include check cashing businesses and consignment or pawn shops. These represent barriers to marketability that, once removed, make other uses more viable.

An outstanding opportunity exists for shared parking, since medical office and retail tenants have a high degree of compatibility. Peak hours for medical office space are during the work week, whereas retailers experience the greatest volume of business on weekends and evenings. By exploring shared parking strategies, land can be more intensely (and profitably) developed, the urban landscape improves, and marketability of the entire node increases.
The Troost Corridor community and stakeholders met regularly for a year prior to this project, and in anticipation of this upcoming plan, to develop goals and to prioritize two key nodes along the corridor that would be explored more deeply in terms of redevelopment. The group was assisted by UMKC’s Department of Architecture, Urban Planning + Design, led by Professor Jacob Wagner, Ph.D. The UMKC design students began their work in January 2012 and completed it at the end of the spring semester in May 2012. The design studio process generated a planning analysis of the corridor including data about the corridor from Columbus Park in the north to 95th Street in the south. These data were organized around the three aspects of sustainability: **Equity, Economy and Environment**.

After the students presented their initial findings to the stakeholders in March 2012, the representatives and residents of the corridor participated in a prioritization process that helped to identify high priority nodes for additional planning. The nodes included **Amour Boulevard** and **63rd Street**, which were later selected by corridor stakeholders in the fall of 2012 for further analysis.

To assist with this planning project, a smaller group of volunteers from these stakeholders agreed to serve on a committee to select the planning consultant team and then also served as a small advisory committee during the planning process. The **Troost Corridor Advisory Group** and the Consultants then worked together to review existing...
conditions, data, and a new market analysis. They developed planning alternatives for each of the two selected nodes and made recommendations for implementation based on the financial viability, catalytic opportunity, and the plans’ contributions toward a more sustainable development pattern for this important urban corridor.

The community-oriented Advisory Group kicked off the planning process with a bus tour on October 30, 2012. Community and neighborhood leaders, joined by the planning consultant team and city staff, traveled the length of Troost Avenue together on a bus provided by Kansas City Area Transit Authority (KCATA) to learn from local leadership about current development projects, plans, challenges and opportunities along the corridor. The Advisory Group’s responsibility was to provide the Planning Team with two nodes or intersections along the corridor to study in detail. After the two-hour bus tour, the group discussed four possible study sites with pros and cons. The Advisory Group prioritized their node selection at their November meeting.

The Advisory Group’s role was to:

- Provide the Planning Team with two specific nodes along the corridor for detailed redevelopment planning and financial strategies for implementation;

- provide direct neighborhood input for each node the planning process progressed;

- and provide outreach to their larger community networks.

A robust community involvement plan for the project maximized outreach and involvement of citizens at every level, from civic and community leaders to business interests, public and private organizations, citizens and residents in the Troost corridor. The planning process included two open community workshops, 6(? ) Advisory Group meetings, numerous individual stakeholder meetings and public feedback from MindMixer and the website.

The Advisory Group Meetings
November 8 & November 20, 2012

The Planning Team presented demographic and economic data together with a preliminary market analysis for the corridor, and led a discussion about future development potential in the area between 27th St. on the north and 75th St. on the south. The
Advisory Group decided to focus on two key intersections on Troost in order to provide two distinct and different market opportunities with potential for redevelopment:

- Armour Boulevard
- 63rd Street (site of the Landing Shopping Center)

Community Meeting #1
Mohart Center - December 4, 2012

More than 70 people participated in a community workshop on December 4th to consider new concepts for sustainable redevelopment along Troost. Stakeholders included neighborhood associations, residents, civic leaders, and business owners to review market data and make informed recommendations to the project team.

Participants were asked to also consider future projections of population shifts over the next two decades when working with large maps and interactive development tools provided at each table.

Working together in small groups of six to 10, community members developed a series of creative ideas that built upon the recently completed transit improvements along Troost Avenue and took advantage of the market analysis for a reality-based
strategy. Those ideas were captured by facilitators at each of the 10 tables, and compiled by the Planning Team for presentation to the Advisory Group.

Community Meeting #2
UMKC, Katz Hall - March 14, 2013

The second and final open community meeting was held March 14, 2013. Based on community feedback from the December 2012 public meeting, the market analysis and data trends, the Planning Team presented three conceptual alternative plans for each of the two study nodes. Details of these concepts and preliminary financial analyses are presented in Section 5 Preliminary Development Concepts.

Extensive outreach prior to the public meeting included e-vites, flyers, and presentations to other organizations, including the Southtown Council's Planning and Development Committee. Everyone who attended the first public meeting was invited to participate in the second one as well.

After a detailed presentation of the development alternatives and preliminary financial strategies, the Planning Team opened the floor to questions from more than 60 people in attendance. After Q&A, team members were positioned at each of the planning boards so that citizens could get a closer view of each alternative and provide more input directly.

Two survey cards, one for each intersection, were distributed as attendees registered. These were collected at the end of the Open House segment of the meeting and were compiled for further discussion by the team and the Advisory Group.

At two working sessions during this design phase, the Advisory Group met to discuss and refine the alternative planning concepts for each node, providing input and direction on the selection of the final recommended development plan at each node. These recommendations are detailed in Sections 6 and 7.
As stated in Section 2, the existing conditions of the corridor and the market analysis were shared with the community as a framework for guiding new ideas about positive redevelopment in the area. This plan is the product of the market analysis and represents a thoughtful, informed and careful assessment with the community about what can feasibly be developed to spur additional growth and positive momentum. The first open community meeting focused on developing “big ideas” or scenarios that could be explored in more detail by the planning team. After alternatives for each of the two selected nodes were developed, including financial impacts, these were then shared with the community at the second public meeting where preferred alternatives were agreed upon.

During the first public meeting, each table of workshop participants responded to a set of questions based on the market analysis designed to spark discussion of what kind of development projects people envisioned for each of the two nodes, and what type of businesses, residents and activities they would most like to attract to the area. At the end of the evening each table shared with the entire group what they believed were their best ideas based on the market analysis information that was presented earlier in the evening. This list of ideas, based on the reality of the market and existing conditions became the creative base for developing a number of preliminary concepts, six of which were refined.

A specific program was developed for each concept to include land use and building types, sustainability metrics and overall character, each of which met the market analysis criteria for each node. Some of the ideas generated address overall neighborhood character and livability, some are programmatic so-called “wish list” items, some are aimed at potential catalytic projects for a specific location and some express the need for funding strategies. Below is the list of the original “Big Ideas” reported during the meeting followed by descriptions of how these were incorporated into each of the six conceptual plans.
Community-Generated “Big Ideas”

- Locate Troost Village credit union
- Non-profit and profit partnerships to help with economic development
- “Troost Bucks” for community service
- Encourage artists to move from west to east side of Troost
- Create Live/Work zone along corridor and incentivize this zone.
- Help with public safety/crime/specifc sites/code enforcement
- Address problem areas
- Develop university district and extend east of Troost with affordable housing.
- Repurpose The Landing shopping center to higher density residential with shops on first floor
- Need public meeting place along Troost
- CID district at 63rd and Troost
- Additional development on 63rd Street corridor east of Troost
- Mixed-use north of 63rd to 59th
- Streetcar/rail system – east/west connections
- Support schools near 63rd St.
- Create business owner coalition to improve corridor
- Redevop The Landing as mixed-income housing to attract all groups
- Develop loan strategy to encourage investment in the neighborhoods
- Interest in additional development at 31st & Troost
- Improve infrastructure/streetscape/building stock
- Attract new families/seniors/students to rehab existing housing stock
- Need multi-purpose building (YMCA)
- Create CID to encourage shared costs/security
- Encourage development of apartments east of Troost
- Retail stores on first level/upper level housing for singles/families without children
- Assisted living housing along Armour
- Want retail and food within walking distance
- Relocate gas station
- Art district near retail
- Bike lanes/access. Not on Troost
During the planning process, the “Big Ideas” from the public meeting were refined and incorporated into what became the central themes for each of the three conceptual plans:

- **Option 1: Urban Neighborhood**
- **Option 2: Health & Fitness**
- **Option 3: Tech + Arts**

The **Urban Neighborhood** concept attracts new residents to the area by extending housing eastward along Armour Blvd. and southward along the east side of Troost. This is envisioned as a mixed income development that would also encourage historic rehabilitation of the Marquette building as well as other older homes in the area. Newly created apartments are anticipated to be approximately 850 sq. ft., similar in size to successfully renovated historic apartment buildings to the west. Parking is arranged to the back of the buildings in order to create a strong and vibrant street scene along Troost Avenue with extensive landscape buffers between the parking and adjacent neighborhoods. Newly created apartment buildings would be similar in character to Kansas City’s historic colonnaded apartments, two and three stories with setback courtyards and extensive landscaping along building fronts.

In keeping with the urban neighborhood theme and in support of the transit corridor, the first floor of the former Rexall Drug Store building on the southwest corner is proposed to house small transit oriented retail business. Coffee and other sundries would be available for both Troost BRT and Metro bus riders. A collection of micro retailers might be another possibility. Rehabilitation of the mixed use building would include second floor apartments, together with a two story addition on the west side fronting on Armour.

Finally, as a project to help support the residential redevelopment, a four-story medical office project is proposed on the northwest corner on the existing gas station site. This recommendation from the market analysis might provide small clinic space or preventative care services. The new facility would serve as an anchor for the entire intersection, but still work within the neighborhood theme with a more street friendly storefront use on the first floor.
OPTION 1: URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD CONCEPT
SITE AREA USES: 4.6 acres [204,185 SQ.FT.]

Residential: 158 Units (@850 SQ. FT./unit) + 60 Rehab Units (@650 SQ. FT.)
Parking: 175 Parking (0.8/unit)
No. of Stories: 3-4

Retail: 9,295 SQ. FT.
Parking: 28 (3/1,000 SQ. FT.)
No. of Stories: 1

Office: 20,000 SQ. FT.
Parking: 60 (3/1,000 SQ. FT.)
No. of Stories: 4

LEGEND
- Existing Structures
- Future Development Opportunity
- Residential
- Medical Office
- Mixed Use
- 2-3 Minute Walk (1/8 Mile)

Armour Option 1: Urban Neighborhood Concept Plan
The **Health and Fitness** concept creates a district that ties together a number of sustainable planning principles and provides extensive enhancements to the livability of the area. This concept incorporates a road diet along Troost with a modified street section to accommodate bicycles and to create wider sidewalks for pedestrians. As such, rent-a-bike facilities and enhanced transit stations with related retail and services are major programmatic components. Curb extensions along Troost at the intersections will serve to shorten pedestrian crossings while at the same time, provide areas for green stormwater collection facilities.

Some new residential units are included much like the Urban Neighborhood concept, but this option provides more medical office space, some of which might house a fitness center or other health conscious services. Some parcels are left as green open space at least for the short term, to be utilized as flexible use areas to accommodate a host of food related activities such as community gardens, restaurant pop-ups, food or grocery trucks. Like the Urban Neighborhood, the existing grocery store would remain with potential expansion to the west.

In addition to the emphasis on the Armour and Troost intersection, this concept also extends redevelopment opportunities northward to the intersection of East 34th St. and Troost. On the northwest corner, a new two-story mixed use project would house the existing not-for-profit “Move-Up” with new residential units on the second floor. The plan assumes that the other existing tenants might also relocate in the new building. On the southeast corner, a new two-story structure would provide “live/work” space where residents would live above storefront space on the first floor with shared outdoor work space behind. **The desire for this type of flexible living space was a common theme on the part of the current residents in the area.** It is anticipated that residents who might be attracted to a district that encourages and supports a healthy and fit lifestyle may also have a strong interest in living arrangements designed to accommodate the need to have common work zones where residents might share a carpentry shop, art gallery space, or garden space. The concept of live/work space is discussed in more detail as part of the Tech + Arts concept.

![Amour Option 2: Health and Fitness Concept Sketch](image)
OPTION 2: HEALTH AND FITNESS CONCEPT
SITE AREA USES: 6.2 acres [274,065 SQ.FT.]

Residential: 132 Units (@850 SQ. FT./unit) + 60 Rehab Units (@650 SQ. FT./unit)
Parking: 154 Parking (0.8/unit)
No. of Stories: 2-3

Office: 50,000 SQ. FT.
Parking: 150 (3/1,000 SQ. FT.)
No. of Stories: 2-3

Mixed Use: 18,374.5 SQ.FT.
Parking: 56 (3/1,000 SQ.FT.)
No. of Stories: 3

Outdoor Garden/Market: 30,000 SQ. FT.
The **Tech + Arts** concept grew out of the community’s desire to attract artists, tradespeople, and design professionals to the area by providing housing where residents could live and work within either the same building or in close proximity. In this concept, the district would grow organically, not unlike the way the Crossroads District has, with housing stock that would take various forms.

This scenario could provide a range of unique live/work opportunities and building types, but a set of specific design guidelines would be needed to ensure that the overall character of the district is compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods. For example, several of the existing structures would remain for rehabilitation/reuse to create shared workspaces such as carpentry or metal shops, artist studio space, catering kitchens or child care facilities. First floor storefronts might offer gallery space for resident artists, or perhaps be used as a shared showroom for work samples or client meetings.

While the Tech + Arts district is envisioned to support a variety of apprenticeship/educational opportunities, it could also incorporate business incubator space particularly aimed at emerging technical businesses like Google Fiber.

Unlike the other two concepts for Troost and Armour Blvd., this option offers a different approach to the existing development on the northwest corner. The existing gas station remains, but would be renovated to provide an enhanced streetscape presence, new landscape treatments and with the building relocated closer to the street.

![Amour Option 3: “Tech + Arts” Concept Sketch](image-url)
OPTION 3: TECH + ARTS CONCEPT
SITE AREA USES: 3.59 acres [156,380 SQ.FT.]

