ROSEDALE UNIVERSITY TOWN DISTRICT
TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT & MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
THE VISION FOR
ROSEDALE UNIVERSITY
TOWN DISTRICT
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
Many stakeholders and individuals contributed their insights throughout a lengthy visioning and public engagement process. This document is a testament to their passion, wisdom, contribution and commitment.
This vision would not have been possible without the many participants who contributed insight, expertise, and boundless energy to its making.
Client / Steering Committee

Rob Richardson
Director, Department of Urban Planning & Land Use, Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas

Zach Flanders
Urban Planner, Department of Urban Planning & Land Use, Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas

Darryl Fields
Senior Transportation Planner, Mid-America Regional Council (MARC)

DESIGN TEAM

Forum Studio

Chip Crawford, PLA, FASLA, LEED GA
Principal In Charge
Matt Maranzana, PLA, ASLA, LEED AP
Project Manager
Tyler Meyr, LEED AP - Urban Designer
Ylan Vo, LEED GA - Designer
Kelsey Laminack - Administrative Assistant

Alta Planning + Design, Inc.

Paul Wojciechowski, PE, AICP, LCI
Principal Planner
Tim Gustafson, AICP - Planning + Transit
Aaron Defenbaugh - Planning + Transit

Development Strategies

Matt Wetli, AICP, CECD - Principal
Andy Pfister, AICP - Associate

CFS Engineering

Sabin Yanez - Principal
Jim Schuessler
Andrew Robertson

Shockey Consulting Services, Inc.

Sheila Shockey - Principal in Charge
Lauren Garrett - Engagement Manager
Erin Dougherty - ENV SP
The Rosedale Master Plan includes the recommendation to establish a ‘Rosedale University Town’ adjacent to the University of Kansas Hospital and Medical Center. The goal of the Rosedale University plan is for the neighborhood to grow alongside the university and hospital in a way that benefits everyone, and for the area to become an active hub of dense activity.

The University Town redevelopment idea creates a plan for the neighborhood to grow alongside the university and hospital in a way that benefits everyone. This area is envisioned as an active hub of dense activity that includes retail and services, offices, living opportunities, a welcoming streetscape, and a seamless connection into an enhanced Fisher Park and the Rosedale Regional Nature Trail. – (Rosedale Master Plan, Pg. 39)

The implementation chapter lists creating a “Fisher Park Development Concept Plan” that includes “trails, transit, traffic improvements, and new development” and shows “how these components best fit together.” (Rosedale Master Plan, Pg. 130) This plan, the Rosedale University Town District Transit Oriented Development & Multimodal Transportation Plan, accomplishes this action item and is a first step toward implementing the University Town vision.

The Rosedale University Town district spans along 39th Avenue from The University of Kansas Medical Center Campus in the east to Fisher Park in the west and includes several blocks to the north and south from 38th Avenue to 40th Avenue. This plan provides additional analysis, public engagement, and recommendations to achieve the goals in the Rosedale Master Plan and includes:
Fisher Park Community Center
Fisher Park is envisioned as home to a new community center or library. This plan creates additional detail for how this park could be enhanced to achieve this goal. The plan considers the relocation of BPU’s existing Fisher Park electrical sub-station, coordinates with existing and future underground utilities, and includes a plan for how the improvements can be phased over time.

An Enhanced Transit System
Transit is vital to the continued growth of Rosedale. This plan calls for improving transit in Rosedale by establishing a transit center near 39th Avenue and Rainbow Boulevard. This move improves the efficiency of transit operations and user experience by better aligning the 107 and 39 routes. The plan also calls for premium transit features that make transit a more attractive option.

39th Avenue Complete Street
The University Town District is envisioned as a walkable area with a high quality of life. Improving the streets and public spaces to support multimodal transportation is central to this vision. This plan calls for improving 39th Avenue and creating a complete street that supports walking, biking, transit, and vehicles. The plan includes a protected bikeway on 39th Avenue that connects parks, institutions, businesses, and mixed-use development.

Planning for Bicycles
Comfortable, safe, and convenient bicycle infrastructure is critical to creating a truly multi-modal environment. This plan includes improvements to the bicycle circulation system and proposes appropriate facilities to support this mode of transportation.

Additional Green Space and Landscaping
This plan recommends using green space and landscaping to connect the University Town District. This includes transforming Marty Ave into a park space and pedestrian thoroughfare and using landscaping and street trees along 39th Avenue to connect Fisher Park and the Rozarks Trails to the University of Kansas Medical Center and Hospital.

Housing and Quality Development
There is a housing shortage in Rosedale that is pushing up prices. Housing affordability is an issue for the area as the strong demand and lack of supply is driving high prices. This plan further refines development scenarios in the University Town District and includes options for increasing housing supply, introducing high quality apartments, and transitioning density to protect established single family neighborhoods.

Future Land Use Update
This plan amends the Rosedale Master Plan Future Land Use map from General Urban to Urban Mixed Use between Booth and Adams Streets between 39th Avenue and 40th Avenue in order to implement plan recommendations. This amendment is informed by market analysis, stakeholder information, and public engagement.
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DISCOVERY

The Discovery Phase documents project goals and priorities
Aligning agendas is often the biggest challenge to moving a vision forward. These goals and objectives were discussed and vetted in stakeholder work sessions in an effort to optimize the outcome and ensure accountability with this effort.
KEY PRIORITIES

CREATE A SUSTAINABLE PLACES PLAN THAT ADDRESSES THE FOLLOWING:

1. Create a transit oriented development plan that allows Rosedale’s population to grow, increase amenities and services available to residents, and promotes a walkable, vibrant, urban neighborhood.

2. Improve the area’s parks, trails, and recreational amenities including options for a community center or library branch.

3. Pursue housing strategies to accommodate diverse housing needs including students, professionals, families, seniors and affordable housing.

4. Refine multimodal transportation strategies that accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, transit and vehicles.
IMPLEMENTATION / FRAMEWORK PLAN

PROJECT PHASE

MOBILIZATION

- Data Collection / Tour Site
- PSP Program, Creating Sustainable Places Initiative, Transportation Outlook 2040, Rosedale Master Plan, Medical Center MP
- Develop a shared vision for the ultimate success of the project
- Confirm Project Goals, Objectives & Schedule
- Facilitate a project “Kick-Off Meeting” to Align Agendas and discuss expected outcomes
- Inventory Regional and Local Environmental, Social, and Economic Context
- Identify and Map Organizational Context and physical environment data

INTEGRATED TRACKS

PLANNING + DESIGN
MULTI-MODAL+ INFRASTRUCTURE
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
MARKET + ECONOMICS

PARTICIPANTS

Steering Committee Meeting / Workshop
Stakeholder Meeting / Workshop
Public Workshop

TIMELINE

DELIVERABLES

Existing Conditions Inventory
SUSTAINABLE PLACES PLAN

ANALYSIS
UNDERSTANDING + INITIAL IDEAS
• Evaluate demographics, assemble property inventory, review transportation alternatives
• Benchmark opportunities and constraints
• Prepare Design Strategies
  - Planning + Design
  - Infrastructure
  - Market + Economics
  - Engagement + Inclusion
• Prepare Initial Design Ideas, Program Development Options
• Public Engagement #1
• Review with Stakeholder / Steering Committee and Community for feedback

IDEATION
DESIGN CONCEPTS
• Create strategies for proposed development
• TOD concepts for Fisher Park and University Town Multimodal alternatives
• Prioritize Design Strategies
  - Planning + Design
  - Infrastructure
  - Market + Economics
  - Engagement + Inclusion
• Coordinate with existing plans
• Prepare Design Concept Options
• Public Engagement #2
• Review with Stakeholder / Steering Committee and Community for feedback

REFINEMENT
PREFERRED DESIGN CONCEPT
• Prepare draft recommendations including the following:
  - Site Program / Amenities
  - Site Design Concepts
  - Multimodal Transportation
  - Open Space / Landscape Concepts / Circulation
  - Sustainable Design Strategies
  - Economic Development Opportunity
• Prepare an implementation plan and strategy
• Develop action plan for funding opportunities and partners
• Identify potential parties responsible for plan implementation
• Public Engagement #3
• Review with Stakeholder / Steering Committee and Community for feedback

DELIVERY
FINAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
• Finalize plans and recommendations:
  - Site Program / Amenities
  - Site Design Concepts
  - Multimodal Transportation
  - Open Space / Landscape Concepts / Circulation
  - Sustainable Design Strategies
  - Economic Development Opportunity
• Prepare an implementation plan and strategy
• Identify potential parties responsible for plan implementation
• Develop an opinion of probable cost for proposed improvements
• List of potential project funding sources, public and private
• Recommendations for policies and financial management tools
• Review with Stakeholder / Steering Committee and Community for feedback
PREVIOUS STUDIES

- Design Guidelines...
- Walkable, Urban Neighborhood...
- Create a Mix of Uses...
- Diverse Housing...
- Multi-modal transportation...
- “University Town” feel..
- Strengthen Identity...

- Sustainable Development ...
- Focus development into ‘Activity Centers’...
- Housing market as opportunity...
- Walkable destinations...
- Public realm...
- Financial Performance...
Creating Sustainable Places
A Centers-and-Corridors Strategy for Regional Sustainability

Regional Opportunities for Sustainable Growth and Redevelopment

December 6, 2013

- Enhance Image...
- Improve pedestrian connectivity and wayfinding...
- Accommodate new growth...
- Improve parking...
- Enhance public greenspace...

7th Street Corridor Transit Project Development Study

Prepared For

Unified Government of Wyandotte County / Kansas City, Kansas and Kansas City Area Transportation Authority

February 2017
Olsson Associates Project No. 013-2967

Demographics...
- Activity centers...
- Route 107 realignment...
- Capital improvements...
- Connex-level bus stop enhancements...

- Data analysis and trends...
- Inventory assessment & analysis...
- Recreation program and services...
- Improvement prioritization & recommendations...
SITE LOCATION

- The Rosedale community is located in Wyandotte County - part of the bistate Kansas City metropolitan region.
- The study area is sandwiched between the Kansas River and a natural ridge to the northeast, and the Kansas-Missouri state line to the east.
- The KU Medical Center adjacent to the study area has been a major catalyst for development in the area.
SITE LOCATION
EXISTING CONTEXT

• The study area is 58 acre zone bounded by:
  Rainbow Blvd to the east
  Minnie St. to the west
  40th Ave to the south
  38th Ave to the north

• 39th Ave and Rainbow Blvd are the major streets in this area

• The study area is primarily residential, with a few commercial buildings along Rainbow Blvd.
Major landmarks in and around the study area include:

- A regional parks and trail system
- Two new mixed use buildings on Rainbow Blvd with retail on the ground floor
- Several larger residential buildings
- The University of Kansas Medical Center and Hospital
ROSEDALE MASTER PLAN

• The Rosedale Master Plan explores the University Town area through a form-based massing strategy that organized building height and density by use.

• This plan clusters dense, mixed-use buildings at the intersection of Rainbow Blvd. and 39th Ave.

• The plan proposes a combined community center and transit center in Fisher Park

- Urban Core Mixed Use
- Urban Mixed Use
- General Urban
- Single Family
- Institutional, Educational, or Public
ANALYSIS

The Analysis phase documents existing conditions
Lloyd

Springfield

Adams

Rainbow
PROPERTY OWNERSHIP

• Within the study area, land ownership is distributed between institutional and public owners, developers, smaller investors, and homeowners.

• There are several publicly owned parcels, including Fisher Park, the Kansas City Board of Public Utilities (BPU) substation, Rosedale Towers, and KU properties.

• Smaller parcels are concentrated to the west of the site, with larger scale developments and businesses located east.

- Wyandotte County and Kansas City, KS
- State of Kansas and Kansas University
- Private business and investment properties
- Owner-occupied and private rental properties
ZONING & FUTURE LAND USE

- The study area is primarily zoned as Residential, with some commercial use along Rainbow Blvd.

- The Rosedale Master Plan proposes a future land use plan that encourages mixed use development around Rainbow Blvd and 39th Street corridors, and an Healthcare District for KU Medical Center.

Existing Zoning

- Single Family District R-1(B)
- Two Family District R-2(B)
- Planned Apartment District RP-5
- Planned High-rise Apartment District RP-6
- Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND)
- Planned General Business District CP-2
- Limited Business District C-1
- Planned Limited Business District CP-1
- Nonretail Business District C-0
- Planned Nonretail Business District CP-0
- General Industrial District M-2
- Heavy Industrial District M-3
Detailed data has been collected for stormwater and sewer systems in the study area.

There is a need to deliver forward-looking utility infrastructure with more information to be collected on electrical, gas, water, and data systems.

*Storm Gravity Mains*
The area includes large natural areas to the west in the form of parks and natural sloped woodlands with integrated trails.

There are many trees and yards, but most are in private properties.

There is a lack of public urban green space like plazas for gathering and recreation.

- Regional Parks
- Forested Area
- Nature Trails
- Planned Regional Trail
• There is an abundance of surface parking lots on the eastern edge of the study area along Rainbow Blvd. Street parking is limited to residential zones, with no street parking in commercial areas.

• KU Medical Center and Hospital is expanding with further plans for structured parking.

• Automobile parking should consist of on-street parking located on every street where space permits, and strategic placement of off-street parking lots and/or structures. As the District is developed over several phases, surface parking may give way to parking structures to keep up with demand.

- Surface Parking
- Structured Parking
/ Existing parking restriction
/ Proposed parking restriction
/ No parking restriction
MASTERPLAN BIKEWAYS

- Most people bicycling in this area currently must travel on or across major roadways. This can be dangerous in some cases, and acts as a deterrent to bicycle use.
- Existing nature trails are not a formal part of the transportation network
- The network could be enhanced with east-west links that extend bicycle facilities to serve the neighborhood

### Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Bike Facility</th>
<th>Speed Limit (MPH)</th>
<th>BLOTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow (N/O 36th)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow (S/O 36th)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oletha</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th (E/O State Line)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th (State Line to Rainbow)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th (W/O Rainbow)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Line</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th (Rainbow to State Line)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47th</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSIT NETWORK

- The eastern side of the study area is served by multiple bus and shuttle routes with stations clustered at the intersection of Rainbow Blvd and 39th Ave.