Residential: 134 Units (@850 SQ. FT./unit) + 27 Rehab Units (@850 SQ.FT./unit)
Parking: 173 (0.8/unit)
No. of Stories: 2

Mixed Use (CO-OP/Gallery/Flex Space): 25,257 SQ.FT
Parking: 89 (3/1,000 SQ.FT.)
No. of Stories: 1-2
The 63rd Street node differs significantly from the Armour node both in character and in scale. The planning process was similar, however, driven by the “Big Ideas” generated from the public meeting together with recommendations from the market analysis. Together, these were incorporated into what became the central themes for each of the three conceptual plans at 63rd St. titled:

- **Option 1: Troost Village**
- **Option 2: Town Center**
- **Option 3: Green Tech**

In general, all of the concepts concentrate redevelopment opportunities south of 63rd St. capitalizing on the approximately 12 acre Landing Shopping Center site. In all three scenarios, new residential units along the north side of 63rd immediately to the west of the existing pharmacy are proposed as future phase development. All three options recommend that the Walgreens pharmacy building be relocated up to the street at such time that the building is scheduled for reconstruction or rezoning in order to complete a 100% corner and reinforce the pedestrian quality of the intersection. On the northwest corner, the existing two-story building is currently for sale and is recommended to remain and be renovated to provide new office space.
Existing streetscape along Meyer Boulevard on the south side of The Landing.

Existing vacant office building located on the northwest corner of 63rd Street and Troost.

Existing drugstore located on the northeast corner of 63rd Street and Troost.

Existing Landing frontage along 63rd Street and Troost.
Central to the **Troost Village** concept is the creation of a new walkable neighborhood envisioned as a catalytic development project that would connect the planned developments of new schools and residential development to the east with the Brookside area to the west. (This is also a recommendation from the 63rd St. Corridor Plan, completed by the City in the late 1990's).

The concept reintroduces the original street grid and re-establishes the neighborhood pedestrian pattern by extending Forest Avenue south to Meyer Blvd. The entire shopping center site is redeveloped as new apartments fronting the newly created streets. New mixed-use units with apartments situated above first floor retail businesses reinforce the neighborhood feel while activating the street scene along Troost Avenue.

The concept also extends redevelopment west of Troost and south of Meyer Blvd. between the existing neighborhoods, schools and church. This opportunity would be created by capitalizing on the future stormwater improvements planned for the Town Fork Creek watershed as part of the City’s Overflow Control program which may provide property acquisition opportunities to allow further redevelopment at Meyer Blvd.

This concept would extend new retail along the east side of Troost south of Meyer Blvd. with additional mixed-use apartments and retail on the west. The new development replaces existing pad site retail and fast food restaurants. The existing grocery store on the east side of Troost could then be relocated to the northwest corner of Troost and Meyer Blvd. In addition to redevelopment of the existing parcels, the stormwater project could also bring a variety of associated amenities for the neighborhood and nearby schools with the introduction of new walking trails and bio-retention gardens. Located within the viewshed of new housing on the steeping sloping site of the current shopping center, these new green space amenities would help to attract new residents.

---

63rd Street Option 1: Troost Village Concept Sketch
**OPTION 1: TROOST VILLAGE CONCEPT**

**SITE AREA USES: 26 acres [1,135,325 SQ.FT.]**

- **Residential:** 576 Units (@850 SQ. FT./unit)
  - Parking: 461 Parking (0.8/unit)
  - No. of Stories: 3-4

- **Retail:** 78,000 SQ. FT. (30,000 SQ. FT. for Grocery)
  - Parking: 234 (3/1,000 SQ. FT.)
  - No. of Stories: 1

- **Office:** 40,000 SQ. FT.
  - Parking: 120 (3/1,000 SQ. FT.)
  - No. of Stories: 2

- **Mixed Use:** 63,700 SQ.FT.
  - Parking: 192 (3/1,000 SQ.FT.)
  - No. of Stories: 2-3
The **Town Center** concept takes a different approach to the redevelopment of the current Landing site with the introduction of a mixed-use "power retail" center. This concept proposes a new east/west street bisecting the current Landing site, lined with mixed use (first floor retail and second floor residential) buildings with a small or junior box retail store as the anchor on the east end and a new medical office building on the corner of Troost and 63rd.

The newly created town center would retain the existing parking structure that is currently on the Landing site, significantly cutting costs for parking. Some small retail and additional mixed-use opportunities extend the Town Center to include the west side of Troost. However, this concept suggests redevelopment opportunities that could be implemented without the additional property acquisitions to the south as part of the OCP stormwater project. Since this option is envisioned more as a commercial development with some residential as opposed to a newly created residential neighborhood, the green stormwater amenities are not seen as critical to attracting development.
OPTION 2: TOWN CENTER CONCEPT
SITE AREA USES: 15.78 acres (707,348 SQ.FT.)

Residential: 511 Units (@850 SQ.FT./unit)
Parking: 462 (0.8/unit)
No. of Stories: 3

Retail: 36,119 SQ.FT.
Parking: 107 (3/1,000 SQ.FT.)
No. of Stories: 1
Medical Office: 28,800 SQ.FT.
Parking: 86 (3/1,000 SQ.FT.)
No. of Stories: 2

Mixed Use: 91,082 SQ.FT.
Parking: 269 (3/1,000 SQ.FT.)
No. of Stories: 3

63rd Street Option 2: Town Center Concept Plan
While the **Green Tech** concept includes some of the elements of both the Troost Village and the Town Center concepts, the primary focus is the creation of a campus-like development along Meyer Blvd. that would support a range of office and spaces designed specifically to attract the high tech, or perhaps the “green” tech community. Seen as a public/private initiative, this option would require major investment from corporate and other private entities with an interest in training and education, or research and development in new technologies.

The newly created campus would offer both outdoor and indoor flexible space to demonstrate sustainable building technologies, such as bio-retention facilities, solar panel installations, green roofs, and so on. In this scenario, the existing grocery store could be relocated to the northwest corner of Troost and Meyer Blvd. and redesigned to have a strong street presence and pedestrian access from the public sidewalk. On the shopping center site, the existing parking garage would remain wrapped with new mixed-use development that offers retail, restaurant and other services that would support the new tech campus.
**OPTION 3: GREEN TECH CONCEPT**

**SITE AREA USES: 23 acres [1,000,240 SQ.FT.]**

- **Residential:** 342 Units (@850 SQ. FT./unit)
  - Parking: 274 Parking (0.8/unit)
  - No. of Stories: 3

- **Retail:** 30,000 SQ. FT. (Grocery)
  - Parking: 90 (3/1,000 SQ. FT.)
  - No. of Stories: 1

- **Office:** 107,200 SQ. FT.
  - Parking: 322 (3/1,000 SQ. FT.)
  - No. of Stories: 2

- **Mixed Use:** 100,215 SQ.FT.
  - Parking: 301 (3/1,000 SQ.FT.)
  - No. of Stories: 3

- **Tech Center:** 39,800 SQ. FT.
  - Parking: 120 Parking (3/1,000 SQ. FT.)
  - No. of Stories: 1

- **Open Green Space:** 4.8 acres (209,850 SQ. FT.)
SECTION 6: FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The final redevelopment scenarios for the two study nodes along Troost Avenue each emerged as a hybridized version of the three conceptual plans that were developed for each location. They were based on the “Big Ideas” developed at the first Community Workshop, as well as further evaluation of the financial strategies necessary to make the proposed development a reality. The original concepts are discussed in greater detail in the prior section.

The Planning Team worked together with the Troost Advisory Group to examine the merits of the various aspects of each conceptual plan. The resulting first draft versions of each of the two final plans were presented at the second public meeting and then further revised in response to additional comments received from meeting participants and city officials. From start to finish, the recommendations reflect the outcomes of an interactive process working back and forth among a broad range of planners and designers, city staff and neighborhood residents.

Armour Boulevard & Troost

Pedestrian oriented in scale, this ultimate plan for Troost Avenue and Armour Blvd. reintroduces some neighborhood retail and small-scale mixed-use buildings with new work-force oriented apartments similar in scale to Kansas City’s historic colonnaded apartment buildings. The plan emphasizes a district identity that welcomes artists, designers and creative residents to flexible live/work space in both existing buildings and new infill buildings. This plan is designed to enhance and strengthen the ongoing surrounding neighborhood revitalization efforts, but retains a slightly higher density along Troost in keeping with the market analysis trends and feasibility. Creative temporary uses of buildings and properties would be encouraged to support the “creative” district idea – pop-up restaurants, food trucks, a farmers’ market in the parking lots on the weekends, movable art galleries, etc.

Example of pop-up restaurant
Central to the plan is to re-establish a “100%” corner by replacing the existing underperforming land uses with new buildings on the northwest and northeast corners with more lively activities to compliment the MAX stations and logical transitions into the neighborhoods on each side. This will be one of the biggest challenges to accomplish and will likely be done in phases.

Urban redevelopment of multiple properties does not often happen all at once, but rather is an organic mix of gradual improvements, removal of blighting influences, stimulus projects and private investment. Before the ultimate build-out envisioned by the community can be attained for this node, a strategic partnership between city agencies and staff and the neighborhoods will need to prioritize how city incentives would best benefit the ultimate outcome. For instance, rather than providing tax incentives immediately, the City might consider acquiring the properties north of Armour, demolishing what is there now and providing a buildable, clean site for new development. Even if the resulting green space sits empty for several years, the removal of the blighting influence could boost neighborhood improvement efforts and provide a more positive climate to attract private sector development in accordance with the plan. This is also important to encourage the further expansion of MAC Properties’ investment to the west to cross Troost toward the Paseo (specified in the updated PIEA Plan). More importantly, if the city or one of its development agencies owns these or other problematic sites, they can control the type of development that happens there. Erecting new neighborhood markers at entrances to Squire Park and North Hyde Park, heavily landscaping or screening neighborhood property from commercial property and new street improvements could be positive additions while seeking longer-term quality development opportunities.
It was clearly established in the Market Analysis that Troost is overzoned for retail use and that the area will need more rooftops and people to increase retail demand. However, it is important that new retail and mixed-use development be located in the right place in order to avoid the current problem – too many vacant commercial properties lining the entire corridor. It is anticipated that existing healthy retail businesses will be strengthened by new surrounding investment. As they upgrade and expand, they should also follow the goals of this plan.

The intersection of Armour Boulevard and Troost is important to retain as a commercial and mixed-use node – to get activity back on the street around the transit stations and to support nearby neighborhoods. The stretches of Troost between the obvious retail nodes will most likely redevelop as residential. The Market Analysis and recent redevelopment supports this concept. Medium density mixed-income work-force housing will support both the proposed retail, the current transit stations and not conflict with the surrounding single-family neighborhoods as long as parking does not encroach.
Even though new infill housing will develop in phases, it is important to identify and plan for the size, density and quality of new housing now as part of this plan. Acquiring and holding key properties in a “land bank” for future development when the time is right is one way the City can help manage the redevelopment process. Other vacant lots may serve as interim surface parking (with appropriate landscaping and screening) until development is feasible.

The land use plan below represents the recommendations of the community, the Planning Team and city staff and should be used in conjunction with the development plan on page 49 to guide future zoning and development decisions as an adopted part of the city’s area plan.

Example of live-work district character
The final plan proposed by the community is shown on page 49 and is grounded in market feasibility. A new four-story medical office building is proposed to anchor the northwest corner and a new one-story retail structure is proposed on the northeast corner (this is a small site and presents difficulty).

New residential apartments proposed along Troost Avenue south of Armour Blvd. are two-story buildings that address the street scene with welcoming courtyards and landscaping. These units could also be designed to accommodate both apartment and common shared use areas in response to the desire to create an environment for residents to both live and work within the same structures. For example, residents might share workshop or art gallery space, child care facilities or simply flexible joint use areas.

Together with the creation of a walkable, pedestrian friendly environment, transit is another major component of this plan. The existing Troost BRT stations currently located on the northeast and southwest corners are proposed to be incorporated into the buildings at both corners. The former Rexall Building is a candidate for a successful renovation of one of the intersection’s signature buildings, with offices, apartments or live/work space above first floor retail. When the market improves this historic building can be extended to the west. Well-screened, surface parking can serve as a placeholder in the interim.

In response to the expressed desire to address walkability, and the overall health and fitness of the residents, the plan calls for the use of extensive landscaping together with curb extensions at the intersections to narrow pedestrian street crossings. The existing curb lines would remain with curb extensions at either end of parallel parking on both sides of Troost. The curb extensions are proposed as part of the City's overall green infrastructure initiatives with bio-retention facilities to address storm water management and water quality similar to facilities elsewhere along the Troost Corridor. All landscape that is introduced should be neat and well maintained. Curb extensions along Armour Blvd. are not recommended, but all new development should include ample landscaping in keeping with the historic KCMO Parks and Boulevard standards.
Armour Boulevard and Troost Final Plan

EXISTING ZONING: R-0.5/R3-2/R-5
SITE AREA: 6.2 acres (274,065 SQ.FT.)

USES:
Mixed Use: 20,774 SQ.FT.
Mixed Use Parking: 63 [3/1,000 SQ.FT.]
No. of Stories: 2

Residential: 170 Units [@$500 SQ.FT./unit]
Rehab Residential: 60 units [@$500 SQ.FT./unit]
Residential Parking: 184 [0.8/unit]
No. of Stories: 2 - 3
Potential District Character
Summary of Project Feasibility for Armour Boulevard and Troost

The economic development tools outlined in the Appendix were modeled in financial pro formas to determine the degree to which they could help to bridge whatever financial gaps exist between the cost of development and the amount of private finance available for each project. In each instance, a very specific set of market, economic, and policy opportunities and constraints point toward unique strategies.

The recent rehabilitation of several historic buildings along Armour has helped to improve market conditions, with many properties achieving per-square-foot rents in excess of $1.30 per square foot. Though these same rents are unlikely to be achievable as far east as Troost, rents are likely to be higher here than most other places along Troost—meaning the financial gap in making quality projects happen is smaller. That said, rents for housing are relatively stronger than for retailers. Achievable retail market rents are relatively low in comparison to other retail areas, so financing commercial development will be more challenging than residential.

Tax Abatement

A PIEA tax abatement was put in place along Armour, beginning in 2010, which provides a 100 percent abatement for 10 years. This has several implications:

- **Improved residential viability**: Net operating expenses for residential projects are lowered, driving infeasible projects closer to viability.

- **Unaffected commercial viability**: Financing retail and Class B office projects (which generally have triple net leases, meaning property taxes are passed onto the tenants) will not be made easier by the property tax abatement.

- **Limited TIF impact**: A property tax increment financing strategy (known as payments in lieu of taxes, or “PILOTS”) cannot be used in addition to an abatement, so the primary remaining local economic development tools available are special assessments—such as Community Improvement Districts (CID’s) and Transportation Development Districts (TDD’s)—as well as retail sales taxes and earnings taxes (formally known as economic activity taxes, or “EATS”).

**TIF, CID, and TDD**

Demand for retail is limited so, while sales tax revenues can be captured using TDD, CID, and a retail sales TIF, the revenues generated will not be as robust as they would be with a development that has a significant amount of retail.
Tax Credits

As a result of these factors, tax credits must, by default, figure prominently as a tool to complement the tax abatement (already in place) in order to bridge the financial gap—thus realizing quality development at the Troost and Armour node. Three major types of tax credits will play a role:

- **Historic Tax Credits (HTC):** These can be used toward the rehabilitation of the Marquette building and/or the commercial building at the southwest corner of Troost and Armour.

- **Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC):** Low-income housing tax credits may be needed to partially finance mixed-income housing.

- **New Market Tax Credits (NMTC):** In order to provide quality buildings at the relatively low retail lease rates, New Market Tax Credits will be needed (in addition to revenues from local economic development programs).

The table below shows potential public funds that could be used toward the development program for Armour and Troost, making use of CID, TDD, and EATs.

As the table below shows, PILOTS—revenues from real property taxes—cannot be generated due to the property tax abatement that is in place. A small

### Summary of Fiscal Impact Analysis: All Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Statistics</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Class B Office</th>
<th>Mixed Income Apartments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasable Square Feet</td>
<td>25,774</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113,250</td>
<td>149,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Assessed Value (estimated)</td>
<td>$179,456</td>
<td>$19,051</td>
<td>$277,498</td>
<td>$476,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Net Present Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues from Retail Sales</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mixed Income Apartments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EATS</td>
<td>$968,748</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$968,748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>$515,119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$515,119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDD</td>
<td>$515,119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$515,119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,998,986</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,998,986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues from Real Property</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mixed Income Apartments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PILOTS 100 Percent</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-School</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% School, 100% All Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>$59,168</td>
<td>$2,929</td>
<td>$264,920</td>
<td>$287,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (CID + 100% PILOTS)</td>
<td>$59,168</td>
<td>$2,929</td>
<td>$264,920</td>
<td>$287,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total (rounded)</td>
<td>$2,060,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$2,330,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Cash Proceeds (1.25 DCF)</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$1,860,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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amount of property revenue could be generated through a CID (although use of property CIDs is rare). The “lion’s share” of public revenue that could be put toward projects is generated by retail sales through use of EATs, CID, and TDD.

Public Finance Strategy for Armour Boulevard and Troost

The following table displays development costs by use, the amount of private finance that could be made available (i.e., the project’s market value), and the financial gap that exists before use of subsidies. (In the case of residential uses, the gap is already reduced, due to the use of tax abatement). Following that line item are the total amounts of subsidies likely to be available, as well as the results of the degree to which those subsidies help make projects viable.

Apartments: With a development cost of $20.8 million and $18.7 million in private finance available, a gap of just $2.2 million is left—as little as 10 percent of the total project value. A number of public and private strategies could be undertaken to bridge this gap:

- Reduce costs: Development costs could be reduced from $130 per square foot to roughly $110 per square foot, although this would result in a loss of development quality (and possibly rental revenues).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feasibility Analysis: Armour and Troost</th>
<th>Apartments</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Class B Office</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>25,074</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Acres</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Costs*</td>
<td>$20,830,000</td>
<td>$4,860,000</td>
<td>$910,000</td>
<td>$26,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Site Improvements</td>
<td>$18,430,000</td>
<td>$5,310,000</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>$22,480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$1,550,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$4,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Finance Available</td>
<td>$18,650,000</td>
<td>$2,850,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$21,180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Principal</td>
<td>$15,860,000</td>
<td>$2,140,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$16,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Equity*</td>
<td>$4,790,000</td>
<td>$710,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$5,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;Gap before Subsidy</td>
<td>$2,180,000</td>
<td>$2,010,000</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$4,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Subsidy Available</td>
<td>$27,838,486</td>
<td>$2,580,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$30,648,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credits (Equity Value)</td>
<td>$27,848,486</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$28,748,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED Funds (Discounted)</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;Gap with Tax Credits*</td>
<td>($25,468,486)</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>($24,168,486)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;Gap with ED Programs*</td>
<td>$1,970,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$2,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;Gap (All subsidies)*</td>
<td>($25,678,486)</td>
<td>($370,000)</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>($25,028,486)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes a 12 percent developer fee; **Assumes a 15-20 percent IRR; Parentheses indicates a surplus

Developments Strategies 2013
• Land subsidy: If land costs could be reduced to $1 per acre, the project would become viable.

• Tax credits: LIHTC could be used to make the project viable. Though the project would be eligible for $27 million in tax credits (using the highly competitive nine percent credits), in theory only a small percentage of that money would be needed to make the project viable (although in practice, use of tax credits typically leads to much higher development costs—thereby increasing the need for more credits). Alternately, the less competitive four percent tax credits could be pursued, and may very well lead to viable projects.

• Shift surpluses: If developers of both the retail and historic apartments are successful in securing NMTC and HTC (both state and federal), as well as local incentives, a small surplus of subsidies would be created that could partly reduce the apartment funding gap.

• Retail: The market value of the proposed retail development is $2.9 million, while construction costs are estimated at $4.9 million, leaving a financial gap of roughly $2.0 million—a high figure, given the total cost of development. In order to subsidize this portion of the project, a combination of TDD, CID, EATs, and NMTC are needed.

• Class B Office: With a $12 per square foot lease rate (triple net) and a development cost of $150 per square foot, making office viable is difficult—even with NMTC. Additional subsidy will likely be needed, which may come in the form of historic tax credits.

The above strategy points to the need for tax credits to make projects viable, as well as the use of a combination of local economic development tools.
The final recommended development plan for the 63rd Street node incorporates many of the "big ideas" first developed and included as part of the three earlier concept plans. The overall Plan is organized around three main planning principles—transit, re-establishment of the original street grid, and green infrastructure for storm water management. The Plan is conceived to enable phasing over time as property is acquired and other ancillary projects are completed.

Transit

The Troost corridor enjoys the largest bus ridership in Kansas City and the redevelopment plan for the 63rd St. node is oriented within a quarter mile walking distance of both the Troost BRT stations and the local cross town bus service. Easy access to transit is a key factor in development of new retail, medical office, multi-family residential, mixed use and office space this major node along the Troost Avenue corridor. The presence of transit also allows for reduced parking requirements and denser land use opportunities.

Street Grid

The Landing Shopping Center is the largest parcel within the planning limits and redevelopment of the site constitutes the largest economic redevelopment effort. The reintroduction of Forest Avenue between 63rd St. and Meyer Blvd. will reorganize the large shopping mall site into a pedestrian friendly two-story mixed use development. The newly created block of Forest is conceived as an active street scene lined with retail and service oriented businesses on the ground floor and residential or office space above. As a center piece to the project, a new anchor restaurant is proposed on the NE corner of Meyer Blvd and Forest where an outdoor patio would overlook the newly created greenway to the south (see page 56 for a further discussion of this new amenity.)

The existing two-story parking structure is to be renovated to provide parking on the upper deck for a junior box retail store on the west side of the garage. On the lower deck, parking will be provided for newly created multi-family units to the south and east.

On the SE corner of Troost and 63rd a new three-story medical office building with an iconic architectural feature is proposed to help reestablish a 100 percent corner. Together with the junior box retail store, the medical building will serve as an anchor for the commercial development. Single story retail is proposed to the south of the medical office building along the east side of Troost and wrapping around the SW corner of Meyer. As with all of the recommended redevelopment, the new retail would be built as an urban model with storefronts at the property line with on-street parking in front with parking lots behind.
Final Plan for 63rd Street and Troost

EXISTING ZONING: B4-5/R-1.5
SITE AREA: 16.89 acres (756,356 SQ.FT.)

USES:
Residential: 201 Units [@850 SQ.FT./unit]
Residential Parking: 161 [0.8/unit]
No. of Stories: 3

Mixed Use: 34,306 SQ.FT.,
Mixed Use Parking: 192 [3/1,000 SQ.FT.]
No. of Stories: 2

Medical Office: 60,813 SQ.FT.,
Medical Office Parking: 180 [3/1,000 SQ.FT.]
No. of Stories: 3

Retail: 132,655 SQ.FT.,
Retail Parking: 397 [3/1,000 SQ.FT.]
No. of Stories: 1

Flex Office Space: 73,270 SQ.FT.,
Tech Center Parking: 220 [3/1,000 SQ.FT.]
No. of Stories: 2

LEGEND
Existing Structures
Residential
Medical Office
Mixed Use
Retail
Flex Office
5 Minute Walk (1/4 Mile)
BRT Station
Green Infrastructure

As part of the Overflow Control Program, the Kansas City Water Services Department (WSD) is currently funding a study of the Town Fork Creek water shed from 63rd Street south to 65th Street. While KCMO WSD usually confines improvements to within the existing right-of-way, it is possible that the level and scale of necessary improvements would involve the use of private property for implementation of new green infrastructure projects to comply with the recommendations of the study and add significant public benefits.

One possibility would require raising the grade of surrounding areas and creating an open channel to carry storm water. This approach provides an amenity that could lend itself to a public-private partnership. The City’s role in making the decision early would help attract high quality development to the area and serve as a catalyst for public investment. The proposed greenway corridor and trail system as shown in the Plan would take advantage of the opportunity to create a significant amenity for the surrounding neighborhoods by leveraging public funding in association with the infrastructure improvements.

The Plan includes conversion of the parcels along the north side of 65th St. to partially divert storm water into a series of bio retention ponds and would create green space for passive recreational use along with a new 10’ multi-use trail. On the west side of Troost, a wet detention facility would serve as a water feature for a new office building with flexible space to accommodate small business incubators such as technology start-ups. These recommendations will require relocation of the gas station and general merchandise store on the SW corner at Meyer Blvd and coordination with the charter school west of Troost. Along the north side of Meyer Blvd. within the extended right-of-way, the greenway corridor and recreational trail will serve as an amenity for new residential development.

Example of potential design for Green Infrastructure corridor.
Proposed Green Infrastructure corridor design for ultimate build-out.

Potential improvements at Meyer Boulevard and new Forest Avenue. Image Credit: Fregonese Associates
Section 6: Final Recommendations - 63rd Street & Troost

Potential District Character
Future Phasing

As a second phase to the overall development Plan, the business incubator space on the SE corner of Meyer Blvd. and Troost Ave. would expand to the south and the existing grocery would be relocated to the NW corner. This would complete the creation of a full corner intersection at Meyer Blvd. and Troost, and also improve access to the grocery story by transit riders. Like all of the proposed new development, the relocated grocery store is recommended to be a pedestrian oriented urban design with the building located at the street property line.

Summary of Project Feasibility for 63rd Street and Troost

The node at Troost and 63rd has a different set of opportunities and constraints that is shaped by the market, economics, and policy. In particular, it is a stronger retail location than the Armour node, with The Landing shopping center (and its 12 acres under single ownership) presenting an excellent opportunity for redevelopment. At 62 percent occupancy, however it is dated and functionally obsolete. The preferred, market driven strategy is to lure one to three anchors/junior anchors (such as Marshalls/TJ Maxx, Old Navy, a grocery store) to a redeveloped retail center—and to leverage those anchors to attract several inline retailers in a smaller, but higher quality shopping center. With better lease rates and sales volumes, the increase in future sales tax and/or property taxes could be borrowed against to pay for necessary improvements today. Any surplus in public revenues generated by retail development could be used to help facilitate development of others uses, such as residential and office space, or the greenway.

TIF, CID, and TDD

Two of these three tools are already in place, but are complicated by multiple boundaries within larger adopted TIF plans and CIDs. Presently, a CID is in place for the Landing site itself. If this could be extended to the remainder of the sites included in the concept plan, a significant amount of sales tax dollars could be captured to make needed improvements. A TDD could be added and used in a similar fashion.

Currently, the other quadrants are already part of the much larger Southtown CID which effectively surrounds the Landing CID. Capturing sufficient CID funds from the Southtown CID for specific use at 63rd and Troost will be necessary in order to spur reinvestment in such a large urban site, but will have positive catalytic impacts for the entire corridor. Because the Troost Corridor planning process has defined this intersection as pivotal to generating reinvestment elsewhere, both the Southtown and Landing CIDs should be amended to create a single CID for these four quadrants while reducing the scale of the Southtown CID. A caveat may be that projected future Southtown CID revenues may already be committed to repaying bonds sold to
finance improvements throughout Southtown, so restructuring the CIDs might pose a conflict with current bondholders.

There is a similar circumstance for TIF. Presently, the 63rd and Troost intersection is part of larger TIF district known as the Southtown TIF. The intersection, located in “Area L” as defined by the Southtown TIF plan, was activated in 2004. Although TIF dollars generated at the site can be committed to projects elsewhere in the TIF district, it would be imperative to dedicate the increment generated at the new Landing redevelopment in order to catalyze reinvestment elsewhere in the district and in the corridor.

The special focus on 63rd and Troost as determined by the planning process necessitates a focus of already available resources being collected for both CID and TIF in order to bridge the financing gap and assure successful implementation. This will require amendments to exiting CID and TIF districts.

**Tax Credits**

Depending on the amount of local economic development tools that are available for use at the site, tax credits will play either a modest or essential role in realizing quality redevelopment of the site. NMTCs are almost certain to play a role. They will be useful in underwriting office development and, by increasing the surplus revenues generated by retail development, would free up money generated by retail sales (and captured with programs like CID and TDD) to help subsidize more difficult components of the plan, like residential uses. These tax credits will be essential to making other uses viable if TIF cannot be utilized.

Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) could be used to create mixed-income apartments. While this may be a necessary strategy, it should probably be used as a last resort for the following reasons:

- **Competition:** Securing LIHTC’s involves a very competitive process for a finite resource. There is no certainty that the project would win the amount needed within a desirable timeframe.
- **Timeline:** Several rounds of tax credits may be needed to be secured over a period of many years, prolonging the development period for housing.
- **Citywide Strategy:** Other high profile projects, including Troost and Armour and 18th and Vine, will almost certainly be competing for these same tax credits and, unlike 63rd and Troost, do not have strong retail (and thus retail sales tax) marketability. Troost has a broader economic toolkit and it may make better strategic sense for the city to focus its efforts in securing LIHTC’s in areas with fewer alternatives.
Local Economic Development Programs

The table below shows potential public funds that could be put toward the development program for 63rd Street and Troost, making use of CID and TDD:

In the table, it is assumed that TIF revenues—from both property taxes and retail sales—cannot be generated, due to the broader Southtown TIF that is already in place. A small amount of property-based revenue could be generated through a CID (although use of property CIDs is rare). A much greater amount of public revenue that could be put toward projects is generated by retail sales through use of CID, and TDD—roughly $10.2 million dollars out of a grand total of $11.6 million in public revenue that could be captured and used to finance public improvements. Significantly, if a strategy is devised to utilize TIF at the site, the grand total could be increased from $11.6 million to roughly $26 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Fiscal Impact Analysis: All Uses</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Med Office</th>
<th>Tech Office</th>
<th>Rental Housing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasable Square Feet</td>
<td>168,961</td>
<td>80,813</td>
<td>73,270</td>
<td>145,725</td>
<td>446,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Assessed Value (Estimated)</td>
<td>$510,899</td>
<td>$172,131</td>
<td>$207,380</td>
<td>$355,580</td>
<td>$1,246,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenues from Retail Sales

- EATS: $4,998,336
- CID: $5,189,317
- TDD: $5,189,317

Total: $15,376,970

Revenues from Real Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PILOTS</th>
<th>Rental</th>
<th>Med Office</th>
<th>Tech Office</th>
<th>Rental Housing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 Percent</td>
<td>$4,424,169</td>
<td>$2,147,520</td>
<td>$1,108,196</td>
<td>$1,874,510</td>
<td>$9,554,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-School</td>
<td>$1,696,534</td>
<td>$823,509</td>
<td>$424,959</td>
<td>$718,741</td>
<td>$3,663,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% School, 100% All Other</td>
<td>$3,080,352</td>
<td>$1,485,914</td>
<td>$766,578</td>
<td>$1,206,525</td>
<td>$8,658,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>$613,895</td>
<td>$311,960</td>
<td>$168,761</td>
<td>$277,197</td>
<td>$1,371,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (CID + 100% PILOTS): $5,038,064 | $2,459,480 | $1,276,957 | $2,151,507 | $10,926,008

Potential Cash Proceeds (at 1.25 DCR): $16,340,000 | $1,970,000 | $1,020,000 | $1,720,000 | $26,040,000
Public Finance Strategy for 63rd and Troost

The analysis displayed in the following table assumes TIF is not used as an economic development tool, but includes programs such as CID, TDD, LIHTC, and NMTC.

- Retail: assuming a lease rate of $16 per square foot and development costs of $120 per square foot, the total development cost is roughly $31.4 million, and the development value is $27.6 million, leaving a financial gap of $3.8 million. This gap could comfortably be covered either by use of New Markets Tax Credits or a combination of TDD and CID programs.

Combining the two creates a surplus of roughly $11 million, which will be necessary to make other, more difficult-to-finance uses viable.

- Apartments: with a financial gap of $8.5 million, significant subsidy is needed to make quality apartment development happen. While Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) could be used, there are a number of reasons—documented earlier in this report—to use them as a last resort. Conversely, money could be taken from the surplus generated through the capture of retail sales dollars to help underwrite housing development.

- Medical Office: Like housing, medical office is likely to require subsidy in order to make it economically viable (unless a medical institution

Feasibility Analysis: 63rd and Troost Sources and Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apartments</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Med Office</th>
<th>Tech Office</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>165,981</td>
<td>60,813</td>
<td>73,270</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Acres</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Costs*</td>
<td>$28,290,000</td>
<td>$31,380,000</td>
<td>$15,740,000</td>
<td>$13,900,000</td>
<td>$89,310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Site Improvements</td>
<td>$21,790,000</td>
<td>$22,040,000</td>
<td>$12,590,000</td>
<td>$10,110,000</td>
<td>$66,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$9,340,000</td>
<td>$3,150,000</td>
<td>$3,790,000</td>
<td>$22,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Finance Available</td>
<td>$19,840,000</td>
<td>$27,350,000</td>
<td>$11,200,000</td>
<td>$7,510,000</td>
<td>$66,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Principal</td>
<td>$14,200,000</td>
<td>$20,660,000</td>
<td>$8,400,000</td>
<td>$5,630,000</td>
<td>$48,890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Equity**</td>
<td>$5,640,000</td>
<td>$6,890,000</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$1,880,000</td>
<td>$17,210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt; Gap before Subsidy</td>
<td>$8,450,000</td>
<td>$3,830,000</td>
<td>$4,540,000</td>
<td>$6,390,000</td>
<td>$23,210,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Subsidy Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apartments</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Med Office</th>
<th>Tech Office</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credits (Equity Value)</td>
<td>$32,690,000</td>
<td>$6,190,000</td>
<td>$3,580,000</td>
<td>$2,840,000</td>
<td>$45,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED Funds (Discounted)</td>
<td>$1,720,000</td>
<td>$16,340,000</td>
<td>$1,970,000</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
<td>$21,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt; Gap with Tax Credits*</td>
<td>($24,240,000)</td>
<td>($2,360,000)</td>
<td>($1,010,000)</td>
<td>($3,550,000)</td>
<td>($32,040,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt; Gap with ED Programs*</td>
<td>$6,730,000</td>
<td>$12,510,000</td>
<td>$2,570,000</td>
<td>$5,370,000</td>
<td>$21,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt; Gap (All Subsidies)*</td>
<td>($25,960,000)</td>
<td>($18,700,000)</td>
<td>($960,000)</td>
<td>($2,530,000)</td>
<td>($43,090,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes a 12 percent developer fee; **Assumes a 15-20 percent IRR; *Parentheses indicates a surplus

DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

Creating Sustainable Places
elects to develop an owner-occupied building). If New Markets Tax Credits are secured to their fullest amount, the financial gap becomes quite small.

- Tech Office: with much lower anticipated lease rates (relative to medical office) for a tech startup facility, the financial gap is large. Even with the use of tax credits and economic development programs, a financial gap exists.

While retail surplus funds could be applied toward tech office, there could be a role for foundations (particularly those interested in fostering entrepreneurship) and the business community. Start-up office and business incubators should not be evaluated, economically, as conventional real estate deals. Rents need to be low and spaces and leases need to be flexible to encourage growth. The end game should not be simply to make a real estate transaction, but to grow jobs and the broader economy. Conversely, institutional and corporate funds that subsidize housing development are rare, so public money (say from a retail CID or TDD) might be best diverted to uses that are both important to the project and have few other funding options. In this case, housing will add vitality to a mixed use district and help weave two communities (east and west) together in a way that a simple retail or commercial development cannot.

Of course, if a strategy is devised to utilize TIF, a greater amount of funds would be available to make projects viable, which would yield several potential benefits:

- Less reliance on uncertain tax credits
- Greater ability to subsidize projects and improve development quality
- Greater “margin for error” if site development costs, environmental costs, etc. end up exceeding initial estimates

Therefore, it is worthwhile to explore TIF as an option. Development of the site hinges on the ability of a high-quality new development to appeal to and attract the junior anchors necessary to improve the ability of the site to increase revenue generation in the form of retail sales and property taxes.
**FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS: ACTION PLAN**

1. The City of Kansas City, MO should adopt this plan, as well as incorporate it into all appropriate area plans.
   - Initiate and sustain annual or more frequent meetings and updates for top community leaders—elected and civic. Keep them aware of progress.
   - Utilize the plan and the process of its implementation as a framework for intergovernmental and citizen cooperation on a variety of issues and levels, thereby building a base for broader engagement within the Troost-Armour node, the Troost-63rd St. node and their extensions north, south, east, and west.

2. Continue and, if necessary, formally establish the public/private planning and implementation committee to be the protector and champion of the Corridor Plan and of measures required for its implementation and expansion.
   - Maintain communication with and input from various public and private interest groups in the community, not the least of which is the real estate development/redevelopment industry. Regarding the latter, focus on those who understand and are interested in or have experience with mixed use projects.
   - Meet with city, county, transportation, economic development, land use, and open space officials to explain the plan and solicit support in concept and in substance with regard to its implementation.
   - Appear before the City Plan Commission, the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the City Council’s Plans & Zoning Committee in support of actions in accordance with the Corridor Plan and, conversely, in opposition to contrary proposals. As the need arises to amend or extend the plan, the committee should lead the way in advocating progressive plan refinements.
   - Maintain a unified front in dealing with city, county, regional, state, and federal officials and organizations as well as with prospects for investment in the planning area—the neighborhoods the city, and other public and private interests working in common, under a compact that transcends changes in political and civic leadership over time.

3. Develop a Special Character Overlay District that will regulate unwelcome land uses currently allowed under the existing base zoning, as well as design guidelines. Amend the Zoning Code accordingly for the corridor between 27th St. and Meyer Blvd.
   - Establish a community-based Task Force of residents and commercial property owners with City Planning and Development Department staff to draft the overlay ordinance including statement of purpose, prohibited land uses and design guidelines, and governance and appeals process.
   - Explore different guidelines for different sections of the corridor in order to protect and enhance its diverse characteristics.
   - Allow flexibility for the creative “district”
aspect at Armour, allowing temporary and interim uses encouraged by the plan.

- Evaluate how the local project approval process can be streamlined by eliminating some, if not many, of the steps required of developers, if they conform with the plan.

4. Utilize the City’s land banking program or other city mechanisms that pool public and/or civic funds earmarked to acquire strategic properties deemed critical to achieving plan objectives.

- Give highest priority to property in two principal categories:
  - Areas designated for future mixed uses (housing, work spaces, retailing) that, without protection, otherwise might be developed in the short term for single uses that would insufficiently contribute to urban dynamics that define the Troost Corridor.
  - Areas designated for future open space, parks or trails – areas to be leveraged as amenities benefiting surrounding residential and commercial uses.
- Continue to prepare more detailed land use plans for potential investment in expansion areas, and identify specific key properties to be targeted for acquisition by the City or its agencies.
- Identify appropriate funding sources for long term land holding.

5. Prepare a capital improvements plan to anticipate and fund necessary public infrastructure on a timely basis – roads, water, sewers, parks, open space and trails, high speed communication, other utilities, etc.

- Target 3rd, 4th, 5th & 6th District PIAC funds for infrastructure improvements at both nodes to encourage redevelopment and target their use over a specific period of time as was done downtown from 1998-2003.
- Prepare design and construction documents for the infrastructure improvements contained in the recommended node plans (e.g., roadway realignments, bikeways and sidewalks, landscaping) on both private and public properties.
- Meet with/appear before city and regional transportation officials to secure short to long range commitments to implement appropriate elements of the recommended nodal plans and multiple sources of funding.
- Address the other key elements of critical public infrastructure that both enable and guide growth in a manner similar to a. and b. above with regard to transportation – water, sewer, fiber optics, parks, open space and trails, etc.

6. The City and its redevelopment agencies should coordinate acquisition of key properties to remove blight and gain control over land that will be critical for future success.
• The city must continue to support neighborhood revitalization efforts along Troost.
• The City must emphasize crime protection as an elemental part of its economic development strategy.

7. Initiate and adopt a joint economic development strategy that is consistent with the job creation and community wealth building goals of the plan.
• Of critical importance is fostering an understanding of the distinction between fiscal development and economic development. A focus on growth of retail establishments and centers that generate sales taxes to fund local government will miss the key point of economic development: promoting economic growth and prosperity based on the high quality jobs for a high quality work force.
• Coordinate through appropriate citizen-based groups in the Troost corridor.
• Coordinate with the Kansas City Economic Development Corporation, the Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerces, Urban Neighborhood Initiative, the Full Employment Council, educational institutions, and other county and state agencies.

8. Create a public information network and effective marketing plan designed to attract private investors and development talent committed both to realizing the recommended plans for both nodes and the entire corridor where applicable and to resisting public and private actions and investments that are not compatible with the plan.
• Make regular progress reports to the City Plan Commission and the City Council. Make regular progress reports to local leadership groups.
• Create and maintain a web page devoted to both nodes, perhaps as an adjunct to a larger Troost corridor web page; include links to and from all appropriate partners (e.g., City, EDC, Troost organizations, etc.).
• Place articles in the local and regional press; encourage bloggers to generate conversation and interest in the redevelopment plans.
• Make direct contact with members of the development/redevelopment industry whose track record locally, regionally,
or nationally would enhance the quality and scope of the redevelopment plans' implementation. Proactively seek developers.

- Create a “name” and “brand” for each node that can be marketed to elicit a preferred image throughout the region and nation. “Country Club Plaza,” “18th & Vine,” and “Westport” are obvious local examples. “Meyer Village” or “Amour Arts” might be starting points.

### BARRIERS TO SUCCESS

1. **Unacceptable and/or unmanageable crime rates against persons and property.**

2. **Market rents and financial rates of return that discourage private investment.**

3. **Lack of suitable redevelopment sites made available at costs that help to overcome insufficient rates of financial return.**

4. **Lack of unity among advocates for redevelopment opportunities**

5. **Lack of real community involvement when developers seek zoning/land use approvals from the City.**

6. **Difficult in holding out for higher-quality development over the long-term.**

### CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS

1. **Open and transparent planning process and follow-up implementation.**

2. **Consensus from local residents and property owners on the direction of the Corridor Plan.**

3. **A core group of supportive property owners and/or developer(s) with the resources and patience to fulfill the plan's goals over time.**

4. **Dedicated citizen groups and public officials who communicate regularly and often on plan implementation progress, possible financial resources, and plan amendments to meet inevitably evolving market conditions and opportunities.**

5. ** Appropriately scaled sites created through land assembly.**

6. **More suitable zoning and regulatory standards.**

7. **Long-term commitment from all levels of city government that Troost revitalization is underway and gaining momentum.**

### CONCLUSION

Troost Avenue has many advocates. Newcomers, long-time residents, dedicated businesses, its faith-based community, not-for-profit organizations, historians, artists, activists have all been working side by side in an eclectic mix for years to improve their
community. They have attended countless public and private meetings and dedicated thousands of hours of volunteer time toward slowly moving forward in all aspects of city life.