- The western side is not well serviced, with the exception of the KU Medical Shuttle that has a limited service area.

/KU Medical Shuttle
/Westwood Shuttle
/KCATA
/The JO

Transit Stop

Masterplan - Rainbow Blvd Alternatives
MEETING MARKET DEMAND IN UNIVERSITY TOWN CENTER

Continued growth at KU Hospital will create development opportunities in UTC.

DEMAND DRIVERS
At KU Hospital through 2040, according to Rosedale Master Plan and Traffic Study

REAL ESTATE DEMAND
Up to 700 new Households in UTC over next 20 years based on location and KU Hospital growth

REGIONAL ECONOMY

- The Rosedale Master Plan and Traffic Study calls for the densification of the UTC Study Area to leverage the planned growth of University of Kansas Hospital.
- Demand projections provided by Economic & Planning Systems (EPS) in the “Neighborhood Market and Opportunity Assessment” in the Rosedale Master Plan and Traffic Study indicate that growth at University of Kansas Hospital will lead to a 20 percent to 70 percent increase in housing units in Rosedale. There are currently 3,300 housing units in all of Rosedale, so this projection would lead to 660 to 2,300 net new units.

- If the Study Area captured its current share of this growth, approximately 200 to 600 new units would be constructed. However, the Study Area is well-positioned to capture a higher proportion of Rosedale’s projected growth because of its adjacency to University of Kansas Hospital and the opportunity for densification. Therefore, the estimated 710 net new units that could be built in the Study Area is with reason.

3,400 NEW JOBS
12,000+ EXISTING JOBS

10,000 FACULTY & STAFF

96% AVG. OCCUPANCY
818 EXISTING HOUSING UNITS

700 NEW HOUSING UNITS
Rosedale UTC is within 5 miles—a 10-minute drive—of several regional job centers.

**KEY STATISTICS**

- **273,000** people
- **5.4%** population growth
- **200,000** jobs
- **13,500** businesses

**JOB CENTERS**

- **KU Hospital / KUMC Area** 12,000 jobs
- **Plaza/Westport** 22,000 jobs
- **Crossroads/Crown Center** 26,000 jobs
- **Central Business District** 37,000 jobs
EXISTING DEVELOPMENT

- There are nearly 820 housing units in the UTC Study Area and 90 percent of the units are contained in multi-family structures. Multi-family occupancy is currently very stable at 96 percent, while overall housing occupancy is 80 percent. More than 80 percent of households in the Study Area rent their housing.

- Housing costs in the Study Area are higher than in Rosedale as a whole, driven by its proximity to KUM.

**Single Family Units**
- 87 out of 818 Total Housing Units
- Current Listing Range: $107K - $326K
- Median Listing Price: $150K

**Multi-family Units**
- 731 out of 818 Total Housing Units
- 96% Multi-Family Occupancy

**Retail**
- 260,000 SF

**Office**
- 120,000 SF

**Hotel**
- 83 rooms
PROJECT GOALS, WHAT IS MISSING?
• Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing with lower rental rates
• Maintain community scale
• Develop Fisher Park into a Central Hub - connection between higher density and residential
• Expand park to reduce speed of traffic
• Improve 39th street appearance by 10-fold
• Higher density along 39th and Rainbow, residential near Fisher Park and further West

WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE BIGGEST CHALLENGE TO THE SUCCESS OF THIS EFFORT?
• Traffic and parking
• Educating people on the benefits of this project
• Changing the perception of Rosedale schools
• Fisher Park as an amenity & destination space that draws people in other than neighbors

WHAT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT THING WE AS YOUR DESIGN TEAM NEED TO GET RIGHT?
• Host public meetings to encourage conversation
• Transit at 39th and Rainbow
• Security along 39th
• Create a timeline for development
• Affordable housing - provide data on current rental rates
• Subsidized housing opportunities
• Keep high density growth near major roads, keep single family separate

WHAT IS REALLY WORKING WELL THAT YOU THINK WE SHOULD KEEP?
• Range of affordable housing
• Diversity and longevity of neighborhood
• Fisher Park, Rozarks trails & walkability
• Residential-like feel along edges

WHAT IS REALLY NOT WORKING WELL THAT YOU THINK WE SHOULD LOSE?
• KU parking - relocate student street parking to KU property
• Sidewalks - need to be upgraded for better accessibility
• Streets - improve paving, lighting, street trees
• Infrastructure - water and sewer needs to be updated
• Lack of amenities - increase for existing neighborhood
• Non-existent businesses and empty buildings on rainbow

WHAT IS THE MOST ASPIRATIONAL THING WE SHOULD CREATE?
• Fair rental rates for families in Rosedale
• Community center with pool / gym / library
• Children’s amenities at Fisher Park
• Hotel
• Assisted living housing / retirement housing
• Develop mixed use off of rainbow - retail and neighborhood services
• Bikeable/walkable sidewalk and streets
• Transit - KCATA route plans
• BPU substation
IDEATION

The Ideation phase explores planning concepts and aligns with public feedback.
• Each mode of transportation that feeds the District is its own layer that should be continuous, connected, and visible as it travels through the development.

• Each layer is added to the overall network as it joins and intersects the other modes. It is important to establish a priority for each user in various contexts so as to elevate and support different users at different places in the network.

\- KU Medical Shuttle
\- Westwood Shuttle
\- KCATA
\- The JO

\- Transit Stop

\- Proposed Signed Bike Route
\- Proposed Bike Lane

\- Existing Trail
\- Proposed Trail

\- Proposed Bike Station location
\- Master Plan Bike Station location
ENHANCE CONNECTIVITY

• Plan for transit on Adams St. while Rainbow Blvd. supports vehicles and cyclists.

  In the short term, transit can remain on Rainbow Blvd. as infrastructure improvements are needed on Adams St. in the long term.

• The transit center should serve as a gateway to the District, close to the intersection of Rainbow Blvd and 39th Ave. Transit routes 11, 23, 35, 39, 51, 107, and 405 should be extended to start and end their trips at the new transit center.
PROPOSED BIKEWAYS

- A connected bicycle network within the District should consist of bike share stations as well as a network of on-street bicycle facilities to provide door-to-door connectivity for those using a bicycle.

- Bike share stations should be located near key activity generators such as the library and the commercial retail establishments along the east side of Rainbow Boulevard. Bike share stations, whether located at bus shelters or at other locations, should be located so as to be highly visible and conveniently close to building entrances.

Proposed 2-way Cycle Track
Existing Signed Bike Route
Proposed Signed Bike Route
Existing Bike Lane
Proposed Bike Lane
Existing Trail
Proposed Trail
Proposed Bike Station
39TH AVE CORRIDOR
CONNECT BY GREEN SPACE

- Parks in this area have minimal design definition, but offer important connections to green space and nature trails.
- 39th Ave is underdeveloped as a public realm.
- Planned improvements to 39th Ave within the KU Medical Center will offer a more active and pedestrian-oriented experience.
- There is opportunity to pull landscape from the west through 39th Ave into the heart of the medical center and towards the streetscale east of the State line Road.
- There is extensive topographic change within the study area.

- Existing steep slopes at the western edge serve as nature areas and recreational landscapes.

- There is opportunity to utilize smaller scale sloped areas further east as public amenities within the neighborhood.

- Detailed massing should be proposed that takes advantage of the slope and landscape features.
ENHANCE STREETSCAPE

- Sidewalks should be present and continuous at all locations on both sides of all streets.

- The sidewalk should be expanded to an urban pedestrian realm (avg. 16ft width) in areas where streetscape and storefront activity are desired.

- Pedestrians should be provided a buffer from automobile traffic.
EXTEND GREEN SPACE

- In addition to extending green space along 39th Ave, there are opportunities to utilize slope as a connective public realm.

- Marty Ave could be adjusted to be a connective linear park that links the medical center to the heart of the residential neighborhood.

- There are extensive opportunities along Rainbow Blvd. to introduce well-programmed and distinctive public spaces for gathering or activity.
39th Ave, east of State Line Road, has a vibrant mix of eclectic retail and dining.

As 39th Ave crosses KU Medical Center, it becomes a vehicular-oriented space, and continues to have limited retail beyond Rainbow Blvd.

There is an opportunity to bring retail experience to the west end of 39th Ave by creating active ground-floor retail and pedestrian zones.

Existing Retail
• New development should be concentrated along Rainbow Blvd and 39th ave, with a more dense urban character adjacent to KU Hospital.

• Building forms transition from high density mixed-use development to the existing single family residential fabric of the neighborhood.

• Lower density middle housing typologies can support increased housing demand overall without causing too much displacement or disruption of existing homes.

Section A: North-South

Section B: East-West
Fisher Park as a gathering space for community

Extend landscape and improve streetscape from Fisher Park through 39th Ave

Bring retail to street front and collect activity along 39th Ave

Connect to KU Med Center and Hospital with public space and transit-oriented development

Connect Marty Ave to 39th Ave with landscape and pedestrian access along slopes
1 CIRCULATION & TRANSIT?
- Consensus on locating the transit center near 39th and Rainbow.
- Increased on-street parking
- Improved bicycle / pedestrian facilities on Rainbow / Adams.
- Agreement on need for bike share stations and more street trees.

2 OPEN SPACE & AMENITIES?
- Connect 39th Avenue corridor from Fisher Park to Rainbow via a linear green space.
- Create a central hub at Fisher Park with a community center, open space and trails.
- Protect the green space and provide additional amenities.
  - Reading Rooms / Seating Areas
  - Meeting Spaces / Fitness Room
  - Pavilion / Trail Head
  - Outdoor Basketball Courts
  - Playground

3 DENSITY & CHARACTER?
- Improve the existing community by connecting the 39th Avenue corridor with neighborhood retail.
- Maintain separate single family housing and transition from University / Office to single family by using missing middle housing.
- The community likes the idea of locating higher density development along the edges of the neighborhood and near major roads.

4 HOUSING STRATEGIES?
- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing.
- Provide higher density along the edges of the community.
REFINEMENT

The Refinement phase clarifies the concepts from the ideation phase into a recommended plan for the Rosedale University Town District.
AERIAL VIEW
The University Town District will be realized incrementally as individual development projects are reviewed and constructed and as infrastructure projects and maintenance occur over time. This phasing strategy diagram shows conceptually how improvements could occur over time. The diagrams in this reference this strategy to illustrate how changes can occur incrementally.

- **PHASE 1: Fisher Park improvements, 39th Ave streetscape improvements, hotel, transit center, and multifamily housing units**

- **PHASE 2: Marty Park, Rainbow Blvd streetscape improvements, multifamily housing units, and townhomes**

- **PHASE 3: Completed 39th Ave greenway, residential streetscape improvements, Fisher Park Community Center, and multifamily housing units**
Near term: Green space and landscape should be used to connect the University Town District. This includes improvements to Fisher Park and using landscaping and street trees along 39th Avenue to connect Fisher Park and the Ozarks Trails to the University of Kansas Medical Center and Hospital. Landscape-based strategies can provide amenities and gathering space in Fisher Park while community programs are developed and incubated in storefront spaces along 39th Avenue.

Long term: Fisher Park is envisioned as the long-term home to a new community center or library. With the anticipated relocation of BPU’s existing Fisher Park electrical sub-station, improvements can be phased over time while coordinating with existing and future underground utilities and preserving open space in the park. In the long term, this facility will collect multiple community programs and serve as a visual anchor at the terminus of 39th Avenue.
A GREAT PUBLIC REALM FOR THE COMMUNITY

- Fisher Park
- Nature Trails
- Rosedale Park
- Rozarks Trail
- Green Street
- 39TH AVE Gateway
- Rainbow Blvd
- Marty Park
- Linear Park & Terraced Greenspace
- Community park amenities
- KU Medical Center
- Neighborhood Gateway
- 39th Ave Gateway

REFINEMENT
IMPROVING FISHER PARK (NEAR TERM)
OFFERING NEW PUBLIC AMENITIES FOR THE COMMUNITY (LONG TERM)
COMMUNITY CENTER EMBEDDED IN FISHER PARK (LONG TERM)
Near term: Enhancement of on-street transit facilities include new shelters and arrival time displays on both northbound and southbound sides of Rainbow Blvd and 39th Ave. For the purposes of promoting transit and making it a more visible component of the District, transit routes that terminate nearby should be extended to start and end their trips at the new transit center, thereby strengthening its place as a main hub of activity. This includes extending Routes 11, 23 to the transit center (to provide direct service to downtown KCMo) as well as Routes 35, 39, 51, 107, and 405.

Long term: The final location of a new transit center will require continued coordination between the Unified Government, KCATA and other stakeholders to ensure compatibility with the roadway street network and activities in the area. The proposed transit center should be designed to serve as a major transit hub for transfer activity as well as a mobility hub for people traveling to and from the District. Whether those users arrive and depart by transit, automobile, by bicycle, or on foot, the transit center should serve as a gateway to the District.
INTEGRATED CORNER HOTEL AND TRANSIT CENTER

- Hotel
- Structured Parking
- Retail
- Integrated Transit Center

Quality Materials
Concealed Parking Structure
Open Entry Space
Car Ramp Spiral
Shared Use Trail
ALTERNATE LOCATION: ADAMS/39TH ST. TRANSIT STATION

- Hotel
- Structured Parking
- Retail

Upgraded Parking Lot

Activated Retail Street

Transit Station

Bike Share
Typical road sections shown in this conceptual plan shall be further evaluated and supported by a roadway network capacity analysis and availability of public right of way. In some cases public or private developments in support of this plan may be encouraged to dedicate public right-of-way to ensure a successful multimodal transportation plan.
39TH AVE - ENHANCED STREETSCAPE AND ACTIVE MIXED USE (NEAR TERM)

- Green infrastructure
- Enhanced Sidewalks
- New Street Trees
- Bikeway

- Residential
- Hotel
- Amenity
- Office
- Retail
39TH AVE - DENSE URBAN CHARACTER (LONG TERM)

- Facades mask parking beyond
- Mix of modern and traditional materials
- Ground Floor Retail
- Rooftop Amenities
- Springfield

89
ACTIVE STREET LIFE - 39TH AVE LOOKING EAST (NEAR TERM)
NEW COMMUNITY ASSETS - 39TH AVE (LONG TERM)
REFINING THE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

This plan amends the Rosedale Master Plan Future Land Use map from General Urban to Urban Mixed Use between Booth and Adams Streets between 39th Avenue and 40th Avenue in order to implement plan recommendations. This amendment is informed by market analysis, stakeholder information, and public engagement.