This plan cannot capture all the progress and projects that are happening – some of which are the result of previous planning efforts and some of which are spontaneous and organic – a sign of healthy growth in any city. But it does recognize what has gone before as a basis for this effort. Successful redevelopment for a sustainable Troost Corridor will never be completely finished and its success depends on the continued dedication of its constituents. This plan is their tool for obtaining realistic and feasible catalyst projects at two critical nodes that will infuse the corridor with more investment and inspire more support from others who need to help.

We do not need to reinvent the wheel each time someone wants to “save” Troost. Troost stakeholders are savvy urban leaders who know how to keep moving forward with their necessary partners in the public and private sectors. This is the City’s fight and responsibility, too and Troost Avenue must continue to be a priority for programs, reinvestment, PIAC funds and pro-active development expertise. None of the recent improvements up and down the corridor are accidents – they are results of strategic funding, targeting of resources and positioning by the city, KCATA, the universities, major institutions and small property owners. Development projects in the central city are complicated and it is important to stick to a strategy for the long term, especially as city staff, elected officials and neighborhood leaders change over time. The implementation of this plan can be a model for adaptation in other parts of the city.
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Statement of the Problem

This Statement focuses on Troost Avenue between 27th St. on the north and 95th St. on the south, a 13 mile-long major arterial street that has developed primarily as commercial along the frontage with residential abutting the commercial. This portion of Troost Avenue developed throughout the early part of the 20th century from a predominantly residential street to a significant streetcar corridor serving single-family neighborhoods on both sides. As zoning came into fashion, the frontage along Troost was zoned “business” or “commercial” to service the adjacent residential neighborhoods. There were also some light industrial uses (dairies, light manufacturing) and some institutional uses such as schools, health facilities, etc.

As with much of Kansas City’s early zoning districts from the 1920’s-60’s, these were considered “open zones”, where any use allowed under the zoning ordinance in the category designated could be developed only by obtaining a building permit; no development plan approval was required. Certain threshold requirements may have triggered some approval from the City, but specific site plan approval generally was not required if the use was allowed under the existing zoning. The City, therefore had little control over design quality, site plan design, landscaping, setbacks or building orientation. This situation has continued today. Although the size of the parcel, replatting requirements, or the use of public incentive tools may prompt a requirement for approval of proposed construction, development is generally unrestricted as to site plan approval.

This situation, which is the case in many other established parts of the City as well, has exacerbated a growing problem over the last 60 years with abandonment of the central City, vacant
properties and blight, which has been driving down the marketability of the area and the potential for revitalization. Neighborhoods on both sides of Troost are currently very engaged in improving their part of the City, but find it discouraging to plan for the future or to attract the quality level of development they want to achieve when there is a fairly constant influx of undesirable land uses. Such undesirable land uses are driven by their own contributory impact on a spiral of lower rental rates, lack of financing, out of town landlords and not enough stable community anchors. Proactively planning for redevelopment is adversely impacted by the City’s inability to exert any quality or land use control over these areas.

The City of Kansas City, Missouri developed and approved a new Zoning and Development Code (“Code”) that went into effect in 2011. Previous commercial districts (labeled C-1 through C-3b) were converted to business districts B1-1 through B4-5, essentially retaining the same allowed uses, height and setback requirements. B1-1, the least intensive district designation is used for administrative offices and small neighborhood retail, with more intensive uses allowed through a special use permit. The business districts graduate up to B4-5, the most intensive uses allowable and include hospitals, adult businesses, vehicle sales and repair, vehicle storage and towing, pawn shops, indoor and outdoor sports facilities, and indoor warehousing. (see attached chart from the KCMO Zoning and Development Code). In addition, B4-5, the most intensive district has no height restrictions but rather is governed a floor area ratio of 6.

For purposes of this specific recommendation, only that area of Troost Avenue between 27th St. and Meyer Boulevard (“Troost Central Corridor”) was considered because of the extent of the open zoning problem and because the character of Troost south of Meyer Boulevard is less urban in...
The purpose of this study was to explore and recommend a solution that can be implemented to restrict certain land uses along the Troost Central Corridor which are inconsistent with the goal of encouraging new, urban design standards for new construction, infill development or rehabilitation of existing buildings and properties without rezoning the underlying parcels.

character and presents slightly different issues. Attached is a series of zoning maps for this portion of Troost affected which illustrates the intensity of the current zoning categories.

As noted on the attached maps, the B4-5 areas are in four critical locations where redevelopment is likely to occur and where planning is under way. These include:

1. 31st St. - 33rd St.
2. Brush Creek Boulevard to just south of Emanuel Cleaver II Boulevard
3. 48th St. to Volker Boulevard
4. 63rd St. to Meyer Boulevard

Another area of concern is the area from 56th to 57th St., which is zoned industrial (M1).

Although a current use on any of these parcels may be benign today, the zoning allows for much more intense uses for which the City and the community have no way to control the compatibility, site plan or quality of design.

Of the 393 total parcels of land in the Troost Central Corridor, each zoning category has the following percentage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B 4-5</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 3-2</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1-5</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD R 4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1-5</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Current zoning from 27th Street to 39st Street

Current zoning from 43rd Street to 51st Street

Current zoning from 51st Street to 63rd Street
Alternatives

There are several methods used by cities to protect or enhance special areas from intrusive, encroaching or negative land uses. One of the most effective methods is to design an “overlay” zone that does not change the underlying base zoning, but does specify permitted and prohibited uses that apply to properties inside a specific boundary.

Kansas City’s Code created four basic types of overlay zones that are now available for the purpose of more clearly defining or protecting certain eligible parts of the City. The Code lists four types of overlay districts under Section 88-205-01:

1. Historic Overlay
2. Neighborhood Conservation Overlay
3. Special Review District
4. Special Character Overlay (adult entertainment and pedestrian-oriented districts)

88-205-03-A. Historic Overlay districts are used to identify sites and areas within the City with structures and groupings of structures that are of historic, stylistic or thematic significance, as identified by historic resources surveys. This is the strictest of the four types of overlays.

88-205-03-B. Neighborhood Overlay districts are used to identify sites and areas within the City that represent clearly defined neighborhoods or commercial areas with predominantly consistent historic or architectural character. Although neighborhood overlay districts typically protect groups of buildings that have some historical significance, historic preservation is not the only goal. Neighborhood overlay districts seek to preserve an area’s cultural, architectural, and aesthetic ambience.

88-205-03-C. Special Review Overlay districts provide for the creation of a design review committee with responsibilities set forth in the overlay ordinance and are limited to the review of exterior changes, visible from the public right-of-way, to a building, structure or element.

88-205-03-D. Special Character Overlay districts include adult entertainment and pedestrian-oriented overlay districts and may include transit oriented development overlay districts, airport overlay districts, urban agriculture overlay district, and others.

As per Section 88-205-05-F, overlay district regulations may allow for the modification of any of the following standards within the zoning and development code:

1. Land uses (principal or accessory). Standards may impose stricter limitations governing uses than allowed by the underlying zoning, but may not permit uses not allowed by the underlying zoning;
2. Lot and building standards (setbacks, density, lot area and height);
3. Site design standards including building coverage, required open space, location of driveways, parking pads and garages;
4. Landscaping and buffering standards, layout of public way, vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns;
5. Sign standards;
6. Lighting standards;
7. Other zoning-related standards necessary to
address unique zoning, platting or development features.

Section 88-205-04-B provides for Components that may be included in an overlay district ordinance, which are:

1. purpose statement, tying the overlay to the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan, citing the public necessity behind the intent and making a direct connection to protecting the public health, safety, morals, general welfare, and aesthetics;
2. location and area of applicability;
3. spatial definitions, with rules for spatial definition as simple and understandable as possible (Provide the information in a way the public can understand. Use graphics as much as possible);
4. procedures for applications, specifying any additional information needed to demonstrate compliance with the overlay district regulations;
5. special definitions, as needed;
6. standards for review and approval to be used by review and decision-making bodies;
7. permitted, prohibited and special uses;
8. review and decision-making bodies charged with reviewing development applications and determining compliance with overlay district regulations;
9. appeals process; and
10. variance and administrative adjustment rules, if different for the overlay district.

Overlay districts are created by the City Council as part of the Code. After the overlay district is created, it is established over a certain area of land as a rezoning. Review of proposed constructed occurs prior to the issuance of a building permit through a design review authority.
Recommendation

After a basic analysis, conferences with the staff of the City Planning and Development Department and the City Law Department, and input from the community through three current planning efforts and a special community meeting on this topic, the following direction is recommended for the Troost Central Corridor:

A Troost Central Corridor overlay district should be established to encourage redevelopment and to maintain the character of Troost. Establishment of the overlay district is a two step process.

First, the City of Kansas City, Missouri should develop and adopt a Special Character District tailored for the Troost Central Corridor. The proposed new overlay district can be drafted to allow for expansion at a later date and after further analysis. The primary purpose for the new overlay district would be to stabilize values and encourage new construction or rehabilitation of buildings. The method to accomplish that purpose would be through identified permitted and prohibited land uses, special permit requirements and design guidelines for the area.

Drafting of the new overlay district necessitates the following actions:

- Conduct further analysis to determine if sub-districts can be established to respect and differentiate the diversity of character, design, architecture, historic resources and connections to surrounding neighborhoods.
- Develop guidelines for appropriate uses outlined in the Troost Corridor Redevelopment Plan, the Cleaver II Boulevard & Troost Redevelopment Plan (collectively "Redevelopment Plans").
the Plaza/Midtown Area Plan and any other applicable plans. Develop specific guidelines for interim and flexible uses called for in the Redevelopment Plans where redevelopment will take longer.

- Develop specific Design Guidelines for each segment of the Troost Central Corridor, if appropriate, based on analysis of the historic inventory, architecture, scale, pedestrian orientation, the market analysis completed as part of the Redevelopment Plans and the surrounding neighborhood context.

- Include guidelines that anticipate larger parcel assembly, as well as smaller existing sites.

- Review the Code alternatives for a city-wide design review board, a specific design review board for the new overlay district or administrative design review with an appeal to the City Plan Commission to decide the best form of governance.

Second, in order to implement the new overlay district, the desired area would need to be rezoned. The boundaries of the rezoning should focus on the frontage portion of the Troost Central Corridor and extend approximately one-half block deep consistent with commercially zoned properties. In some cases, the area within the proposed overlay would be expanded. Those areas would be along the Troost Central Corridor at key nodes, such as at Armour, Brush Creek Boulevard – Emanuel Cleaver II Boulevard and the area between 63rd St and Meyer Boulevard. Such areas require special attention and have the potential for more intense development and should extend beyond the half block limitation.

This overall effort should be led by the City Planning and Development staff and the Law Departments, with the support and participation of a community task force of neighborhood residents, business owners and civic leaders who shall select their own co-chairs. This Task Force shall be open to volunteers with the caveat that membership should be consistent and is likely to be time consuming. The ordinance should be developed and ready for public hearings and approval by Council by March, 2014.
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Introduction
The Troost Corridor in Kansas City

The Troost Corridor has long been a figurative and actual “dividing line” in Kansas City, between a walkable, service and job-rich environment on the west side (that today appeals to knowledge workers) and an underserved (and largely minority) community to the east for which barriers have long been present to achieving the core tenets of the American Dream: prosperity, education, quality housing, security, and upward mobility for one’s children. It is, in part, for this reason that the Troost Corridor was selected for further study and revitalization.

A thorough understanding of the existing conditions along the Troost Corridor is necessary in order to analyze the potential for redevelopment opportunities that coincide with market trends, to evaluate the context in which strategic decisions need to be made and to explore specific catalytic projects that can create the foundation for a more sustainable future for the corridor and the neighborhoods that surround it.

Demographic Trends

A number of demographic and consumer preference trends are merging in a way that will make the urban core of Kansas City more attractive for new investment and economic vitality than it has been for many years. As rehabilitation and reinvestment on the west side of Troost continues to improve and make neighborhoods a healthy place to live, work, and play; market momentum will likely steer toward the commercial and retail uses along the Troost Corridor itself as well as the neighborhoods to the east.

The following outlines the demographic opportunity that is coming, as well as some of the current challenges and dichotomous community that lies on either side of the Troost Corridor.
A Changing Nation

Observing national and statewide trends in housing construction, demographics, and consumer preference is key to understanding what is in store for the future development of the Troost Corridor. The following sheds light on important trends that may be taken into consideration when assessing the redevelopment of the Troost Corridor.

A Growing Population and Building Stock

Despite the current housing downturn, long term demand for housing is great as the national population continues to grow. Demand for places of employment (such as office space) and places to provide services (such as retail space) will also continue to grow despite a recent development slowdown during the recession. A study conducted by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute concluded

- The United States will reach 400 million people by 2040, up 100 million from 2005.
- The next 100 million people will require 40 million homes.
- The population of the Kansas City Metro area is projected to be 2,141,252 in 2016. This is a four percent increase (89,974 people) from the 2011 population. Of that growth, 20 percent will occur in the city of Kansas City, Missouri (19,438 more people).

In order to meet the need of these additional residents, neighborhoods in Kansas City will need to continue to offer a unique, distinctive, and desirable residential environment.

Smaller Households Mean Smaller Homes

The national population is not only growing but it is shifting demographically, which implies that the types of housing offered will have to be altered to meet changing needs. Households are becoming more diverse.

- In 1960, 48 percent of households had children.
- By 2025, this number will be reduced to 28 percent.
- In 1960, 13 percent of all housing units were occupied by a single person. This increased to 26 percent by 2000, and is projected to increase to 28 percent in 2040 as the attached table illustrates.

![Decline in Households with Kids](image)

*Source: Census for 1960 and 2000, 2025 adapted from Marthe Farnsworth Richelle, How Changes in the Nation’s Age and Household Structure Will Reshape Housing Demand in the 21st Century. HUD (2003).*
Catering to the Aging Population

Another important demographic trend that creates a need for specific types of housing is the aging population. In the United States, 41 million of the next 100 million will be over the age of 65.1 The graph below demonstrates the growing 65+ population.

Older adults are generally not able to live alone in single family, detached homes. They need care in case of an emergency and need access to public transit, as most are no longer drive. Multifamily housing stock within walking distance to retail and commercial amenities caters to an aging population. Housing located close to viable public transit is also important to older adults.

Consumer Preferences

Understanding that people do not necessarily live where they would prefer is fundamental to housing market analysis. Residents often choose to live in areas with decreased walkability because there are better educational facilities.

Consumers may choose to live far from their work due to high levels of crime in neighborhoods near employment centers. Increasingly, surveys indicate that people recognize there are tradeoffs to owning a big home, and are willing to exchange some space in order to reduce commute times and live closer to shopping. According to a study from Atlanta, Georgia, 33 percent of residents in conventional suburbs prefer a more walkable environment and 49 percent prefer a neighborhood where they can walk to nearby shopping. The study also concluded:

• 20 to 40 percent of residents showed a preference for compact, walkable neighborhoods, but only five percent live in such an environment.
• 59 percent would prefer shorter commutes, even if it means living in a higher density environment with smaller lot sizes (see adjacent chart).
• 55 percent would accept a smaller house if it meant more options to walk, cycle, or take transit.
• 53 percent prefer closer proximity to work over living on a cul-de-sac.

In terms of lot sizes, respondents preferred to have larger lots and drive to nearby amenities as opposed to having smaller lots and walking to amenities. Even when consumer surveys indicate that a minority of Americans prefer attached housing or small lot sizes that are within walkable,
Having key amenities within walking distance—grocers, pharmacies, health care, and restaurants—is cited as important by a majority of Americans. The following chart demonstrates the importance of walkability according to a study conducted by the National Association of Realtors.

The new construction or rehabilitation of attached or multifamily housing and retail options in neighborhoods abutting the Troost Corridor would help meet consumer demand for compact, walkable housing supply in Kansas City. This new housing stock may also attract new types of residents and homebuyers who would not otherwise be attracted to the city.
Area Demographics

While the populations in Kansas City and the Kansas City MSA increased during the past decade, the Troost Corridor and the areas around it lost population—particularly east of Troost, which experienced a 22 percent decrease. However, the populations in the Troost Corridor and east of Troost are not expected to decrease further through 2016, while the remaining three areas studied by the team (and detailed in this section) are projected to increase slightly. This projected turn of events would represent a “breakthrough” for the Troost Corridor, and is likely a result of the anticipated increase in the desirability of close-in neighborhoods.

The following table summarizes demographic trends for the 5 areas studied: Troost Corridor, East of Troost, West of Troost, Kansas City, and the Kansas City MSA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Troost Corridor</th>
<th>East of Troost</th>
<th>West of Troost</th>
<th>Kansas City</th>
<th>MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Projection</td>
<td>24,541</td>
<td>25,147</td>
<td>33,077</td>
<td>482,930</td>
<td>2,141,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Estimate</td>
<td>24,581</td>
<td>25,213</td>
<td>32,119</td>
<td>463,492</td>
<td>2,051,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Census</td>
<td>24,658</td>
<td>25,333</td>
<td>31,781</td>
<td>459,787</td>
<td>2,035,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Census</td>
<td>28,155</td>
<td>32,480</td>
<td>33,395</td>
<td>441,545</td>
<td>1,836,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth 2011-2016</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth 2010-2011</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth 2000-2010</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Map of Market Areas
Age Distribution

Age demographics are very telling regarding the varying demographics in and around the Troost Corridor. West of Troost, which is attractive to knowledge workers, has a high proportion of people in the early workforce—young professionals, essentially. East of Troost, there are higher proportions of school age children and seniors. One housing strategy for the Troost Corridor is to make it more attractive to a potential market of young professionals who seek an urban lifestyle and proximity to places where they work. At the same time, if the existing population to the East of Troost is to be served, quality housing options need to be provided for families and seniors as well.

The age distribution comparison is summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>Troost Corridor</th>
<th>East of Troost</th>
<th>West of Troost</th>
<th>Kansas City</th>
<th>MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population (estimates): Total population</td>
<td>27,313</td>
<td>30,897</td>
<td>32,996</td>
<td>472,603</td>
<td>2,081,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4 (Preschool)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 17 (K-12)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24 (College Age)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 (Early Workforce)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 49 (Family Years)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 64 (Empty Nesters)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74 (Seniors)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ (Elderly)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Trends

A number of demographic and consumer preference trends are merging in a way that will make the urban core of Kansas City more attractive for new investment and economic vitality than it has been for many years. As rehabilitation and reinvestment on the west side of Troost continues to improve and make neighborhoods a healthy place to live, work, and play; market momentum will likely steer toward the commercial and retail uses along the Troost Corridor itself as well as the neighborhoods to the east.

The following outlines the demographic opportunity that is coming, as well as some of the current challenges and dichotomous community that lies on either side of the Troost Corridor.

Demographic Trends
One of the most obvious housing opportunities over the next several years will be to serve an aging population. Within the next few years, the Seniors cohort in the Troost Corridor is projected to increase by nearly one-third, while the Early Workforce and Empty Nesters cohorts will increase by five and two percent, respectively. The Family Years cohort will decrease the most of the eight age cohorts, by about eleven percent. Growth in seniors will have other ramifications, such as increased demand for health care that could create demand for more medical office space.

The projected population growth for selected age cohorts in the Troost Corridor is illustrated in the graph below.

**Projected Population Growth**
*Troost Corridor: 2010-2015*
*Source: ESR (2010), 2012*

- Pre-school (0-4)
- K - 12 (5-17)
- College Age (18-24)
- Early Workforce (25-34)
- Family Years (35-49)
- Empty Nesters (50-64)
- Seniors (65-74)
- Elderly (75+)

---

**Educational Attainment**

Educational attainment data reveals the high desirability of the area West of Troost, and the lack of access to one of the fundamental building blocks to prosperity in the area East of Troost. Across each level of educational attainment, the East of Troost market area tends to have the smallest proportion of graduates compared to the three other study areas, while the West of Troost market area tends to have the largest. Strategies are therefore needed to make the Troost Corridor more appealing to an educated group of knowledge workers who can provide new investment to the area, and at the same time provide access to upward mobility to many existing residents who would then be empowered to enhance the community through entrepreneurship and investment.
Income Characteristics

Educational attainment and income are closely correlated, as household income data demonstrates. Again, the same theme is present—residents on the west side of Troost are more well-off than residents on the east side. The median household income in the Troost Corridor is $35,989, which is 43 percent higher than in the East of Troost market area ($25,168), but eight percent lower than in the West of Troost market area ($38,922). About 38 percent of households in the Troost Corridor earn less than $25,000 per year—barely a living wage for a family—compared to 50 percent East of Troost and 33 percent West of Troost.

Interestingly, the MSA has the highest median household income of the five study areas, at $60,442—much higher than the household income for even the neighborhoods West of Troost. Yet a closer look at the data shows that is because the West of Troost area has more singles (and thus fewer two-income households). On a per capita basis, incomes West of Troost are comparable to the regional average. This confirms the appeal of the West of Troost area to singles—a population that could be attracted to new housing along Troost.
Household Trends

As household incomes increase, home values can often follow a similar trajectory. The median home value for the area East of Troost is significantly lower than the other regions, although the proportion of homeowners is much greater than in the area West of Troost. These data likely point to the fact that there is a larger percentage of seniors East of Troost (seniors tend to have high ownership rates, despite low incomes) and young singles West of Troost (who are inclined to rent). Housing demand throughout the Troost Corridor appears diminished compared to other areas of the Kansas City Metro, due to the relatively low occupancy rates. Yet this has more to do, in many instances, with obsolescent housing, as opposed to lack of desirability of urban living. The corridor may benefit from updates or adaptive reuse of the existing housing stock, as well as the addition of a mix of retail and employment.

Relevant housing characteristics and comparisons for the Troost Corridor, East of Troost market area, West of Troost market area, Kansas City, and Kansas City MSA are summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Troost Corridor</th>
<th>East of Troost</th>
<th>West of Troost</th>
<th>Kansas City</th>
<th>Kansas City MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units (2010)</td>
<td>15,052</td>
<td>16,742</td>
<td>24,379</td>
<td>230,678</td>
<td>892,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units (2010)</td>
<td>11,403</td>
<td>12,374</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>197,720</td>
<td>806,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units by Units in Structure (2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure of Occupied Housing Units (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Owner Occupied Units</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Renter Occupied Units</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Housing Value (2010)</td>
<td>$89,966</td>
<td>$88,184</td>
<td>$122,172</td>
<td>$112,776</td>
<td>$139,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Commute Time (2000)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data from 2010 are projections based off of the 2000 Census, and 2000 data is from the 2000 Census.
**Transit Use**

The high percentage of rental units West of Troost, in combination with the high proportion of low-income households East of Troost, likely contribute to residents’ means of transportation to work. While the majority of residents in all four market areas drive alone to work, residents East of Troost are more likely to take public transit than residents in the three other market areas, likely due to the fewer number of residents who own cars. In contrast, the area West of Troost has the largest proportion of residents walking to work, at seven percent, which can be attributed to the moderate amount of rental units and employment centers in the area. Additional walkers, bikers, and transit users could be attracted to the corridor with the incorporation of retail design improvements, further rental units, and other components that lead to a walkable, mixed-use neighborhood.

*Diagram showing Alternative Means of Transportation to Work*

**Source:** ESRI (2000), 2012
Basic Geography

The Troost Avenue Corridor runs north to south from the Columbus Park neighborhood on the north near 3rd Street to Bannister Road over the course of more than 90 blocks and about 11 miles.

This study and plan are focused on the context area from 23rd Street on the north to Gregory on the south with particular attention to the two nodes selected for greater study including Armour at Troost and 63rd/Meyer Blvd. at Troost.

Context: 23rd Street south to Gregory (71st)
Nodes: Armour Boulevard at Troost; 63rd Street and Meyer Blvd. at Troost

Census Tracts (2010)

16 tracts (from north to south; west/east): 43/162; 178/52; 51/53; 65/169; 66/63; 74/75; 82/81; 86/87
16 tracts (numerical): 43, 51, 52, 53, 63, 65,66, 74,75, 81,82, 86,87, 162, 169, 178

Neighborhoods: Context Area neighborhoods (23rd Street to Gregory)

Neighborhoods: Longfellow, Beacon Hill, North, Central and South Hyde Park, Center City, Squire Park, Manheim, Rockhill, Research Park/Kauffman, 49/63 (including Troostwood), Holmes Park, Neighbors United for Action
Existing land-use patterns on Troost

The Troost Corridor has long served as a major north-south corridor framed on either side by residential neighborhoods with a diversity of housing. Several major employment nodes (largely non-residential in character) punctuate this fabric at Hospital Hill (21st to 25th, west of Troost), the Research and University District (Kauffman, Stowers Institute, MRI Global, UMKC and Rockhurst from 47th to 55th) and the major commercial and health node from 63rd to 69th Street including The Landing and Research Medical Center Brookside campus.

Since the 1947 Master Plan for Kansas City, urban planners have recognized that the “string” of commercial development along Troost Avenue has been a concern for adjacent neighborhoods. At the time that the plan was completed, Troost Avenue was identified as the longest, commercial business corridor in the city including a major “secondary” shopping area at 31st and Troost. According to the plan, secondary centers had many of the characteristics of the city’s downtown central business district, but were considered more “local in nature.” The node at 31st and Troost was recognized as one of the biggest shopping districts in the city outside of the downtown.

The plan found that areas zoned for business in the city were about four times greater than the area needed to meet the demands of the population. Further, the plan identified “string development” as another major problem where “stores string out along a major trafficway instead of clustering in centers.” (1947 Master Plan, page 4). This pattern was seen as a source of “damage” for adjacent residential areas. At the time the city was in a process of land use and transportation transition from the city of the streetcar and mass transit to the city of automobiles and this process impacted the character of Troost Avenue.

More recently, the Physical Framework Plan of the FOCUS Comprehensive Plan (1997) further recognized the string pattern of commercial development:

“When the streetcar system was a dominant form of transportation, long commercial corridors developed to serve neighborhoods along the rail lines. Corridors like Prospect, Troost, and Independence Avenue prospered. These corridors are still zoned for commercial uses, even though transportation, technology, and the marketplace have changed.” (City of Kansas City MO, FOCUS Physical Framework Plan, p. 41)

In 2013 much has changed in terms of land use, retail business patterns, transportation and economic development. Mixed use, inner-city commercial corridors, such as Troost, now exist not only in the context of metropolitan competition but also in the context of national and international big box retailers as well as on-line retailers. As such, the redevelopment of Troost will require a new approach to commercial development and land use planning. Troost does retain a locational advantage that should be marketed and enhanced in ways that will build its strengths as a transportation-oriented corridor. The corridor is anchored by large institutional land uses and major employers at Hospital Hill, the University District and the Landing/Brookside Campus of Research Medical Center. These institutions have a vested interest in the long-term sustainability of the neighborhoods on Troost.

The historical development pattern of the streetcar neighborhoods east and west of Troost provide a basic urban structure that can be rebuilt and enhanced to create more walkable and transit-oriented development patterns. Reorientation of land use patterns around the MAX Bus Stops, for example, will require the coordination of new private development with the public transportation investments that have already been made. This will require, however, planning new retail development for pedestrians, bus riders and bicyclists in ways that have been largely
ignored by the automobile-oriented, retail development practices of the past 50 years.
Recent public investments in infrastructure and facilities have been made on Troost including the
MAX bus stops and stations, ATA Bus transfer facility at 39th Street, and sidewalk improvements.
These investments are important signals to private property owners about the desired pattern of
growth on Troost. However, individual land use decisions and development patterns must follow
the guidelines established in the existing FOCUS Plan and other Area Plans in order to create
a more walkable, pedestrian-oriented corridor. Without the use of existing design guidelines,
much of the future development will likely follow a pattern of suburban, automobile oriented
development that undermines the vision for a more sustainable Troost corridor.

Land Use Pattems in the Larger Context Area (27th Street to Gregory Blvd.)
In addition to the historical “string” development pattern of commercial land uses one-block
depth on Troost, there are other significant land use patterns worthy of note and consideration.