The land use districts are based on the transetct model that defines a series of zones that transition from the least intense single family neighborhood fabric to the most intense area along Rainbow Blvd and 39th Ave that is centrally located with infrastructure capacity and a concentration of services for both local residents and surrounding institutions. This plan supports a gradual densification of the University Town District to leverage the projected growth of University of Kansas Hospital.

Proposed Districts

- Urban Core Mixed Use
- Urban Mixed Use
- General Urban
- Single Family Neighborhood
- Institutional, Education, or Public
- Parks and Open Space
- Creative and Industrial Mixed Use
LOCATING HIGH QUALITY DEVELOPMENT

Section A: North-South

Section B: East-West

- Urban Core Mixed Use
- Urban Mixed Use
- Single Family
- Institutional, Educational, or Public
Create a land lease policy for KUMC Endowment-owned land that is aimed at reducing development cost, promoting affordable housing, and creating high-quality development.

2 Partner with developers experienced with high-quality urban redevelopment/infill projects that use multiple funding sources to create successful mixed-use and mixed-income properties.

3 Create an affordable housing fund that is funded by a portion of the incremental revenue gain that will be generated by new market-rate development.

4 Leverage existing housing and development programs.

5 Adopt an affordable housing policy that requires a certain percentage of new housing units meet defined affordability requirements. For instance, 10% of all new housing units in Rosedale UTC shall be affordable to households earning at or below 60% or 80% of the area median income. In return, developers would receive density bonuses or other public incentives.

### Locating New Housing

**Affordable Housing**
- **Avg. Rent Per Month**: $350-$1,000
- **Unit Sizes (Sq. Ft.)**: 700-1,300
- **Avg. Rent Per Sq. Ft.**: $0.75-$1.50
- **Units Per Acre**: 30-45
- **Comments**: LIHTC, 10% Affordability Requirement, 1 BR, 2 BR, 3 BR Units

**High Density Upscale**
- **Avg. Rent Per Month**: $800-$2,000+
- **Unit Sizes (Sq. Ft.)**: 500-1,200
- **Avg. Rent Per Sq. Ft.**: $1.60-$2.50
- **Avg. For-Sale Price Per Sq. Ft.**: $250K+
- **Units Per Acre**: 60-80
- **Comments**: Structured Parking, Studio, 1 BR, 2 BR, 3 BR

**Low Density Upscale**
- **Avg. Rent Per Month**: $600-$1,650
- **Unit Sizes (Sq. Ft.)**: 500-1,200
- **Avg. Rent Per Sq. Ft.**: $1.30-$2.00

**Townhomes**
- **Avg. Rent Per Month**: $1,000-$2,500
- **Unit Sizes (Sq. Ft.)**: 1,000-1,600
- **Avg. Rent Per Sq. Ft.**: $1.00-$1.50
- **Avg. For-Sale Price Per Sq. Ft.**: $225K+
- **Units Per Acre**: 20
- **Comments**: Surface Parking, Studio, 1 BR, 2 BR Units

**Proposed Strategies:**

1 Create a land lease policy for KUMC Endowment-owned land that is aimed at reducing development cost, promoting affordable housing, and creating high-quality development.

2 Partner with developers experienced with high-quality urban redevelopment/infill projects that use multiple funding sources to create successful mixed-use and mixed-income properties.

3 Create an affordable housing fund that is funded by a portion of the incremental revenue gain that will be generated by new market-rate development.

4 Leverage existing housing and development programs.

5 Adopt an affordable housing policy that requires a certain percentage of new housing units meet defined affordability requirements. For instance, 10% of all new housing units in Rosedale UTC shall be affordable to households earning at or below 60% or 80% of the area median income. In return, developers would receive density bonuses or other public incentives.
PROVIDING HIGHLY AMENITIZED HOUSING OPTIONS (NEAR TERM)
INTEGRATING NEW DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC SPACE FOR THE COMMUNITY (LONG TERM)
BUILDING A DESTINATION FOR THE ROSDALE COMMUNITY - MARTY AVE LOOKING EAST (NEAR TERM)
GENERAL CONSENSUS

• General approval and appreciation for the basic concept - a mix of uses, diverse development, improved walkability, integrated transit options and enhanced green space.
• The community seems very excited for a positive change!

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

• Great campus concept and atmosphere for commuters, students, residents.
• Include local retail and dining.
• More Trees!
• Maintain fruit trees in Fisher Park
• Love the idea of making “affordability” a policy.
• Very important to maintain a high amount of affordable housing.
• Include appropriate bike parking at buildings.
• Upgrades to Fischer Park will increase property values.
• Consider a playground before anything else at Fischer Park.
MARKET ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
**EPS Market and Opportunity Assessment**

**Summary of Key Findings, DS Notes**

*Primary Demand Drivers in Rosedale that Impact the Study Area*

- **Institutions**: University of Kansas Medical Center (UKMC) and The University of Kansas Hospital (TUKH) currently employ approximately 6,500 people and current enrollment is 3,300 students. The institutions plan to grow in terms of physical footprint, employment, and enrollment during the next 50 years. This translates into increased demand for nearby housing and services for students and staff.

- **Location**: The study area is within two miles of Crown Center, Downtown Kansas City, MO, and the Country Club Plaza. It has excellent access to I-35 and Southwest Boulevard. Current and future residents have good access to regional amenities and job centers. The location is also considered urban, which aligns with the preferences of certain consumer segments that are projected to grow.

- **Favorable Regional and National Demographics**: Demand is anticipated to continue to grow for infill residential development that is less car-dependent, which requires locations like the study area that have good transportation networks and are near jobs, shopping options, public amenities, and entertainment options. In fact, population growth in cities outpaced population growth in suburbs from 2010 to 2015.

EPS forecasts that the Kansas City MSA will gain 173,000 new households between 2010 and 2030. Of these, 159,000 (97 percent) will be in the under 35 or the 65 and older age cohorts (Generation Z, Millennials, and Empty Nesters). Thus, the market for starter homes and for those downsizing is projected to grow substantially and Rosedale is positioned to capture some of that growth if suitable units are developed.

*After losing households for years, Kansas City, Kansas and Rosedale gained households from 2010 to 2015. Rosedale has a high percentage of renters (64 percent) compared to Kansas City, KS (39 percent) and Kansas City, MO (38 percent), which is partially attributed to the presence of UKMC and TUKH.*

There are more jobs located in Rosedale and the study area than there are residents. With suitable housing, it is possible to capture some of the commuters as residents.

*Secondary Demand Drivers in Rosedale that Impact the Study Area*

- **Startup Village** is headquartered near 45th Street and State Line in southeast Rosedale. As of January 2016, it housed 22 businesses in 10 properties, some located in Rosedale. It has the potential to create jobs and housing demand in Rosedale as successful firms spin-off.

- **Southwest Boulevard** is an urban industrial area with excellent access to regional transportation and employment networks. This district has the potential for redevelopment and re-use of industrial buildings as new creative space, which would bring jobs and potential residents to Rosedale.

*Existing Conditions*

- **Housing**: Rosedale has a strong rental housing market, driven by the presence of UKMC. Existing rents range from $0.75 per square foot
at older properties to $2.00 per square foot at newly constructed properties, with an average rent of $1.16 per square foot.

The for-sale market in Rosedale is less expensive than adjacent cities and market areas. The median price is $78,500, whereas the median prices in nearby areas range from $160,000 to $320,000. EPS describes this as an opportunity for infill and targeted redevelopment. Mission Cliffs was built in 2007 and homes sold for $140,000 to $200,000, although prices would be higher in today’s market.

- **Commercial and Retail**: EPC identified approximately 400,000 square feet of retail and commercial space, 724,000 square feet of office space, and 1.07 million square feet of industrial space. No industrial space is located in the study area.
  - Retail is concentrated along Southwest Boulevard, Rainbow Boulevard, 39th Street, and 43rd Street. The average retail rent is $15 per square foot, and EPS suggests targeting local and regional businesses because Rosedale likely does not meet site location criteria for most national chains, aside from fast food.
  - Office development is generally concentrated near KUMC, 47th Street, and State Line Road. Average rents are $22 per square foot.

- **Recent Developments (since 2006):**
  - CVS and McDonald’s at 43rd and Rainbow
  - Boulevard Row Townhomes (45th and Rainbow)
  - Mission Cliffs single-family homes and townhomes (100 homes)
  - 39Rainbow mixed-use development at 39th and Rainbow with 30,000 square feet of retail, Holiday Inn Express (83 rooms), a skilled nursing center, and 70,000 square feet of office and multi-care facilities.
  - Woodside Village, located at 47th Place and Rainbow, is a two-phase mixed-use project. The first phase contains 91 apartments with rents ranging from $1.75 to $2.00 per square foot and 20,500 square feet of retail space. A second phase with KUMC units and 16,350 square feet of retail space is planned.
  - Rainbow Village is a Home2 Suites by Hilton extended stay hotel that is under construction at 34th and Rainbow. It will contain 89 guest rooms and is being developed in response to KUMC’s expansion.

Primary constraint to new development is the lack of available sites, particularly vacant sites. There are a few potential catalyst sites in the study area.

**EPC’s demand projections would result in:**
- 20%–70% increase in housing units in Rosedale
- 25%–35% increase in retail SF
- Doubling to Tripling of hotel rooms, if all room demand is met by new hotels in Rosedale

- This could mean:
  - 200 to 600 new units in Study Area
  - 5,000 to 15,000 SF in new retail in Study Area (thinking of 39th & Rainbow)
  - Another hotel?
Rosedale University Town Center
Primary Demand Drivers: University of Kansas Medical Center & The University of Kansas Hospital

EXISTING CONDITIONS

4.1M SF
Building Area

10,000
Faculty & Staff

3,500
Students

GROWTH THROUGH 2040

1.76M SF
Net New Building Area

3,400
Additional Faculty & Staff

1,700
Additional Students

Rosedale University Town Center
Projected Real Estate Demand in Rosedale (Rosedale Master Plan)

1. **Retail / Mixed-Use**
   - 85,000 SF – 127,000 SF
   - Independent Market
   - Restaurant/Bar
   - Unique Experience

2. **Housing**
   - 580 to 2,460 units
   - Majority Rental
   - Infill Opportunities

3. **Hotel**
   - 450 Rooms
   - Med. Center Traffic

Greatest opportunity for density near Med. Center

Rosedale
- Housing Units: 3,300
- Multifamily: 2,000 units
- Office: 730k SF
- Retail: 360k SF
- Industrial: 1.2M SF
- KU Med: 4.1M SF
- Hotel Rooms: 190 (89 u/c)

UTC Study Area
- Housing Units: 800
- Multifamily: 715 units
- Office: 120k SF
- Retail: 26k SF
- Hotel Rooms: 83

Sources: Development Strategies; CoStar
RETAIL

10,000 to 15,000 SF
New Street-Level Retail

$24/SF to $28/SF
Modified Gross Lease Rates

Sources: Development Strategies
**HOUSING**

300–400
New Units

70%-80%
210-320 Units
Rental Housing

$1.60 to $2.00/SF
1 BR Rent

$1.00 to $1,400/MO

$1.30 to $1.80/SF
$1,250 to $1,800/MO
2 BR Rent

$1.40 to $1.85/SF
$2,000 to $2,800/MO
3 BR Rent

Sources: Development Strategies; CoStar
HOUSING

300–400
New Units

20%-30%
60 to 120 Units
For-Sale Housing

$1.10 to $1.50/SF
$175,000 to $275,000
Townhome Sale Price

$1.30 to $1.80/SF
$225,000 to $325,000
Single-Family Sale Price

Sources: Development Strategies
MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Maranzana, Forum Studios
From: Andy Pfister, Development Strategies
Date: December 15, 2017
Rec: Update to Real Estate and Strategy Memo
Copies:

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize existing real estate metrics in the Rosedale University Town Center (UTC) Study Area, as well as to comment on future demand.

Existing Conditions

There are nearly 820 housing units in the UTC Study Area and 90 percent of the units are contained in multi-family structures. Multi-family occupancy is currently very stable at 96 percent, while overall housing occupancy is 80 percent. More than 80 percent of households in the Study Area rent their housing.

Housing costs in the Study Area are higher than in Rosedale as a whole, driven by its proximity to KUMC. Current rental rates for professionally managed apartments range from $600 to more than $1,200 per month and average $830 per month. Rents for renovated units at properties like Johnson Med Center Apartments and Vista condominiums rent in the $1.50 to $1.70 per square foot range.

For-sale options in the Study Area are limited—there are currently five listings, ranging from $107,000 for an older two-bedroom home to $325,000 for a renovated three-bedroom home on a large lot. A three-bedroom single-family home is currently under construction and is listed for $280,000.