Hospital Hill and Beacon Hill

This node located at 22nd and Troost provides a redevelopment area of both health-oriented
land uses (West of Troost) and the residential redevelopment of Beacon Hill (east of Troost).
Hospital Hill includes Truman Medical Center, Children’s Mercy Hospital, UMKC Schools of
Dentistry and Pharmacy, City of Kansas City Health Department, Western Missouri Mental
Health, and other related office-type uses. The adjacent residential area known as Beacon Hill
includes a mix of historic single-family homes as well as new construction and vacant residential
lots currently proposed for a master planned community. South of Hospital Hill there is the
historic Longfellow neighborhood. Hospital Hill was not categorized as part of the FOCUS Plan
neighborhood planning process since it is predominantly non-residential in character. Beacon
Hill was identified as a redeveloping neighborhood with the associated opportunities and
challenges of significant land use and building changes. The FOCUS Plan is discussed in more
detail in the Plan Review section of this report.

Streetscape modifications are planned for 23rd Street to 30th Street, and the introduction of a 250
bed student housing complex will solidify connections between Hospital Hill and Beacon Hill.

27th and Troost

This node is historically significant due to its association with several jazz clubs that were once
located here. Today the area is largely vacant on three corners with occupied apartment
buildings on the northeast corner and a vacant historic building at the southwest corner. Many
of the blocks to the east are empty due to demolition without new construction, although this
area is covered by the significant Beacon Hill Redevelopment Plan, which has completed new
infrastructure and will house new single-family infill and multi-family housing units. A grocery
store is currently being planned for this intersection in association with Hospital Hill Economic
Development Corporation. The Hospital Hill housing development is on the northwest corner.

31st and Linwood Blvd.

Historically, the area on Troost between 31st and Linwood was recognized as a major
“secondary” retail center and one of the largest outside of downtown. Around 1950 the area
contained a large concentration of businesses and a much higher density of population at the
time. Today only a few historic apartment buildings, such as the St. Regis to the east, provide
evidence of this history of urbanism.

To the west of Troost there was a concentration of industrial land uses between 31st and Linwood
running to Gillham. Today much of this area remains a mix of industrial and residential land
uses with some remaining and generally underutilized or vacant industrial buildings. The fabric of buildings in this area provides a much different context for redevelopment than the largely residential areas along Troost to the south. Today the area is in a process of redevelopment, which was noted in the FOCUS Comprehensive Plan. Recent development includes a gas station at Hamson and E. Linwood Blvd and the adaptive reuse of existing historic buildings along Troost.

33rd Street to 47th

From 33rd Street south to 47th Street the pattern on either side of Troost is largely single-family homes that face east-west onto streets that run north and south. This is the typical Kansas City street grid system that accommodated a diversity of housing types in the early 20th Century – including large and small single family homes, two family flats, and small apartment buildings (2-6 story), such as the noted Kansas City colonnade. The exception is Armour Boulevard where much larger mid-rise buildings are typical.

Armour at Troost

The land use pattern at Armour and Troost is distinct because of the remaining and largely intact corridor of mid-rise apartment housing units running to the west. This concentration of apartment buildings provides a much higher density of housing units and population than is typical of the rest of the city and the Troost corridor. Redevelopment efforts here have been driven by the use of historic tax credits to revitalize the mid-rise apartment buildings along the boulevard. East of Troost there is a greater supply of vacant lots and sites for new, infill development, including a large vacant lot on the southeast corner of Armour and Troost. Armour Boulevard is part of the parks, parkways and boulevards system of Kansas City. The historic McLaughlin building on the southwest corner provides an important and defining historic framework for this intersection.

39th Street Node

The 39th Street node on Troost is notable because of the mix of land uses on Troost, including the ATA’s transit facility and early learning center, De La Salle High School and several churches. This
intersection is one of the highest traffic pedestrian stops on Troost because of the existing bus lines on 39th and the MAX BRT on Troost. Despite this high level of pedestrian activity there is very little commercial activity at the corner to serve the needs of bus riders and pedestrians.

**Brush Creek and the University District (47th to 55th)**

47th and Brush Creek area – including Anita Gorman Conservation Center, includes a redeveloping area that was once largely industrial and transportation oriented district built out in the early 20th century. Recent efforts by large land owners have resulted in an abundance of cleared land for redevelopment. Historic buildings have been demolished decimated and new development is largely oriented towards automobiles and chain retailers.

South of Brush Creek, UMKC and Rockhurst present two major education institutions that provide an anchor and a concentration of activity between Volker Boulevard and 55th Street. Rockhurst University recently completed a $9 million parking garage at 53rd and Troost, the first new building in their multi-phased master plan. The second building will be a new $25 million classroom facility and an $8 million performance space for theater and music. UMKC has completed numerous investments recently in their campus, including the new student union, parking garage and the addition to the Bloch School of Business. Also Of note are two research oriented facilities- the Stowers Institute and the MRI Global (formerly known as the Mid-West Research Institute). Both of these facilities as well as the Kauffman Foundation facilities suggest the concentration of cultural, intellectual and research-oriented land use activities that make up the Brush Creek Corridor at Troost. This concentration of cultural institutions is noted in the Plaza Urban Design and Development Plan.

**63rd Street, The Landing and Research Medical Center (Brookside)**

South of 63rd Street significant changes are evident in the residential fabric surrounding Troost Avenue. In this area the typical grid-iron pattern of streets to the north is altered by street and development patterns more typical of the post-WWII era.

The Landing is a commercial mall-type development typical of post-WWII retail development. One might say that this mall represents a classic “Victor Gruen” typology of development set within the context of the Kessler-designed Parks and Boulevards System where Paseo Boulevard meets Meyer Boulevard just south of 63rd Street.

According to the typology developed by Rowe (1991), The Landing fits the post-war model of an “open pedestrian mall” as a building complex with one large anchor tenant, a central pedestrian corridor (which was later enclosed) and a large area of surface level parking. These types of developments met a larger, regional market based on automobile-oriented development. For more details on the current status of The Landing – see our analysis of market conditions.

**Residential neighborhoods in the Troost Corridor**

Immediately adjacent to the mixed-commercial corridor of Troost Avenue are a series of residential neighborhoods largely developed before World War II. There are 16 neighborhoods between Hospital Hill (27th Street) and The Landing (at 63rd). These neighborhoods present a diversity of housing options including single-family and multi-family structures. Several historic districts are found west of Troost and historic landmarks are evident throughout the corridor. The FOCUS Comprehensive Plan was the last time that a systematic analysis of neighborhood conditions was conducted by the City of Kansas City Missouri. The Neighborhood Prototypes
Figure 3: The Landing

Plan provides the framework for neighborhood-based community planning. It also identified four types of neighborhoods throughout the city that were self-selected by residents who attended a series of neighborhood workshops. These four types include the following:

- **Developing Areas**: with major expanses of land that have never been developed, where development is imminent, and where some new development has occurred in recent years (there are none on Troost).
- **Conservation Areas**: of any age and type of development that is in good condition and of good quality, with a strong market.
- **Stabilization Areas**: of any age and type of development that is experiencing problems — with building renovation, stagnant property values, increasing vacancies and/or a weakening market. These problems can range from relatively minor to severe, but they need stabilization strategies to survive and become healthy neighborhoods again.
- **Redeveloping Areas**: in which severe problems exist — the existing fabric of the area is generally gone and significant public and private investment is necessary. These neighborhoods may be changing from one type of predominant land use to another (such as a residential area with notable industrial land uses emerging).

Of the 16 neighborhoods on Troost between 24th Street and Gregory (our area of study), two areas were not categorized, four neighborhoods were identified as Redeveloping Areas, four neighborhoods were identified as Conservation Areas, and six neighborhoods were identified as Stabilization Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Stabilization</th>
<th>Redeveloping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rockhill</td>
<td>Longfellow</td>
<td>Beacon Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park central / Research Park</td>
<td>Central Hyde Park</td>
<td>North Hyde Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 49/63</td>
<td>South Hyde Park</td>
<td>Squire Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Park</td>
<td>Manheim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern 49-63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbors United for Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parks, Public Uses and Open Spaces

There are very few parks that are directly located on Troost Avenue or even within a few blocks east or west of the corridor. However, Troost Avenue is surrounded by the Parks and Boulevards system - both east and west of Troost. On the eastside, Paseo Boulevard and its associated public spaces runs parallel with Troost Avenue from Admiral Boulevard on the north to 79th Street where it ends. To the west, a mix of parks and boulevards are within a short distance of the Avenue, including Gillham and Rockhill Road.

The Parks and Boulevards System of Kansas City, Missouri represents one of the unique landscape planning legacies of our municipality. The system was nationally recognized in the early 20th Century when it was under construction and design by the City under the direction of George Kessler. Today the system provides an opportunity for enhancement, beautification and design that will advance the city’s efforts to become a more sustainable and climate-neutral city. The Kessler legacy presents an early 20th Century example of the impact of city beautiful and picturesque design movements on the urban design of our city.

Several boulevards cross Troost Avenue. These include Admiral, Linwood, Armour, Brush Creek, Cleaver II, Volker, and Gregory. Gillham Road connects several parks between Armour Blvd and Brush Creek Blvd. to the west of Troost. At Brush Creek Boulevard (46th and Troost) the Parks systems crosses Troost in a low lying area that runs south to Brush Creek.

Boulevard and Parkway Standards of Kansas City, Missouri

The City of Kansas City, Missouri Parks and Recreation Department is currently preparing Boulevard and Parkway Standards. The standards set out in the draft document are by type of roadway (boulevard, parkway, park roads and streets), with notations of design standards that apply to each type. The Standards in the document are those which differ from the general requirements used by the City of Kansas City Public Works Department. “The Plan objective is twofold: to provide agreeable driveways, and by giving certain special advantages and a handsome appearance to such avenues, to make the abutting land, and the land near them especially sought after for residence purposes, and thereby to enhance the value of such lands.” The Plan sets standards for boulevards like Armour Boulevard, Gillham Road, Broadway Boulevard, and The Paseo.

Historic Properties The area has significant historic properties and districts that have been approved by the City of Kansas City, Missouri Landmarks Commission, including: Kansas City Missouri Historic Registry Districts Armour/Gillham Historic Apartment District (1982) North Hyde Park Historic District (1993) Old Hyde Park Historic District Kansas City Historic Registry of Individual Properties Newbern Apartments 525 E. Armour (1978) Chalfonte Apartments 1110 E. Armour (1978)

Source: Amended & Restated Armour/Gillham Corridor General Development Plan 15 : Page
Historic and Cultural Resources on Troost

The history and cultural diversity of Troost Avenue and the adjacent neighborhoods are key assets that make this corridor unique. From the perspective of placemaking – which is a central concept of the MARC CSP strategy, the Troost corridor is uniquely positioned to use its historical fabric and cultural resources to help define and shape future development patterns and identity. Further, the leadership group for the Troost Corridor identified the celebration and awareness of the avenue’s history as a key element in their efforts to build a more sustainable corridor.

Figure 1: The Battle of the Big Blue

Historic Resources

One of the challenges for the Troost corridor moving forward is the fact that much of the corridor remains un-surveyed for historic resources. In other words, much of the historic building fabric has not yet been surveyed and its historic resources remain un-identified and un-recognized. This is especially true for post-WWII era neighborhoods and for areas of social significance – such as African-American history. Recognizing existing historic assets through the development of a Troost Corridor Historic Resources Survey is an important next step for sustainability efforts on Troost.

Historic Resources on Armour Boulevard

There is a concentration of historic structures and districts along Armour Boulevard. This includes North Hyde Park Historic District (KC register), EF Swinney Residence, Hyde Park Historic District (National), the Chicago / Chalfonte Apartments, the Newbern Apartments and Jansen Place. According to the Armour PIEA General Development Plan:

The Planning area was developed in the early portion of the twentieth century from 1919-20 until 1940, although much of the surrounding single family residential neighborhoods were built from the late 1880’s through the 1920’s. Construction features of the multi-story residential buildings include masonry structures with limestone block foundations, brick and terra cotta facades, double-hung wood frame windows, and flat roofs with membrane coverings. The dominant improvements in the Planning Area included historic mid-rise residential structures which front Armour Boulevard. The Bellerive (1922), Park Central (1930), and Clyde Manor (1920) apartment
buildings are from eight to nine stories in height and contain 287,738 square feet and 409 units prior to redevelopment.

Other Historic Resources on Troost (National and Kansas City Register Properties):
The Western Baptist Bible College building lies just east of Troost near Highway 71 in the Beacon Hill area.

The historic 18th and Vine Jazz District lies east of Troost on 18th Street. The district is on the National Register of Historic Places and includes the Mutual Musician’s Foundation building, which is a National Historic Landmark.

At Linwood there are several recognized historic resources including the Kansas City Athenaeum and the St. Regis Hotel.

St. Mark’s Lutheran Church (KC)
Southmoreland Neighborhood Historic District
Rockhill Historic District
Historic Apartment Buildings

Historic commercial buildings throughout the corridor are largely un-surveyed and un-protected.

Green Impact Zone Historic Resources Survey 2009-2010

The Green Impact Zone was surveyed for historic resources in 2009 by UMKC as part of an urban planning and design studio led by Jacob Wagner. This survey process identified a number of historic resources, including the most common architectural types for both residential and commercial buildings, as well as the levels of historic integrity by block within the 150 block area of the Zone. The area from 39th Street south to 51st Street on both sides of Troost was surveyed as part of this effort.
Cultural Resources

Cultural resources include both tangible and intangible aspects of local culture. These may include people, organizations, cultural and arts spaces, and landmark cultural institutions and facilities. Cultural resources are another important form of cultural capital that can be leveraged for redevelopment and revitalization purposes throughout the Troost corridor. There are numerous cultural resources along the Troost corridor, some of which are included in the list below:

Partial List of Selected Cultural Resources, Spaces and Organizations

- CCO (offices located in the KCMO Health Dept. Building at 24th and Troost)
- Kansas City Urban Youth Center
- Operation Breakthrough
- Telephone Booth Gallery
- Hoop Dog Gallery and Urban Garden
- YMCA Metro Head Start
- Project Living Proof / Metropolitan Energy Center
- Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership (UMKC)
- Anita B Gorman Discovery Center
- Rockhurst University
- UMKC
Local building typologies, architectural heritage and public space precedents

Single Family Residential

There are at least 17 different types of single family housing styles in the neighborhoods along Troost from Hospital Hill south to 63rd Street. The mix of housing styles varies by neighborhood following patterns based on the date of construction. Areas to the north were developed much earlier than neighborhoods south of Brush Creek. Most of the area between 24th Street and 63rd Street was built before 1939 with a large building boom in the 1920s. As such, the most common single family residential building type in this area is the classic American bungalow.

Other common housing types from the early 20th century include the Four Square, Kansas City Shirtwaist, Craftsman, the Tudor or English Cottage, Dutch and Colonial Revival, and Prairie style homes.

In the post-war period new housing types were introduced, especially in the neighborhoods south of 63rd Street, but also in some cases as infill housing in the early 20th century neighborhoods. These styles include the Ranch, Tudor and other Post-War styles and they tend to include attached garages, a feature that is not common north of 63rd Street.

Multi-Family Residential

Historic multi-family residential structures include a variety of units in structure from the Two-Family Flat to large mid-rise apartment buildings on Armour Boulevard.

Historic Commercial Structures

Historic commercial buildings on Troost are a finite resource that continues to be under-valued and even demolished despite great potential and historical significance. The Green Impact Zone Historic Resources Survey and Plan (2010) recognized a variety of commercial structures on Troost.

Important site amenities, public spaces, views and scenic opportunities

The Troost Corridor is a historically significant, primary north-south commercial corridor, zoned almost continually commercial (the half block adjacent to Troost on either side). Part of this is due to the boulevards to the East and West, Paseo and Rockhill, respectively, as many business types are restricted from boulevards.

North of the downtown loop, in Columbus Park, the urban design characteristics are of an earlier pattern of development. This area is quite dense in comparison to the metro, averaging 12 DU/acre. Most structures are multi-story with little setbacks, side yards or garages. Alleys are common and still functional, and there is on-street parking. Most buildings here are pre-World War I stock.

South of the loop to approximately 24th street, the land uses are mostly industrial and institutional. Light industrial uses are very common as well as outreach services and facilities for at-risk populations. City bus facilities and a school are also located in the area. Generally, this area is under-developed with large parcels of land lying vacant. This area was also the center
of jazz culture and clubs in Kansas City (specifically, 15-18th streets along Troost) though little evidence is left. A few low-income housing developments exist in the area, which adds to the overall feel of unwanted land uses being centralized in this area. Social services, low-income housing and dirty industry are all congregated here.

The area from 24th St. to 47th St. on Troost forms the bulk of its housing stock and commercial activity. The neighborhoods built here are streetcar suburbs and were generally built out prior to World War I. Setbacks and side yards tend to be small, as seen in Columbus Park, though parcel widths start to grow slightly. This reduces the density to about 6-10 DU/acre, depending on the specific neighborhood. While alleys may have been a part of the original design, most are not in use here or are missing altogether. Most structures are multi-story with on-street parking and few garages (at least originally). This portion of Troost has some of the strongest elements of sustainable urbanism, including commercial walls directly on the sidewalk and green infrastructure to help address water runoff and quality. New infrastructure like sidewalks and street trees are also a positive for this area.

South of Brush Creek to about 63rd street, the pattern of development continues to change. Though still streetcar suburbs, built mostly between the two World Wars, setbacks and side yards have grown. Overall lot sizes increase as well, with few alleys and detached garages starting to become the norm. While there is still on-street parking, there is a shift to driveway/rear/garage parking. Average densities also fall in this area, to about 6-8 DU/acre. The two universities dominate the northern part of this section, “scholar’s row”, as well as research institutions. There is a small, local commercial node south of the universities, between the larger ones at 47th and 63rd.

The extreme southern end of the Troost corridor, south of 63rd street, was the last to develop. The housing stock in this area mostly after 1930 and the bulk is post-World War II. The pattern of housing here reflects the change to post-war, ranch style, single-story construction. Setbacks and side yards are now relatively large, lot sizes as well. Alleys are now completely gone, and the attached garage is starting to make its presence known. Density here is the lowest all along the corridor, at 4-6 DU/acre. This area also starts to have some light industrial applications, as well as the nuclear facility on Bannister.

The shift from an urban area designed for people to one designed for the car is striking along Troost, and typically follows the pattern of the further south you travel, the more auto-oriented the development becomes.
Analysis of Existing Infrastructure

Summary

Troost Avenue is a four lane, Commercial/Mixed Use arterial street that runs north and south, from US 24 Hwy to Bannister Rd. A few blocks west of US 71 Hwy, Troost is directly accessible from the following major east/west streets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US 71 Hwy Access Points</th>
<th>East/West Streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel Cleaver II Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63rd St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An existing conditions survey has been made along the Troost corridor and also along potential development nodes at Armour Blvd, and at 63rd St. General conditions of the roadway, pedestrian circulation and access, current transit ridership and facilities, streetscape amenities and the impact of existing utilities have been observed.

The conditions have been evaluated using a rating system of new, good, fair and poor, with color coding. Color coding allows a visual evaluation of larger areas, such as multiple categories and multiple blocks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Constructed within the past 2-3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Needs continued preventative maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Needs repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Needs major repair or replacement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The midpoint of this study is Brush Creek, and the adjacent Plaza, UMKC, Emanuel Cleaver II Blvd and Volker Blvd. This is generally a breaking point in evaluating existing conditions north and south of the midpoint. The new Troost Avenue Bridge over Brush Creek is shown in Figure 4.
Roadway

Evaluation of the roadway includes the condition of the pavement, curb, driveways, traffic signals and on-street parking. From Brush Creek, north, street conditions are good, with some areas from 27th St to 29th St in fair to poor condition. From Brush Creek, south, street conditions are fair to poor.

The City of Kansas City is about to make major streetscape and street improvements in the reach between 23rd St and 30th St.

Pedestrian

Pedestrian circulation and access includes an assessment of the sidewalk, crosswalks and ADA accommodations. Sidewalks were new to good condition from Brush Creek to Armour Blvd, and good to fair from Brush Creek, south. ADA ramps are included at most intersections from Brush Creek to Armour Blvd, but are lacking at several intersections south of Brush Creek. Troost crosswalks are in fair condition, with proper signage, but lacking proper striping. The aforementioned improvements along Troost will add significant pedestrian amenities in that reach.

Transit

The Troost MAX, or BRT has been in operation for about 2 years. It includes improved bus shelters, with BMP planters, large identifying markers, and show real time information on arriving and departing buses. North and south average daily ridership at Armour Blvd and 63rd St has been 460 riders per day. The Troost BRT has the highest ridership in Kansas City. The locations of other BRT stations are shown on the summary chart. A new park and ride was constructed at 31st St and Troost. Photo 2 shows the shelter provided for riders during bad weather at southbound
UMKC and Rockhurst Universities site. This shelter is typical of those located at Armour and 63rd St.

**Figure 5: BRT Station - Midtown 31st Street**

**Landscape**

There are street trees along almost all the blocks of Troost. Most are mature trees planted between the curb and sidewalk, with occasional plantings of new, or replacement trees. There are newly constructed BMPs between 31st St and Linwood Blvd, as part of the BRT improvements, to control and treat stormwater using green infrastructure methods.

**Utilities**

The utilities observed or studied were ones with a visual impact or a physical impact, such as overhead power and sewers. There is a high voltage overhead transmission line on the east side of Troost, the length of the study area. The single, widely spaced, poles place the lines more than twice the height of existing power and lighting poles. Power is underground along the corridor, sometimes fed from behind the existing buildings. Street lighting varies from wood poles with overhead wires to metal poles with underground wires. There is lighting along the entire west side and along the both sides from 43rd St to Emanuel Cleaver II Blvd.

The condition of the storm inlets was evaluated, because of potential interference with pedestrian circulation. Inlets in fair or poor conditions can be tripping hazards and cause backup of stormwater at intersections, and in pedestrian areas. There are storm sewer lines on both sides of Troost, ranging in size from 8” to 48”. Some of the sewers are separate and some are combined. The Overflow Control Plan (OCP), currently being implemented by the City is addressing the problems from sewer overflows, basement back-ups, flooding and water quality within the Brush Creek and Town Fork watersheds. There are downspout disconnection programs, infiltration/inflow repair work, green infrastructure solutions, sewer separation, and sewer flow metering, to reduce and monitor stormwater entering the system.

There is an 8” water line on the west side of Troost, that extends north of 27th St and south of Gregory Blvd. The age of the 8” CIP line from 27th St to 30th St has been researched by the water department, and found that it was constructed about 1885 to 1887. Major improvements in the corridor may necessitate replacement of this aged line. A parallel 16” water line begins at
43rd St and continues south of Gregory Blvd.

**Armour Blvd - Eastbound and Westbound**

Troost is the midpoint of the study. Existing conditions were evaluated along Armour Blvd, about ½ mile east and west of Troost, from Gillham Rd to Highland Ave. Street conditions are fair west of Troost and good east of Troost. The right lane is marked as a bikeway in both directions. Crosswalks were all in fair condition, and without ADA ramps at the intersections, except Troost and Tracy Ave. Curb and sidewalk is good west of Troost and good east of Troost up to The Paseo. There are street trees west of Troost and east of Troost up to The Paseo. Street lighting is metal pole, on both sides of Armour. Power is underground. East of Troost, storm inlets were new or in good condition.

**63rd St - Eastbound and Westbound**

With Troost as the midpoint of the study, similar conditions were evaluated along 63rd St, about ½ mile east and west of Troost, from Oak St to Bushman Dr.

Street conditions are fair. Curb and sidewalks are good to poor. Photo 3 shows typical Troost Ave street, sidewalk, and signal condition and the southbound BRT Station. Commercial development is available in the brick building. There is almost no on-street parking along 63rd St, except near Oak St and Cherry St. There are very few street trees along 63rd St. Wood pole street lighting is along the south side of 63rd St.
### Existing Conditions

**REVISED - January 15, 2013**

#### Troost Avenue

**TROOST AVE - SOUTHBOUND**

**WEST SIDE OF ROADWAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROADWAY</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Curb</th>
<th>Driveway</th>
<th>Traffic Signal</th>
<th>On-Street Parking</th>
<th>PEDESTRIAN</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>Crosswalk</th>
<th>ADA Ramps</th>
<th>TRANSIT</th>
<th>BRT Station</th>
<th>BRT Ridership</th>
<th>STREET TREE</th>
<th>STREET LIGHTING</th>
<th>On-Power</th>
<th>Storm Inlet</th>
<th>Storm sewer</th>
<th>Sewer line</th>
<th>Water line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31st St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Linwood Blvd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>33rd St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Armour Blvd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>37th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Manheim Rd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>39th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>40th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>41st St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>42nd St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>43rd St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>44th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>45th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>46th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cleaver II Blvd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Volker Blvd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>50th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>51st St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>52nd St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>53rd St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>54th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>55th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>56th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>57th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>58th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>59th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>60th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>61st St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>62nd St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>63rd St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Meyher Blvd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>65th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>66th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>67th St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Gregory Blvd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Existing Conditions

**REVISED - January 15, 2013**

### TROOST AVE - NORTHBOUND

#### EAST SIDE OF ROADWAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGEND</th>
<th>ROADWAY</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Curb</th>
<th>Divertory</th>
<th>Traffic-Signal</th>
<th>On-Street Parking</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>Crosswalk</th>
<th>ADA Ramp</th>
<th>BRT Station</th>
<th>BRT Ridership</th>
<th>Street Tree</th>
<th>Storm BMP</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Street Lighting</th>
<th>Oh Power</th>
<th>Storm Inlet</th>
<th>Sewer Line</th>
<th>Water Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table contains various conditions for different aspects of the roadway, such as street, curb, diverts, traffic signals, on-street parking, sidewalk, crosswalk, ADA ramp, BRT station, BRT ridership, street tree, storm BMP, utility, street lighting, Oh power, storm inlet, sewer line, and water line. The values indicate the presence (Y) or absence (N) of these conditions at different points along the road.
## Eastbound - South Side of Roadway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Curb</th>
<th>Driveway</th>
<th>Traffic Signal</th>
<th>On Street Parking</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>ADA Ramp</th>
<th>Crosswalk</th>
<th>ADA Ramp</th>
<th>Street Tree</th>
<th>Storm Inlet</th>
<th>Street Lighting</th>
<th>Off Power</th>
<th>Storm Inlet</th>
<th>Sewer</th>
<th>Water Line</th>
<th>LEGEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gillham Rd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry St</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TROOST AVE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Paseo</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Westbound - North Side of Roadway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Curb</th>
<th>Driveway</th>
<th>Traffic Signal</th>
<th>On Street Parking</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>ADA Ramp</th>
<th>Crosswalk</th>
<th>ADA Ramp</th>
<th>Street Tree</th>
<th>Storm Inlet</th>
<th>Street Lighting</th>
<th>Off Power</th>
<th>Storm Inlet</th>
<th>Sewer</th>
<th>Water Line</th>
<th>LEGEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gillham Rd</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison St</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TROOST AVE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Paseo</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Existing Conditions

**Troost Avenue**

#### 63RD ST - EAST & WESTBOUND

**SOUTH & NORTH SIDE OF ROADWAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGEND</th>
<th>ROADWAY</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Curb</th>
<th>Driveway</th>
<th>Traffic Signal</th>
<th>On-Street Parking</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>Crosswalk</th>
<th>ADA Ramp</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Street Tree</th>
<th>Storm Drain</th>
<th>Storm Sewer</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Off Power</th>
<th>Storm Inlet</th>
<th>Sewer Line</th>
<th>Service Line</th>
<th>Water Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastbound - South Side of Roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oak St</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cherry St</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Holmes St</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rockhill Rd</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Harrison St</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TROOST AVE</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Forest Ave</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Paseo</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Meyer Blvd</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound - North Side of Roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oak St</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cherry St</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Holmes St</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rockhill Rd</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Harrison St</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TROOST AVE</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Forest Ave</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Paseo</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bushman Dr</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>wp</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>