Current Housing Summary: Rosedale UTC Study Area

| Total Housing Units | 818 |
| Multi-Family Units  | 731 |
| Single-Family Units | 87  |
| Housing Occupancy   | 80% |
| Multi-Family Occupancy | 96% |
| Renter Households   | 82% |

Sources: Development Strategies, Inc.; CoStar; Wyandotte County Unified Government; ESRI

Current Housing Costs: Rosedale UTC Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartments/Rental</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio Rent Per Month</td>
<td>$606 - $797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$1.02 - $1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BR Rent Per Month</td>
<td>$729 - $789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BR Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$1.07 - $1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR Rent Per Month</td>
<td>$712 - $1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$0.75 - $1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rent</td>
<td>$831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rent per SF</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Single-Family/For Sale                     |               |
| Current Listing Range                      | $107K - $325K |
| Median Listing Price                       | $150K         |
| Median Listing Price / SF                  | $115          |

Sources: Development Strategies, Inc.; CoStar; realtor.com; zillow.com
The median household income in the Study Area is $31,500 and the median household income in Rosedale is $36,200. This has important implications regarding housing affordability. Based on the graphic below, the current rental stock meets the affordability needs of more than half of the existing households. That percentage increases when Rosedale Towers is considered. Tenants at that property pay 30% of their income for rent at it serves mainly those earning less than 50 percent of the area median income for the Kansas City MSA.

Approximately 20 percent of current households can afford a rental rate of $1,300 or more, which is in line with new market-rate properties in the region that could be constructed in the Study Area. It is important to note that the affordability ranges presented in the following two graphics are based on the household incomes in the Study Area and do not necessarily line up with market-based product pricing. For instance, most upscale market-rate rents range from $1,000 to more than $2,000 per month. The intent of the graphics is to show what the market would look like for existing households if stratified in this manner.

The following graphic illustrates affordability for purchasing a home. More than one-third of existing residents cannot afford the existing for-sale housing stock, which is relatively affordable when compared to the Kansas City region. There are limited for-sale options available at any given time.
Summary data for various multi-family properties is included in the following table.

### Existing Rental Properties

#### SUMMARY OF SELECTED RENTAL PROPERTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>One-Bedroom</th>
<th>Two-Bedroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occ. Rate</td>
<td># of Units</td>
<td># of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosedale Study Area Properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rosedale Towers (income-based)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Malvern Hill South</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>$609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Malvern Hill North</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Med Center Apt, (converted)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pfingst Bar Med Center</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Spring Valley</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>$651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Representative Neighborhood Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occ. Rate</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Rent (D)</th>
<th>Size (SF)</th>
<th>Rent (D)</th>
<th>Size (SF)</th>
<th>Rent (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mission Manor</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$593</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>$1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mission Road Studios</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 University Plaza</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$588</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rainbow Ridge Apartments</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$587</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 University House</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$745</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$674</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development Demand and Future Capacity

The Rosedale Master Plan and Traffic Study calls for the densification of the UTC Study Area to leverage the planned growth of University of Kansas Hospital. Based on preliminary calculations, developing the Study Area according to the plan would result in the redevelopment of multiple blocks that would include:

- 390,000 square feet of Urban Mixed-Use development
- 480,000 square feet of General Urban development, and
- 47 new townhomes

Of the existing multi-family properties, Rosedale Towers (122 units), Vista condominiums (167 units), 2217-2225 W. 39th Avenue (8 units), and Malvern Hills North (50 units) would remain. Approximately 63 of the existing 87 single-family homes would remain as well.
Assuming that 870,000 square feet of new building area will be added to the Study Area if it is built to the capacity shown in the master plan, it would result in approximately 710 net new housing units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Master Plan</th>
<th>Net New Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Units</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Units</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Master Plan allows for approximately 870,000 SF of new building area, 15,000 of which is assumed to be retail/commercial. Unit count estimate assumes 800 square feet per unit.

Demand projections provided by Economic & Planning Systems (EPS) in the “Neighborhood Market and Opportunity Assessment” in the Rosedale Master Plan and Traffic Study indicate that growth at University of Kansas Hospital will lead to a 20 percent to 70 percent increase in housing units in Rosedale. There are currently 3,300 housing units in all of Rosedale, so this projection would lead to 660 to 2,300 net new units.

If the Study Area captured its current share of this growth, approximately 200 to 600 new units would be constructed. However, the Study Area is well-positioned to capture a higher proportion of Rosedale’s projected growth because of its adjacency to University of Kansas Hospital and the opportunity for densification. Therefore, the estimated 710 net new units that could be built in the Study Area is with reason.

**Anticipated Real Estate Pricing**

The Study Area market can be divided into three segments: Affordable, Mid-to-Upper Scale, and Luxury. Existing properties fall into the Affordable and Mid-to-Upper Scale price points. It is important to maintain current affordable price points, while diversifying the housing stock with upper-end product that is currently not available in the Study Area or and is in limited supply in the market area that serves University of Kansas Hospital.

Potential product pricing is summarized in the table on the following page and price points are based on the existing housing stock in the Study Area, existing new construction market-rate properties in similar areas in the Kansas City region, and typical luxury properties.
The following table summarizes a survey of new market-rate properties.

### New Urban Multi-Family Properties

#### SUMMARY OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Bedroom</th>
<th>Two-Bedroom</th>
<th>Three-Bedroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Rate Properties</th>
<th>One-Bedroom</th>
<th>Two-Bedroom</th>
<th>Three-Bedroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate Units</td>
<td>Rent (SF)</td>
<td>Rent (SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 West 39th Street Apts.</td>
<td>57% 72</td>
<td>$1,237 653</td>
<td>$1.83 598 588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Woodside Village (lease-end)</td>
<td>82% 91</td>
<td>$1,468 744</td>
<td>$2.063 1,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 West Hill</td>
<td>59% 71</td>
<td>$1,382 795</td>
<td>$1.74 555 1,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 45 Madison</td>
<td>56% 132</td>
<td>$1,306 687</td>
<td>$1.93 1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 City Place at Westport</td>
<td>92% 268</td>
<td>$1,206 758</td>
<td>$1.59 1,481 1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Interstate Flats</td>
<td>97% 39</td>
<td>$1,011 562</td>
<td>$1.89 1,285 1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Platinum Lifestyle - John Campbell</td>
<td>100% 79</td>
<td>$1,420 939</td>
<td>$1.69 1,849 2,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>94% 772</td>
<td>$1,285 90</td>
<td>$1.80 1,683 1,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Strategies

The following list summarizes preliminary strategy ideas relating to housing and real estate development. These ideas can be shared at the upcoming meetings and refined as we move forward and hear from stakeholders.

1. Create a land lease policy for KU Endowment-owned land that is aimed at reducing development costs, promoting affordable housing, and creating high-quality development.
2. Partner with developers experienced with high-quality urban redevelopment/infill projects that use multiple funding sources to create successful mixed-use and mixed-income properties.
3. Create an affordable housing fund that is funded by a portion of the incremental revenue gain that will be generated by new market-rate development.
4. Leverage existing housing and development programs.
5. Adopt an affordable housing policy that requires a certain percentage of new housing units meet defined affordability requirements. For instance, 10 percent of all new housing units in Rosedale UTC shall be affordable to households earning at or below 60 percent or 80 percent of the area median income. In return, developers would receive density bonuses or other public incentives.

Affordable housing set aside requirements are typically tied to the county or regional area median income as documented by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The following table summarizes median income data for different income levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>AMI Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>50% AMI</td>
<td>$26,200</td>
<td>$29,950</td>
<td>$33,700</td>
<td>$37,400</td>
<td>$40,400</td>
<td>$43,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>60% AMI</td>
<td>$31,440</td>
<td>$35,940</td>
<td>$40,440</td>
<td>$44,880</td>
<td>$48,480</td>
<td>$52,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>80% AMI</td>
<td>$41,900</td>
<td>$47,900</td>
<td>$53,900</td>
<td>$59,850</td>
<td>$64,650</td>
<td>$69,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>100% AMI</td>
<td>$52,400</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>$67,400</td>
<td>$74,800</td>
<td>$80,800</td>
<td>$86,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD User FY 2017 Income Limits

At 60 percent of AMI, the income threshold for a 4-person household is $44,880 and is $59,850 at 80 percent of AMI.

1 The median income in Rosedale UTC is significantly lower than in Wyandotte County; however, almost any affordable limit is tied to areas for which HUD publishes rent and income limits, which are primarily county or metropolitan areas. Local officials could stipulate a lower AMI level, such as 50 percent or even 30 percent, to ensure set aside units are affordable at the current neighborhood level. That is a local policy decision.
The preceding income data can be used to calculate maximum rents that would be considered affordable, as summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>AMI Level</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>50% AMI</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$670</td>
<td>$790</td>
<td>$850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>60% AMI</td>
<td>$670</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$980</td>
<td>$1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>80% AMI</td>
<td>$930</td>
<td>$970</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
<td>$1,370</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>100% AMI</td>
<td>$1,190</td>
<td>$1,260</td>
<td>$1,510</td>
<td>$1,760</td>
<td>$1,930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rent based on paying up to 30% of income for rent, minus utility costs. Utility costs estimated based on Kansas City, Kansas Housing Authority Utility Allowance Schedule for 2018.

Monthly Utility Estimates: Studio-$119, 1 BR - $147, 2 BR - $170, 3 BR - $184, 4 BR - $239

Affordable Housing Set Aside Precedents

Affordable housing set aside ordinances have been implemented in many areas in the U.S. The following table summarizes details from programs in Chicago, Detroit, and Nashville. Additional details can be found in the actual ordinance documents for those municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Example Affordable Housing Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Requirement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemptions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Incentives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Hyperlink:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Maranzana, Forum Studios
From: Andy Pfister, Development Strategies
Date: December 18, 2017
Rec: Rosedale UTC Economic Development Tools

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize existing economic development tools that could be utilized in Rosedale UTC to support quality new development that meets the primary goals for this area.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TOOLS

The following provides a “toolkit” of resources that might be utilized in the implementation of the plan.

Cities have available a variety of fiscal tools to induce private investment. These generally fall under the following five categories:

- **Bond financing** (based on anticipated future revenue)
  - Key Program: Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

- **Supplemental taxes**
  - Key Programs: Community Improvement District (CID)

- **Tax reductions**
  - Key Programs: Neighborhood Revitalization Area (NRA), Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRB), Constitutional Exemption (EDX)

- **Grants**

- **Tax credits**
  - Key Programs: Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), New Markets Tax Credits (NMTC), Historic Tax Credits (HTC)

**Anticipated Future Revenue**

In certain instances, future taxes generated by real estate investments can be used to finance current costs of facilitating those improvements. This mechanism is referred to generically as Tax Increment Financing (TIF). The capture of taxes resulting from increased assessed value (the increment) is used to pay debt service on bonds issued to fund selected costs of development.
This would involve the creation of a new TIF districts in Rosedale UTC. TIF revenue would be generated through the capture of net new property taxes, and could be used to finance public infrastructure and site acquisition and clearance.

To determine the efficacy of a TIF strategy, the level of taxable investment that is likely to be attracted to the selected areas has been evaluated as part of this project's market study—as has the value, or increment, that can be created for the larger TIF district. It would be critical for school district representatives to agree on an appropriate level of tax capture because property taxes provide significant funding for the school district.

Supplemental Taxes

This section focuses on improvement districts which are sometimes also referred to as special tax districts. In general, an improvement district generates a steady source of revenue to finance services and project costs that are considered “special” to landowners, residents, and businesses within a designated geographic area. Therefore, a separate tax is levied only on those properties within defined boundaries that will be benefited by those expenditures.

Community Improvement District (CID)

A CID (or similar program) typically involves a special sale tax or property tax that supports an array of needed supplemental programs and services. These often include marketing, maintenance, security, and limited capital improvements, including streetscape enhancements. It is important to note that the imposition of such supplemental taxes or fees do not have to be limited to businesses and commercial properties but can also come from residents and residential properties. In the case of condominium owners, this could be incorporated into the monthly condo fee if arranged for at the outset of the development or billed directly to each unit along with the property tax bill from the assessor.

Tax Reductions

Personal and real property tax reductions, or abatements, are common economic development incentives, particularly where significant new real estate investment occurs or new jobs are created. In most instances, the abatements act to reduce operating costs of investment real estate (office, industrial, retail, or rental apartment buildings) for a designated period of time. In Kansas City, Kansas, the primary tax reduction program is the Neighborhood Revitalization Area (NRA), and there are separate programs for residential and commercial uses.¹ For both, there are different criteria for minimum increase in assessed value (e.g., 5% to 15% minimum increase in


value), percent of rebate (50% to 100%), and the term of the rebate (5 to 20 years) based on the location and scale/cost of the development.

Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRB) and Constitutional Exemption (EDX) primarily apply to companies that create significant new employment or export goods. The targeted development for Rosedale UTC is primarily residential, so these mechanisms would not apply.

Grants

While far less available than in the past, there remain opportunities to obtain grants and soft loans from a wide variety of both public and private sources. Private corporate and charitable foundations do target their support to different aspects of urban investment and revitalization such as economic development, environment enhancement, historic preservation, and open space and parks. Most government grants are ones resulting from legislators’ capacity to target appropriations to special community needs and high profile projects of wide public benefit. Foundations might be compelled to participate (financially or otherwise) in the project—particularly if a component of the project is consistent with a particular mission. For example, efforts to support entrepreneurship and business start-ups might garner the interest of the Kauffman Foundation. KU Endowment might also participate in specific programs that also benefit KU Medical Center and University of Kansas Hospital.

Tax Credits

Because the private market alone cannot deliver the products that are proposed as part of this development plan, public support is necessary to make development economically viable. Tax credits are one form of public participation that can be used to reduce the costs of development, thus making projects viable that otherwise could not be developed.

Three types of tax credits would be particularly useful: Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) New Markets Tax Credits (NMTC), and Historic Tax Credits (HTC). LIHTC are used to provide affordable housing, defined broadly as rental units offered at below market rents to households that earn below 60 percent of area median income (AMI). New Markets Tax Credits are used for the development of commercial properties in distressed areas. Historic Tax Credits, as the name implies, can be applied toward the preservation, renovation, and rehabilitation of historic buildings.

There are many similarities in the broad ways in which the tax credits work. The provide tax credits for a percentage of eligible costs (which consist of most building hard and soft costs; infrastructure costs are rarely included). Once awarded, the future value of these tax credits can be bought and sold on the private market, usually at a discounted rate. This discounted rate becomes the “equity value” of the tax credits.
Date: December 18, 2017
RE: Rosedale UTC Economic Development Tools

Impact of Tax Credits on Phasing

The state of Missouri places limits on the amount of tax credits that can be awarded to a project on an annual basis. This can have a significant impact on the phasing of a development. Further, tax credits are not necessarily awarded to the same project in consecutive years. In this way, an affordable project that could technically be absorbed into the market in two years might actually take five to seven years—or more—to develop, due to the constraint of limited tax credit allocations.

Impact of New Markets Tax Credits on Location

New Markets Tax Credits can only be allocated in qualifying census tracts; the chief criterion for this designation is median household income. Rosedale UTC is wholly located in qualifying census tracts.
To: Matt Maranzana,  
Project Manager – Forum Studio  

From: Paul Wojdechowski, Alta Planning + Design  
CC: Chip Crawford, Forum Studio  

Date: June 17, 2017  

Re: Area Connectivity Plan Memorandum  

The vision for the Rosedale University District is a connected, walkable, transit-oriented development that attracts residents, students, workers, and visitors to a vibrant mixed-use environment in the eastern side of heart of Kansas City, Kansas. Of key importance in the success of the redevelopment of the Rosedale University Town District will be achieving a high level of connectivity through site design and the creation of a transportation that places a priority on walking, bicycling, and the use of transit and is complemented by automobile transportation that is thoughtful in the placement of travel lanes, pick-up and drop off areas, and a system of parking - both on and off-street - that is integrated with all other land uses.

Each mode of transportation that feeds the District is its own layer that should be continuous, connected, and visible as it travels through the development. Each layer is added to the overall network as it joins and intersects the other modes. It is important to establish a priority for each user in various contexts so as to elevate and support different users at different places in the network. Users of each mode should be supported in traveling to the District, and the design of the Center should allow for a welcoming “park once” culture that encourages walking one a visitor has arrived.

To encourage this, the development of the District should reflect a hierarchy of modes that are accommodated in the design. Fine-grained, two-way networks for each mode helps to increase visibility and familiarity, and helps to distribute traffic for each more efficiently than grouping traffic into peak directional flow. The sections below identify the needs for each mode, starting with the modes that require the greatest amount of accommodation:

- Pedestrians
- Transit Users (and operators)
- Bicyclists
- Automobile users
**Pedestrian Network**

The pedestrian is the indicator species of a walkable, mixed-use environment. The presence of pedestrians should highlight that there is street-level activity, where the District’s visitors and residents feel safe and comfortable walking, and that walking is both pleasant and efficient as a choice of transportation. Sidewalks should be present and continuous at all locations within the development on both sides of all streets. The width of the sidewalk should expand in areas where streetscape and storefront activity are desired, and pedestrians should be provided with a buffer from automobile traffic wherever feasible through the use of on-street parking. Pedestrian crosswalks should be marked at all intersections with an emphasis on making crosswalks highly visible at unsignalized crossings. Signalized intersections should be designed with the pedestrian first in mind to minimize crossing distances (which shortens signal clearance phases) and include
pedestrian signals complete with countdown timers. Pedestrians should be provided with WALK signals during every signal cycle, which eliminates the need to provide push buttons.

Transit Network

The transit network includes a series of bus routes, some of which begin and end their trips within the Rosedale University District. The proposed transit center, to be located on 39th Avenue west of Rainbow Boulevard, should be designed to serve as a major transit hub for transfer activity as well as a mobility hub for people traveling to and from the District. Whether those users arrive and depart by transit, automobile, by bicycle, or on foot, the transit center should serve as a gateway to the District. For the purposes of promoting transit and making it a more visible component of the District, transit routes that terminate nearby should be extended to start and end their trips at the new transit center, thereby strengthening its place as a main hub of activity. This includes extending Routes 11, 23 to the transit center (to provide direct service to downtown KC Mo) as well as Routes 35, 39, 51, 107, and 405. With headways ranging from 10 to 30 minutes during a typical weekday, a transit center with buses arriving and departing every 2-3 minutes would provide frequent opportunities for transfers while also concentrating bus operations for transit operators and make more efficient use of bus operator facilities (e.g. bathrooms). As opposed to extending the 11/23 Bus line to downtown the shuttle can provide service to the end of the 11, 23 Routes on Southwest.

In considering the circulation of vehicles to and from the District, the development's two north-south routes; Rainbow Boulevard and Adams Street were identified as a potential two-way pair. However, transit networks in small and medium-sized cities benefit greatly from networks that operate in both directions on a single street, reducing the potential confusion to occasional or first-time users, while also providing better support for bus stop amenities and pedestrian infrastructure to support pedestrian crossings on round trips. For this reason, it is recommended to consider two-way transit vehicle operation along streets that are connected to the transit center. While peak period traffic for automobiles would use Rainbow Boulevard, the transit center would be a transit focus for the University Town Center on Adams Street, as opposed to Rainbow that will allow for efficient movement of transit vehicles and minimize delays to automobile traffic from transit pick-up and drop off activity on Rainbow Boulevard.
Bus stop amenities should include shelters, signage, and bus stops located near key activity generators also should serve as transfer points for “last mile” trips by walking or biking. Bus stops with shelters should be designed to accommodate bike parking and bike share stations as a single facility. The key is to provide a more permanent nature to the bus stops for enhancing comfort and security at all stops.

Bicycle Network

A connected bicycle network within the District should consist of bike share stations as well as a network of on-street bicycle facilities to provide door-to-door connectivity for those using a bicycle. Bike share stations should be located near key activity generators such as the library and the commercial retail establishments along the east side of Rainbow Boulevard. Bike share stations, whether located at bus shelters or at other locations, should be located so as to be highly visible and conveniently close to building entrances.

Bike infrastructure should be conveniently located, should emphasize comfort and safety of the bicyclist. A “spine” of high-quality bicycle facilities can help to attract and concentrate bicycle traffic to a certain point of the corridor, and if designed accordingly, can help to mitigate potential conflicts between pedestrians, automobiles, and transit vehicles. It is for this reason that the bicycle spine should be located along Rainbow Boulevard. Designed either as a two-way facility on one side of Rainbow Boulevard helps to assign bicycle traffic to the land uses that benefit from this facility, the campus. Transit service, located along side but integrated into the design, supports the use of round trip and daily transit ridership, most likely suited to work and school trips.
Automobile Network

The automobile network consists of the roadway grid and automobile parking. Automobile parking should consist of on-street parking located on every street where space permits, and strategic placement of off-street parking lots and/or structures. As a matter of policy, on-street parking should encourage turnover, and should be priced to encourage those seeking long-term parking to park in off-street lots or structures. As the District is developed over several phases, surface parking may give way to parking structures to keep up with demand.

The design of off street parking should emphasize the need to accommodate the motorist arriving at the District, and should help the motorist become a pedestrian as soon as possible after parking. To achieve this, parking lots or structures should have a street-level entry and exit that accommodates both automobiles and pedestrians at the same location, and should discourage the use of direct entry to adjacent buildings. This helps encourage shared parking is accessible to all visitors, and supports a “park once” culture that allows visitors to travel around the District as a pedestrian rather than having to move the vehicle for each stop during a trip chain.

The roadway grid should emphasize the distributed network approach to accommodating traffic volumes during typical weekdays and peak periods. Rainbow Boulevard and Adams Street currently accommodate 90% and 10% of north-south travel, respectively. As the District develops, Adams Street can be rebuilt to accommodate a larger share of current traffic levels and help to absorb the impact of future traffic growth. Instead of a one-way pair, it would be possible to design both north-south streets to accommodate two-way traffic. Bicycle travel would be prioritized along Rainbow Boulevard through the design of the buffered sidepath, and motor vehicles would be prioritized on Adams Street, providing more consistent predictable travel times for circulation in the town center that are less affected by peak period congestion on Rainbow Boulevard.

From a traffic capacity standpoint, two facilities of similar width and traffic volume can be optimized to balance traffic volumes and minimize delay at intersections, which provides network. Keeping intersections two-way traffic provides for better pedestrian accessibility through the use of shorter signal cycle lengths, and WALK phases during every signal cycle, eliminating the need for additional push-button infrastructure.
Rosedale University Town District TOD and Multi-Modal Transportation Plan

39th Street West of Rainbow Option

Adams Two-Way Option
Rainbow Two-Way (Left Turns at Intersections) Option
Introduction

As stated in the Rosedale Master Plan and Traffic Study document, street and transportation goals focus on creating a safe transportation system that accommodates pedestrians, cyclists, transit, and motor vehicles. It also must ensure that the local street network is configured to accommodate future traffic needs as the neighborhood grows and the hospital expands. As transportation networks are reimagined, Rosedale’s streets must contribute to image, character, and redevelopment goals. Taking a ride through the Rosedale University Town District on any given day, and it quickly becomes clear: people want to bike in the study area, but the transportation environment is focused on cars. Change must take place in order to provide the mode shift towards increased biking, walking, and transit. The following is an assessment of the bike level of travel stress and recommendation to enhance biking in and to the district, as well as using biking and bike share as an extension of the transit network. While the Rosedale University Town Center District is just a part of the overall master plan, it will set the tone for development of a connected bikeway network that is low stress and focuses on a wide range of bicyclist skill levels and ages. In
order to assess the existing and proposed network, we must look at the land use corridors and the nodes of development that are envisioned. This will set the tone for development of a connected bikeway network.

The Existing Bikeway Experience - Facility Types

For the purposes of establishing the existing network in the Rosedale University Town Center Area, bicycle facilities are broken into two categories: off-street trails and paths, and on-street bikeways. Off-street trails and paths are generally located in parks and along natural features like rivers or along other transportation infrastructure like arterial roads. On-street bikeways are located on the roadway pavement itself, often in the form of bike lanes such as along Southwest Boulevard or simply identified as signed bike routes. The following bicycle facility types are present in and around the Rosedale University Town Center study area.

Shared-Use Paths (Trails)

A shared-use path or trail, also called a multi-use trail, allows for two-way, off-street bicycle use and may be used by pedestrians, skaters, wheelchair users, joggers and other non-motorized users. These facilities are frequently found in parks, along rivers, and in utility corridors where there are few conflicts with motorized vehicles, except at roadway crossings. The Rozarks Trails in the study area are single track dirt nature trails that run along the ridge connecting the Rosedale Arch, Fisher Park, and the Mission Cliffs area. These trails are recreational in nature and are volunteer-driven facilities. These trails are an asset to the active transportation network, and the City should continue to support the development and maintenance of these trails; however, they are not standard for inclusion into the transportation network by function or standard. The Regional trails network must be connected by shared-use paths that connect destinations or other bikeway facilities with paved trails of at least 10' wide, paved surfaces. The American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 4th Ed. (2012), often referred to as the AASHTO Bike Guide, includes details of minimum standard trail design guidance that can constitute this segment of the bikeway network. The Rozarks Trails are an important destination and a part of the Rosedale Regional Nature Trail.

Because of their separation from motor vehicle traffic, shared-use paths appeal to the widest variety of user types, from families with children to adult recreational riders to everyday commuters. When these linear shared-use paths lead to popular destinations like the Rozarks Nature Trails, or connect to the on-street bikeway network, their utility expands greatly, offering a comfortable, low-stress bicycling environment for people to use for everyday trips.

Sidepaths

Sidepaths along arterial and collector roadways combine the design characteristics of a shared-use path with the directness and convenience of the roadway system. Sidepaths are generally at sidewalk level and separated from the road by a curb and a planting strip, providing at least a minimum separation from adjacent motor vehicles. Sidepaths are preferred by many bicycle users due to their separation from the roadway; however, without appropriate design, they can become a source of crashes and negative interactions with both motor vehicles at street and driveway crossings, and with pedestrians as well.

Sidepaths can be an integral component of the bike network, and if designed appropriately can provide a comfortable, low-stress bicycling environment for people of all ages and abilities, and expand the off-street trail system into neighborhoods, schools, and other community destinations.
Consistent with the AASHTO Bike Guide, path width is generally a minimum of 10’ wide, but reduced to 8 feet for constricted areas. In cases where there is significant activity on a side path or shared use path, widths can be increased to 12’ or greater, depending on usage by pedestrians and bicyclists, if they are to be a part of the bikeway network.

Bike Lanes
Bicycle lanes designate an exclusive space for bicyclists with pavement markings and signage. The bicycle lane is located adjacent to motor vehicle travel lanes, and bicyclists ride in the same direction as motor vehicle traffic. Bicycle lanes are typically on the right side of the street (on a two-way street) between the adjacent travel lane and curb, road edge or parking lane. Standard bicycle lanes can be found on Southwest Boulevard, to the north of the study area. On one-way streets, bicycle lanes may be located on either the right or left side of the street. Currently, there are no bike lanes that directly serve the study area. Bike lanes can also include travel way or parking side buffers that can increase a level of comfort for people bicycling. There are no buffered bike lanes in the study area.

Signed Routes
Shared streets in Kansas City, Kansas, near the study area are where bicyclists and motor vehicles use the same roadway space. Signed shared roadways in the area add guide signs as well as warning signs to provide identification of bike routes in the overall bikeway system and are prominent the east in Kansas City, Missouri. Guide signs provide information to people riding bicycles and alert people driving motor vehicles to be aware and respectful of other road users. Signed shared roadways are often installed on streets that have constraints prohibiting a more separated bikeway type, and are essential for addressing gaps in the bikeway network or serving as the final leg of a bicycle route on a low-volume, low-speed roadway. While these types of bikeways have their place in the network, they cannot constitute the network if the network is intended accommodate a wide range of ages and abilities. If these types of signed routes are used on low-speed, low-volume local roadways in the area, they should include additional traffic calming and diversion measures to increase bicycle comfort and prioritize bicycle traffic.
Bikeway Level of Travel Stress Assessment

A look at Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) on arterial and collector roadways in the study area reveals the extent to which the current transportation network is limited in its ability to serve a wide variety of bicyclist types. Using the Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress methodology established by the Mineta Transportation Institute’s (MTI) Report 11-19: Low-Stress Bicycling and Network Connectivity published in 2012, the Plan analyzes levels of bicycle traffic stress on arterial and collector roads in within the study area. Most people bicycling in the study area must travel on or across these major roadways to reach their destinations. The analysis combines individual roadway characteristics, like the presence of dedicated bicycle facilities, number of travel lanes, presence of parking, and posted speed limit, to assign a level of traffic stress to the roadway. Table 1 provides definitions for each of the four levels of traffic stress, as defined in the MTI Report 11-19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Traffic Stress</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLTS 1</td>
<td>Presenting little traffic stress and demanding little attention from cyclists, and attractive enough for a relaxing bike ride. Suitable for almost all cyclists, including children trained to safely cross intersections. On links, cyclists are either physically separated from traffic, or are in an exclusive bicycling zone next to a slow traffic stream with no more than one lane per direction, or are on a shared road where they interact with only occasional motor vehicles (as opposed to a stream of traffic) with a low speed differential. Where cyclists ride alongside a parking lane, they have ample operating space outside the zone into which car doors are opened. Intersections are easy to approach and cross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLTS 2</td>
<td>Presenting little traffic stress and therefore suitable to most adult cyclists but demanding more attention than might be expected from children. On links, cyclists are either physically separated from traffic, or are in an exclusive bicycling zone next to a well-confined traffic stream with adequate clearance from a parking lane, or are on a shared roadway where they interact with only occasional motor vehicles (as opposed to a stream of traffic) with a low speed differential. Where a bike lane lies between a through lane and a right-turn lane, it is configured to give cyclists unambiguous priority where cars cross the bike lane and to keep car speed in the right-turn lane comparable to bicycling speeds. Crossings are not difficult for most adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLTS 3</td>
<td>More traffic stress than BLTS 2, yet markedly less than the stress of integrating with multilane traffic, and therefore welcome many people currently riding bikes in American cities. Offering cyclists either an exclusive riding zone (lane) next to moderate-speed traffic or shared lanes on streets that are not multilane and have moderately low speed. Crossings may be longer or across higher-speed roads than allowed by BLTS 2, but are still considered acceptably safe to most adult pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLTS 4</td>
<td>A level of stress beyond BLTS 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At its core, the BLTS scoring decreases in comfort (1 is the highest comfort level) as the number of lanes, posted speed limit, and traffic volumes increase. Scoring in BLTS is based off of the four basic categories defined in the MTI report. This scoring methodology is summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2: Segment Scoring Matrix for Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Lanes</th>
<th>Mixed Traffic</th>
<th>Street with Bike Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Volume</td>
<td>&lt;= 30 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 lanes</td>
<td>&lt;= 3k</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3k - 10k</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10k - 20k</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;20k</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Lanes</td>
<td>&lt;= 3k</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3k - 10k</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10k - 20k</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;20k</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ Lanes</td>
<td>All volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BLTS scoring decreases comfort (1 is the highest comfort level) as the number of lanes, posted speed limit, and traffic volumes increase. Traffic volumes reduce comfort more where bicyclists share the road with motorized vehicles, but comfort also decreases in bicycle lanes as traffic volumes next to those bicycle lanes increase. It is important to note that the presence of wide sidewalks along arterial and collector roadways was not factored into this analysis in order to represent on-road level of traffic stress for bicycling. Wide sidewalks and shared-use paths along roadways generally earn higher scores than adjacent on-street facilities, but those higher scores are often reduced when the path crosses a busier roadway with a lower BLTS score, reflecting the impact of major roadway crossings on a facility’s safety and comfort.
Table 3: Segment Scoring for Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress in the Rosedale University Town Center Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Bike Facility</th>
<th>Speed Limit (MPH)</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>BLOTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow (N/O 36th)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28400</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow (S/O 36th)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24500</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oletta</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th (E/O State Line)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9800</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th (State Line to Rainbow)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12400</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th (W/O Rainbow)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Line</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th (Rainbow to State Line)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5900</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21400</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47th</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of key streets in the study area are shown in Table 3. The ability of these streets to achieve a high level of comfort for a significant number of people traveling in and to the corridor will either enhance the ability of new trips to be made by biking and a mode shift to biking from cars, or it will maintain or worsen the mode split as trips increase with new development. Our goal is to enhance the potential mode split and shift to biking, and transit-supportive biking trips.
Proposed Bikeway Plan from the Master Plan

Figure 4 shows the proposed bikeway network as included in the Rosedale Master Plan and Traffic Study document. The goal of the bikeway network is to provide connectivity and offer an alternative to traveling by car to destinations in the Town Center. Based on our assessment of the level of traffic stress in the study area, the planned network of routes that was included in the Master Plan Document will not provide the types of facilities and the connectivity to serve the study area, nor will it effectively create the模式 shift envisioned by the plan. Much of the trail network included as existing are nature trails and not a formal part of the transportation network. Other elements like bike lanes, or even buffered bike lanes do not provide the separation that will draw people out of their cars and onto a bike, or to multimodal trips combining transit and the proposed bikeshare expansion into the study area.

On-street signed bike routes offer connections, but the shared environment will not substantially attract new bicycle traffic, especially where there are significant conflicts and motor vehicle access to parking garages and medical center facilities. 41st Avenue could also benefit from a more separated bikeway type that will allow service to a low stress bikeway loop for the area. Bike boulevards on Lloyd and Fisher will benefit from enhanced wayfinding, signing, markings and traffic calming, as noted, but directly serving separated bikeways.

Consistency in bikeway types is important to the overall plan and to providing low stress to low stress connections where we want to encourage bike travel, and connections between transit and destinations, as well as from bike share locations and transit or destinations.

Proposed Bikeway Facility Types

Bicycle facilities vary greatly in character, context, and intended user. The bicycle facility types described here in this chapter are recommended in the Plan and are described in greater detail in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design Guide in the appendix of this document. These facility types can best be understood when positioned along a spectrum that moves from most integrated with motor vehicle traffic to most separated from motor vehicle traffic. The illustration below depicts this concept.
Figure S. Marked On-Street Bikeway Continuum

Although the diagram above does not include all on-street bicycle facilities recommended in this plan, most notably “Share the Road” and “Bikes May Use Full Lane” signage, but it conveys the various strategies to accommodate bicycle travel that respect the contexts, constraints, and opportunities of each roadway. The facility types described below are also listed in order from most integrated to most separated.

**Bikes May Use Full Lane Signage**

“Bikes May Use Full Lane” signs are used on roadways in which travel lanes are intended for shared use by motor vehicles and bicyclists and are too narrow for motor vehicles and bicyclists to travel side by side. Unlike “Share the Road” signs, “Bikes May Use Full Lane” signs provide clearer, more descriptive information regarding the positioning of bicyclists within the travel lane. These signs are often placed along roadways that do not permit a more separated facility like a bike lane, yet provide an important segment of the bicycle network.

**Shared Lane Markings**

Shared lane markings, or “sharrows”, are road markings used to indicate a shared lane environment for bicycles and automobiles. Shared lane markings remind drivers of bicycle traffic on the street and recommend proper bicyclist positioning within the travel lane. These markings are often coupled with Bikes May Use Full Lane signs to reinforce the shared lane environment, and with wayfinding signage to guide people bicycling to popular destinations.
Bicycle Boulevard
Bicycle boulevards are non-arterial streets with low motorized traffic volumes and speeds, designated and designed to give bicycle and pedestrian travel priority. Bicycle boulevards use signs, pavement markings, and traffic-calming measures to discourage through trips by motor vehicles, while accommodating local access. These facilities provide people of all ages and abilities with comfortable and attractive places to walk and ride a bicycle. Intersection crossing treatments (particularly at arterial crossings) are used to create safer, more comfortable, and convenient bicycle- and pedestrian-optimized streets. People riding bicycles should feel comfortable bicycling two abreast or “conversation riding” while traveling on a bicycle boulevard.

Bike Lane / Buffered Bike Lane
Bike lanes designate an exclusive space for bicyclists with pavement markings and signage. The bike lane is located adjacent to motor vehicle travel lanes and bicyclists ride in the same direction as motor vehicle traffic. Bike lanes are typically on the right side of the street (on a two-way street), between the adjacent travel lane and curb, road edge or parking lane. Buffered bike lanes are conventional bicycle lanes paired with a designated buffer space, separating the bike lane from the adjacent motor vehicle travel lane and/or parking lane.

Cycle Track/Separated Bike Lane
Of all on-street bicycle facilities, separated bike lanes, also referred to as cycle tracks or protected bike lanes, offer the most protection and separation from adjacent motor vehicle traffic. Separated bike lanes are physically separated from motor vehicle traffic and typically provide bicycle travel in the same direction as motor vehicle traffic. They may be at street level, or raised above street level, yet still distinct from the sidewalk or pedestrian facility. In situations where on-street parking is allowed, protected bike lanes are located adjacent to the curb and sidewalk, with on-street parking repositioned to provide additional separation between people bicycling and people driving.

Some separated bike lanes are bi-directional and support bicycle movement in both directions on one side of the street. A two-way separated bike lane may be configured at street level with a parking lane or other barrier, or as a raised facility to provide vertical separation from the adjacent motor vehicle lane. Two-way separated bike lanes must provide clear and understandable bicycle movements at intersections and driveways. Education is important to inform people how to travel in a safe manner.

Sidewalk
Sidewalks provide for bi-directional travel on one or both sides of the road. Because of their location adjacent to the roadway (but separated by a five-foot minimum tree lawn or landscaping buffer), this type of shared use path offers the most comfortable bicycling or walking experience along a roadway, however the potential for conflict with motor vehicles at street and driveway crossings makes the design of the sidewalk at these crossings of utmost importance. Their importance within the overall bikeway network is critical and are integral to the functionality and connectivity of the network and provide vital connections to important destinations throughout the Rosedale Town Center area. This makes the engineering of crossing points critical for these trails to be low-stress travel ways for active transportation.
Bike Circulation and Network

While people in Kansas City, Kansas are legally permitted to bicycle on all public roadways except interstate highways, most people bicycling prefer to travel on trails, designated bike lanes, and low-speed/low-volume local streets. This national preference for separated facilities and calm local streets is common across the Midwest and in the Kansas City Region. Together, trails/sidewalks and on-street bikeways can comprise a great bike network, which is shown in the map below. However, merely providing bike lanes does not adequately reach the largest population of individuals who ride bikes.

Together, the trails, wide sidewalks, and on-street bicycle facilities described above will make up the Rosedale University Town Center District bike network. To better understand how the network currently functions, the Plan examines the key network characteristics of quality, connectivity, comfort, safety, wayfinding, and support facilities.

Quality

The quality of roadway and trail surfaces, pavement markings, wayfinding signage, and bicycle parking facilities is critical to the safety of people bicycling and the functionality of the bicycle transportation system. Network quality cannot vary through the district. Shared-use path and wide sidewalk surfaces should be in good condition and offer smooth, accessible surfaces for bicycling, walking, skateboarding, inline skating, and other trail activity. Pavement quality on the road network and associated on-street bikeways is more variable. Road surfaces in poor condition can deter bicycle activity and create safety hazards. Materials used for shared lane markings and bike lane striping points should be durable markings and striping products to reduce the need for annual scheduled maintenance to extend the life cycle for on-street bikeways.

Connectivity

Strong network connectivity is critical to the success of any bike network. Intersecting trails and low-stress bikeways can extend the distance that people feel comfortable bicycling and can better help people reach nearby destinations. The Kansas City, Kansas bike network has notable linear and area gaps that limit opportunities there are bike lanes present on several roads, but none of these bike lanes intersect. In
addition, major barriers like Rainbow Boulevard, Mission Road, and I-35 create challenges to bicycle mobility. As we enter the district, we must pay close attention not only to segments and bikeways in those segments, but we must address how people negotiate intersections in order to reach destinations in the district. While the one-way/two-way pair concept is still open, we must address separated bikeways on Rainbow and 39th Street, as well as connection of these bikeways to the transit center on Adam. This focus will work in whatever configuration Rainbow ultimately takes in the future. Figure 6 shows the bikeways along Rainbow that will address either roadway configuration, as well as gateways to the development area, and focus intersections to prioritize transit, bicyclists and pedestrians.

The Network

While our focus on this planning activity for the University Town Center District is limited, connections to the town center are challenged by several barriers that are both linear and perpendicular, like Rainbow Boulevard. These challenges are addressed in the Proposed Bikeway Network shown in Figure 7. The network incorporates the base ideas included in the Master Plan, but focuses on low-stress connectivity along and across active transportation barriers that restrict desired mode shift and reduce the level of

![Figure 7: Proposed Bikeway Network](image-url)
Our recommendations are as follows for the bicycle circulation and facility planning:

- Maintain the connection from the Southwest Avenue Bike Lanes to the district along the west side of Rainbow through a shared-use path/Cycle Track to 36th Street.
- Develop a two-way cycle track south of 36th Street along Rainbow on the west side of the roadway and transition to the east side at 39th Street.
- Locate the wide sidepath south of 39th Street on the east side of the road to serve the University all the way to Olathe Blvd. This spine can continue on Rainbow to the south or run on parallel streets as bicycle boulevards. The reason the sidepath is positioned on the east side is to make sure parking could possibly be included along the west side of the street that will serve retail and the pedestrian realm can be enhanced to serve the retail frontage.
- Add cycle tracks to connect to Rainbow on 36th Street, 39th Street, Booth, Olathe and State Line, creating a low-stress separated bike loop to link all areas of the district to the core at 39th and Rainbow, the transit center along 39th, and the community center/library to the west of Rainbow. While these bikeways would be best served as cycle tracks/separated bikeways, a phased approach should be considered in which less-separated facilities are installed first to define these roads as bicycle corridors, and then replaced to meet growing demand and capitalize on redevelopment opportunities. The increase in development will yield additional demand that will likely increase traffic volumes and require a separated facility. This plan looks at the ultimate build-out of the area.
- Bike boulevards and trail connections in the heart of the district allow for connectivity between cycle track segments, and connections to the trail network. The bike boulevards in this network plan are envisioned to support residential land use and calm streets for all ages and abilities. The shared-use path connections allow connectivity from the regional network to the town center.

A key element of this bikeway network will be wayfinding. Between the on- and off-street bikeways and connections between bikeways, wayfinding will serve the district and bikeway users and will allow branding of the network with other branding in the district. The wayfinding plan will also serve bikeshare stations and transit users as they use biking for their last mile connection to destinations in the district and adjacent destinations. These signs provide critical information to people bicycling, including directional guidance to key destinations and districts, as well as distance and time to reach these locations by traveling the designated route. The addition of travel times to wayfinding signage is more common in cities across the country for its ability to counter the perception of travel times as a significant barrier to bicycling, especially for utilitarian and commuter purposes.
Kansas City B-Cycle Bikeshare

The expansion of bikeshare to the Rosedale University Town Center District is clearly envisioned as a way to serve this development node of activity. As with the City of Kansas City, it is likely that bikeshare expansion occur in advance of the bikeway network development. Bike Walk KC has secured federal funding for expansion of Kansas City B-Cycle station to Kansas City, Kansas and into the State of Kansas. With this opportunity come challenges, including how to navigate the state process with the KDOT for securing equipment, with securing local funding to match the federal funds, and with identifying funding sources to operate the stations as part of the overall Kansas City B-Cycle network. This section of the memo will focus on station locations as part of the bikeway network to get the most benefit of the bikeshare system, and the bikeway network. Existing locations are shown in Figure 8, below, which a figure from the Master Plan document.
As the network in the Master plan was proposed, the bikeshare stations were not served well by the bikeway network. Past experience with bikeshare systems indicates that low-stress bikeway infrastructure helps bikeshare dramatically, as well as the focus on using bikeshare as a support system to the transit network. We are proposing an additional two stations to serve the district more effectively and locate the stations along low-stress bikeways in the proposed network.

Stations we have added or adjusted are as follows:

- 39th and Fischer St. – The station will be located at the Library/Community Center. This is a key destination that will need to be served by the bikeshare system.
- 39th at Transit Center (Adams) – A bikeshare station will need to be located at the transit center, along with a bike storage station for the integration of bikes and transit.
- 40th Street and Booth – This bikeshare location is located on the edge of the mixed use district and provides for access to bikeshare that can access low stress routes that connect to the transit center, University and medical areas of the district.
• Olathe west of state Line – This station will serve the parking garages along Olathe and allow people to grab a bike and travel to other destinations in the district.
• 39th and state Line – This station has been secured by Bike Walk KC in the southeast corner of the intersection in Kansas City, Missouri. Another station to the east along 39th Street will provide two key steps of connection to Rosedale a reality.
• 37th and Cambridge – this station was noted in the original Master Plan document and will serve the parking and new construction in this part of the district. This location or adjusted location to keep parking to the north, yet connect an alternative through biking to the district will be critical. An additional station may be needed to the north.
• 39th at the A.R. Dykes Library – this will be a core station but stations to the east and west will be critical for people to use bike share around the district.

It will be critical to get key stakeholders to provide local match for bikeshare stations in the district to provide the concentrated density of stations to make bikeshare functional for the success of the district.

The Six E’s Framework – A Foundation for the District

Building a culture that supports and encourages bicycling within the Town Center will require focus on actions and programs beyond infrastructure. It will require the addition of low-stress bikeways that support bicycling by people of all ages and abilities; programs, training, and organized rides to give people the exposure to cycling in the district and confidence to travel by bike; enforcement programs and laws that create an environment of mutual respect among all road users; and guidelines and policies to guide staff and elected officials to enable smart, responsible choices. It takes a comprehensive approach, and above all, it takes ambition, will, and perseverance.

The Unified Government has many of these assets and characteristics already, but it is a focus on the “Five E’s” or the Building Blocks of a Bicycle Friendly Community: Education, Encouragement, Engineering, Enforcement, and Evaluation that will create the transportation environment for the District to succeed. Equity is the sixth key indicator, thereby creating the “Six Es” that will be used for assessing and planning the bikeway network and supporting programs.
When looking at the area being bike friendly, we must use best practices for creating bike culture in the area. This planning effort is a chance to get the process started in the area that can provide all facets of a bike friendly community. One of the major weaknesses was the lack of dedicated on-street bicycle facilities, particularly on arterial and collector roadways that feed the District and can circulate bicyclists in the area.

Based on LAB guidelines we can enhance the bicycling environment through the following actions:

- **Engineering**: Provide bicycle facilities on arterial and collector roads to help bicyclists of all skill levels reach their destinations quickly and safely. Consider protected infrastructure like cycle tracks and buffered bike lanes on roads with posted speed limits over 30 miles per hour, as well as low speed streets that carry significant vehicular traffic.

- **Education**: Develop public education campaigns to encourage respectful and responsible travel behavior among all road and trail users in the area.

- **Enforcement**: Use targeted information and enforcement to encourage all road users to safely and respectfully share the road and provide information about road users’ rights and responsibilities.

- **Encouragement**: Coordinate with the University of Kansas, and Medical Center to promote cycling in and around the campus, university and town center district to educate visitors, residents and students on safe cycling practices.

- **Evaluation & Planning**: Develop a coordinated Bicycle Advisory Committee that includes the University, Medical Center, Unified Government, business owners and Bike/Walk KC meet regularly to support plan implementation and build broad public support for bicycle improvements. Encourage law enforcement to participate on the Bicycle Advisory Committee.
Early action recommendations to get bike implementation off the ground can range from offering more training opportunities for engineering and planning staff on accommodating bicyclists, to hosting events in which a major corridor is closed to auto traffic and programmed for bicycling, walking, group exercises, and other outdoor fun and games.

Support Facilities

End-of-trip facilities like short-term bike racks, bike lockers, and long-term secure bike parking areas are essential to the success of the bike network. A lack of secure parking can deter people from bicycling to destinations, even for short trips. The Unified Government and major institutions like the University of Kansas and KU Medical Center, should provide short- and long-term bicycle parking at popular destinations like the university campus, parks, the proposed Library/Community Center, and businesses in the area. Bicycle parking should be designed into streetscape projects and new developments in and around the district in the form of bike corrals or individual bike racks, depending on needs of the land use in that area. In addition, the district should offer long-term parking in developments, in city-owned facilities, and at the transit center in the form of a bike station. Locker rooms and showers can be located at the bike station and in developments across the city, as well as in university buildings to better support bicycle trips by staff, faculty, and students. Bicycle repair stations, or “fix-it” stations, have become an important part of the bicycle landscape in recent years. Each station along the bike network can provide a bike stand, tools, and in most cases tire pumps for people to fix a flat or make other basic adjustments to their bikes.

A bike parking ordinance using a model ordinance should be developed immediately to set the stage for development and the support of bicycling in the district. Attention to this element of bicycling will increase the bicycle parking supply and reduce this perceived barrier to bicycling.
To: Matt Maranzana,  
    Project Manager – Forum Studio

From: Paul Wojciechowski, Alta Planning + Design

CC: Chip Crawford, Forum Studio

Date: December 17, 2017

Re: Parking Management Memorandum

In taking a holistic approach to creating a district that supports multi-modal transportation and encourages biking, walking and the use of transit, parking must be managed in a way that will support these efforts, not undermine them.

First, the concentration of parking lots to the north-east quadrant of the district will focus parking to an area that is more central to the Medical Center Area as well as further away from the district where we are hoping to have an increase in density and activity without expanses of parking lots. These parking lots will be well connected to the district by transit and bicycle routes. The bike station located at the parking ramps should be connected with clear, direct access from the bike station to the town center. If right of way permits, this could be a dedicated corridor prioritizing bicycles and pedestrians. The thought behind this is that once you arrive to the area you can leave your vehicle in the lot and easily and conveniently get around the district by walking, biking or taking a local transit option (shuttle).

Additionally, parking will be available within the district in mid-block ramps, surface lots or in on-street parallel parking. It is important to the success of the district to activate the street with pedestrians and not to have the primary arrival and activity happen on the backside of the businesses at the parking lot. Construction and design of the parking lots that are located mid-block should require that visitors are connected to the street and public sidewalk, rather than the back sides of the buildings and businesses. This will serve to activate the sidewalk and street, and also encourage the use of the parking lots as a park-once area where they park their car and walk throughout the district, rather than feeling like they have parked near their only destination and must move their car for each local trip within the district that day.

On-street, parallel parking provides the benefit of offering convenient parking as well as provides a buffer between the sidewalk and cafe area and vehicular traffic on the roadway. This parking should be priced higher than the lot/ramp parking in order to encourage quick turnover and pricing in line with the
convenience it offers. It should be short duration parking with enforcement, as failure to enforce this will be detrimental to nearby businesses.

Parking requirements for businesses should be reduced when land uses or building uses with different peak patterns are able to share parking lots. This provides round the clock usage of the parking lots which benefit the safety and vibrancy of the area along with providing a cost savings for construction.

Finally, the design of the parking ramps should require some space for covered, secure bike parking for employees and visitors that are not comfortable leaving their bikes in racks in front of businesses. These spaces should be secure, however also convenient to access and visible from the parking lot entrance. Additionally, parking ramps should also accommodate in policy for parking spaces for carshare vehicles such as Zipcar, if such a service were to be active in the area and request space. It will not require anything special in terms of design except signage and striping indicating the reserved space.

Providing bike parking and space for car share vehicle parking supports the notion that each visitor, employee and nearby resident has a variety of transportation options at their fingertips and they can use each mode seamlessly through convenient access and plentiful options. They do not have to rely on having their own vehicle as the only mode of transportation throughout their day.
MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Maranzana,
    Project Manager – Forum Studio

From: Paul Wojciechowski, Alta Planning + Design

CC: Chip Crawford, Forum Studio

Date: December 17, 2017

Re: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategy Memorandum

The Transportation Demand Management strategy works hand in hand with the Parking Management philosophy as well as the connectivity and bike circulation plans.

The transportation demand management strategy of the University Town District is to provide a layered network of transportation options and a dense, vibrant district. With an easily accessible network of fixed route bus, shuttle service, vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle routes, all visitors to the University Town District will adjust their mode to fit their destination and day.

Because the area is looking to increase in density and reduce single occupancy vehicle trips, we will be looking to keep the vehicular access to the University Town District to just the minimum required. Through design and densification, it will be easier to take a shuttle, walk or bike within the University Town District, so visitors, students and employees are more likely to leave their car in a ramp and get around locally by foot, bike or shuttle.

Creating better modal connections will facilitate this process. Once parked, a person arriving to the University Town District or parking lot will have convenient access to a shuttle stop, bike share bike or network of sidewalks. The mode they choose will depend on their personal preference and the distance they need to travel.
Accomplishing these connections and networks will be achieved by following the recommendations for the parking strategy and the recommendations in the connectivity plan memorandum. In addition to formulating design changes, implementing the densification and land use changes described for University Town in the Rosedale Master Plan and Traffic Study will be critical to the success of reducing single occupancy vehicle trips.

Businesses in the University Town District as well as KU should implement additional TDM strategies within their own operations. Ideas such as staggering work hours to avoid shift changes adding to congestion at peak times, managing, limiting and pricing parking permits to reduce demand as needed and encouraging carpooling, biking and walking through incentive programs and infrastructure design. Smaller businesses can operate bicycle friendly business programs where they provide their employees or customers with rewards based incentive programs for arriving by bike.
To: Matt Maranzana,
   Project Manager – Forum Studio

From: Paul Wojciechowski, Alta Planning + Design

CC: Chip Crawford, Forum Studio

Date: August 11, 2017

Re: Bus and Bike Circulation Strategy

As part of the development of the Rosedale University District concept plan, there is a need to plan for the movement of bicycles and transit vehicles in a manner that maximizes access to the district while mitigating potential conflicts between these modes.

The following circulation strategy is recommended to accommodate the movement of bicycles and transit vehicles based on the proposed location of a transit center in the northwest corner of the intersection of Rainbow Boulevard and 39th Avenue. In addition to the proposed transit center at this location, the northwest corner also is the site of a proposed bike share station. As users of both modes wish to reach the heart of the Rosedale University District, it is important to consider the pathways of both users, and mitigate potential conflicts through network design and operations.

When planning for high-quality bicycle facilities in the presence of transit routes, it is important to consider three key objectives:

- Separate turning movements between bicycles and transit vehicles
- Separate paths of travel for both modes through the use of separated facilities
- Where feasible, place bicycle facilities on the left side of one-way streets, allowing buses to use the curb zone on the right side of the street

The following circulation diagram shows the pathways of travel for bicycles (in blue) and transit routes (in red). A two-way separated bicycle lane is proposed on the west side of Rainbow Boulevard north of 39th Avenue. South of 39th Avenue, the two-way separated bike lane is placed on the east side of the roadway. A two-way separated bike lane is proposed on the north side of 39th Avenue. Whenever a bicyclist crosses from one side of the roadway to the other along Rainbow Boulevard, or when traveling on 39th Avenue across Rainbow Boulevard, all turning movements occur on the north side of 39th Avenue.
Transit vehicles would enter and exit the transit center using Adams Street, and bus turning movements at the intersection of Rainbow Boulevard and 39th Avenue occur away from where bicycle turning movements or crossings are located. Transit vehicles would travel in both directions on Rainbow Boulevard and 39th Street.

While the circulation plan separates potential conflicts by placing bike and transit vehicle pathways onto different streets or by separating turning movements, there are three points where pathways for these two modes cross:

- Adams Street & 39th Avenue
- Rainbow Boulevard and 39th Avenue
- Adams Street & Rainbow Boulevard (north)

The following images illustrate potential design solutions for where bicycle and transit vehicle lanes cross paths at intersections, showing the separation of modes and the mitigation (or elimination) of turning conflicts.

CIRCULATION PLAN:
Key Objective:
Separate Pathways and Turning Movements Between Modes

Buses:
- Adams Street - Entry/Exit Point for Transit Center
- 39th Avenue - Serve East-West Paths for Routes 39, 51, Medical Shuttle
- Rainbow Blvd - Serve North-South Paths for Routes 105, 106, 107, 123

Bicycles:
- Rainbow Blvd - Two-Way Cycle Track, Switches Sides at 39th Avenue, Turns Occur Outside Path of Travel for Buses
- 39th Avenue - Two-Way Cycle Track On North Side of Street
Above Left: Separated bike lane behind a bus boarding platform. Above Right: Protected intersection concept.

Above: Protected intersection of two one-way bike lanes and a bus-only lane in Chicago. Source: San Francisco Bicycle Coalition.
Residential Grid Connection Only
One-Way Pair on Adams Street
Maintain Adams Street as 2 Way till 39th Street
New Connection to Southwest Boulevard Through Fisher Park
Realignment Back to Two Directions on Rainbow

Option #1

Option #2

Remove Traffic Signal
MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Maranzana,  
Project Manager – Forum Studio

From: Andrew Robertson, P.E., CFS Engineers

CC: Chip Crawford, Forum Studio

Date: August 25, 2017

Re: Alternative Roadway Connections

For the Rosedale University District concept plan, there is a need to assess alternative roadway connections to improve vehicle circulation and access. The main existing connections from KU Medical Center to I-35 include Mission Rd/43rd Ave/Rainbow Blvd and 7th St Trafficway/Rainbow Blvd. Southwest Blvd can be accessed via Rainbow Blvd, Mission Rd, or Minnie St. The current 7th St Trafficway interchange is heavily congested during peak hours compared to the Mission Rd interchange.

Existing Routes that Connect I-35 to the KU Medical Center

In this memo, alternative connections to provide improved access to the Mission Rd interchange where vetted. Possible alternative roadway connections to accommodate the movement of passenger vehicles includes alternative 1, East Connection to Mission Road, and alternative 2, North Connection to Southwest Boulevard.
East Connection -

The East Connection to Mission Road includes extending 40th Avenue from Thompson Street to Mission Road and three options to provide a connection to the University District. The benefit of this connection is that vehicles headed to and from the KU Medical Center can make use of the interchange at Mission Road & I-35 with a more direct route compared to the heavily congested interchange at 7th Street Trafficway & I-35.

In the figure below, three possible street grid connections are possible. The 40th Avenue Connection (shown in yellow), the Lloyd Street Connection (shown in blue), and/or the Minnie Street Connection (shown in red) can provide the connection to the hospital area when used in combination with the 40th Avenue Extension (shown in green). The 40th Avenue Extension, as laid out in the alignment below, would have a 9.3% grade. This grade is steeper than most similar residential collector roadways which have a recommended maximum grade between 6-8%. One remedy would be to build a cul-de-sac on Thompson Street at 40th Avenue and to reconstruct an additional 250 ft roadway segment of 40th Avenue to the east of the extension thus creating a vertical profile of less than 8%. The 40th Avenue Extension would affect the driveways of one business, one residence, and would most likely require land acquisition of the business along Mission Road (shown in pink).

The 40th Avenue Connection would have a 1.4% slope, the Lloyd Street Connection would have a 0.5% slope, and the Minnie Street Connection would have a 2.5% slope, but each of these options would require substantial fill and culvert design to account for the low point in the topography or a bridge. For the 40th Avenue Connection, the max elevation difference between the new roadway and the existing low point would be 38 ft. For the Lloyd Street Connection, the max elevation difference between the new roadway and the existing low point would be 44 ft. For the Minnie Street Connection, the max elevation difference between the new roadway and the existing low point would be 60 ft. Considering the relative cost of each of these connections, the 40th Ave Connection is preferred to be constructed with the 40th Avenue Extension (shown in yellow).
North Connection -

The North Connection to Southwest Boulevard includes connecting Fisher Street from Lake Avenue to Cherokee Street. The benefit of this connection is that vehicles headed to and from the KU Medical Center can make use of another connection to Southwest Boulevard and avoid traffic on Rainbow Boulevard.

In the figure below, the Fisher Street Connection (shown in orange), as laid out in the alignment below, would have a 8.3% grade. This grade would require reconstruction of the existing portion of Fisher Street to the north of Lake Avenue which would affect one residential driveway and one utility access driveway. This option would require substantial fill, water management, and utility alignment. For the Fisher Street Connection, the max elevation difference between the new roadway and the existing low point would be 26 ft.

Summary of Alternative Connections -

The East Connection and North Connections present design challenges due to the drastic changes in topography. The benefits of the alternatives are increased access to the main arterials in the area and commuters would greatly benefit using the new routes during congested times. In addition, the new connector routes open up new land for development. The predicted cost to construct the east and north connections may mean these alternatives are infeasible; however, the value added for new development and improved connectivity could be substantial.
MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Maranzana,
Project Manager – Forum Studio

From: Andrew Robertson, P.E., CFS Engineers

CC: Chip Crawford, Forum Studio

Date: August 25, 2017

Re: Rainbow Complete Street Pros and Cons Evaluation and Traffic Analysis

Pros and Cons -

The following concepts demonstrate improvements for Rainbow Boulevard which benefit more modes of travel and accommodate a healthier retail environment. These options are centered on pedestrian roadside and crossing safety enhancements, new multimodal facilities, and incorporation of ideas into a larger area multimodal plan.

Option 1 - “Retail” Boulevard

Description Add On-street Parking for businesses on west side of Rainbow Boulevard.

Pros

- New on-street parking in front of businesses provides direct access to storefronts
- New on-street parking provides a buffer between flowing traffic and sidewalks
- Shorter distance for pedestrians to cross Rainbow Boulevard
- Bus turnouts are easy to implement to keep traffic flowing
- Works within existing width constraints on Rainbow Boulevard

Cons

- Reduction in number of Thru-Lanes; Rainbow Boulevard cross-section configuration changed from 2-lanes each direction to 1-lane each direction with a center turn lane and parking along the west side
- No designated space for bikes
Option 2 - "Bicycle" Boulevard
Description Add Two-Way Cycle Track on east side of Rainbow Boulevard.

Pros
- New two-way cycle track for bicycles in front of the Medical Center provides direct access to the hospital
- New two-way cycle track for bicycles provides a buffer between flowing traffic and sidewalks
- Shorter distance for pedestrians to cross Rainbow Boulevard
- Works within existing width constraints on Rainbow Boulevard

Cons
- Reduction in number of Thru-Lanes; Rainbow Boulevard cross-section configuration changed from 2-lanes each direction to 1-lane each direction with a center turn lane and a two-way cycle track along the west side
- No designated space for on-street parking
- Bus turnouts are hard to implement with two-way cycle track

Option 3A - One-Way Pair (Parking and Bicycling on West Side)
Description Rainbow Boulevard is two lanes headed north and Adams Street is two lanes headed south between 39th Avenue and 41st Avenue. On-Street Parking and Two-way Cycle Track on west side of Rainbow Boulevard.

Pros
- New on-street parking and two-way cycle track in front of businesses provides direct access to storefronts
- New on-street parking and two-way cycle track provides a buffer between flowing traffic and sidewalks
- Shorter distance for pedestrians to cross Rainbow Boulevard
- No reduction in number of Thru-Lanes
- Bus turnouts are easy to implement to keep traffic flowing
- Space for additional street landscaping and street trees
- Works within existing width constraints on Rainbow Boulevard

Cons
- Reduction in commercial visibility on Rainbow Boulevard due to redirected vehicles
- Facilities for bus stops are spread out
- Adams Street would need to be widened because the design does not fit within existing width constraints
Option 3B - One-Way Pair (Parking on West Side and Bicycling on East Side)

*Description* Rainbow Boulevard is two lanes headed north and Adams Street is two lanes headed south between 39th Avenue and 41st Avenue. On-Street Parking on west side of Rainbow Boulevard and Two-Way Cycle Track is on the east side of Rainbow Boulevard.

**Pros**
- New on-street parking in front of businesses provides direct access to storefronts
- New two-way cycle track in front of the Medical Center provides direct access to the hospital
- New on-street parking and two-way cycle track provides a buffer between flowing traffic and sidewalks
- Shorter distance for pedestrians to cross Rainbow Boulevard
- No reduction in number of Thru-Lanes
- Space for additional street landscaping and street trees
- Works within existing width constraints on Rainbow Boulevard

**Cons**
- Reduction in commercial visibility on Rainbow Boulevard due to redirected vehicles
- Facilities for bus stops are spread out
- Bus turnouts are harder to implement with two-way cycle track
- Adams Street would need to be widened because the design does not fit within existing width constraints

The following concept is for Adams Street.

**One-Way Pair Follow-up Option - Parking on Both Sides of Adams Street**

*Description* Adams Street is two lanes headed south with On-Street Parking on east and west side between 39th Avenue and 41st Avenue.

**Pros**
- New on-street parking

**Cons**
- Requires additional roadway width which could impact adjacent properties.

Use of the One-Way Pair Option with improvements to Adams Street is accomplishes the goals for new multimodal facilities and on-street parking in front of businesses. Going one step further would be a Two-Way Pair Option.
Option 4 - Two-Way Pair

Description Rainbow Boulevard is 1-lane each direction with a left-turn lane as needed and Adams Street is 1-lane each direction with a center turn lane. On-Street Parking on west side of Rainbow Boulevard except in areas with left-turn lane and Two-Way Cycle Track is on the east side of Rainbow Boulevard. Transit would be designated to use Adams Street.

Pros
- New on-street parking in front of businesses provides direct access to storefronts
- New two-way cycle track in front of the Medical Center provides direct access to the hospital
- New on-street parking and two-way cycle track provides a buffer between flowing traffic and sidewalks
- Shorter distance for pedestrians to cross Rainbow Boulevard
- Bus turnouts are easy to implement on Adams Street
- Works within existing width constraints on Rainbow Boulevard
- Splits demand of thru traffic for road network by substantially directing traffic to use an improved Adams Street

Cons
- Reduction in commercial visibility on Rainbow Boulevard due to redirected vehicles
- Adams Street would need to be widened because the design does not fit within existing width constraints

Two-Way Pair Follow-up Option - Parking on Both Sides of Adams Street

Description Adams Street is 1-lane each direction with a center turn lane with On-Street Parking on east and west side between 39th Avenue and 41st Avenue.

Pros
- New on-street parking

Cons
- Requires additional roadway width which could impact adjacent properties

Two-Way Pair Follow-up Option - Incremental Improvements to Adams Street

Description Adams Street is currently a southbound one-way 1-lane road with parking on the east side. An interim step for the Two-Way Pair option is to widen the existing pavement to be 1-lane each direction.

Pros
- Maintains the existing housing stock along Adams Street for time being

Cons
- Requires additional roadway width which could impact adjacent properties
Two-Way Pair Follow-up Option - Improvements to Booth Street

*Description:* Booth Street is currently a northbound one-way 1-lane road with parking on the east side. To improve traffic flow at the network level, Booth Street could be improved to be 1-lane each direction with on-street parking on both sides and a two-way cycle track on the west side.

**Pros**
- Improves the traffic flow for the roadway network and better serves the University Town District

**Cons**
- Requires additional roadway width which could impact adjacent properties

**Traffic Impact Analysis of the Four Options**

While traffic counts were not part of the scope of this study, the capacity versus the demand of vehicles was checked. To the right is an image of 2013 yearly traffic published by KDOT. The values represent the average annual daily traffic (AADT) in units of vehicles per day (vpd). Rainbow Boulevard has approximately 19,900 vpd.

For Option 1 and 2, Rainbow Boulevard would have a reduction in number of thru-lanes thus the capacity of the road will decrease; Rainbow Boulevard cross-section configuration changed from 2-lanes each direction to 1-lane each direction with a center turn lane. The upper limits of capacity for this lane reduction configuration is around 20,000 to 22,000 vpd, therefore this option is feasible.

For Option 3, the capacity of Rainbow Boulevard will not have a reduction capacity. Adams Street will have a large increase in traffic demand but will be improved to accommodate meet the traffic flow capacity needs. This option would provide the most capacity compared to the other options with a lot of room for growth.

For Option 4, Rainbow Boulevard would have a reduction in number of thru-lanes thus the capacity of the road will decrease, but some of the demand will be split with an improved Adams Street. This would provide more capacity than Options 1 and 2 but less than Option 3.

A comprehensive traffic impact study is needed to check the level-of-service, delay, and queue lengths along Rainbow Boulevard and Adams Street with regards to the proposed options.
MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Maranzana,  
Project Manager – Forum Studio

From: Andrew Robertson, P.E., CFS Engineers  

CC: Chip Crawford, Forum Studio

Date: November 29, 2017

Re: Fisher Park Community Center and Transit Routes Connection

Fisher Park Community Center -

Preliminary concepts for a community center in Fisher Park are currently under consideration for the near future. The community center building would possibly include activity rooms, meeting rooms, event space, and/or exercise facilities while the park grounds would include upgrades to playground equipment and possible relocation, new sidewalks that would integrate with the connecting walking trails, and a sizable parking lot. A lot of care will go into the design process leaving space for a comfortable walking environment and improved maintenance of landscaping. One of the ultimate goals for the facility is connectivity and the promotion of facilities that encourage less dependence on driving.

Inclusion of a new transit stop at the community center would allow for increased local ridership and would allow bus drivers to stop as needed to utilize the community center’s bathrooms. The transit stop would need to be well designed with safety enhancements in a open, well-maintained, and well-lit environment. This stop would be phased in after completion of the community center and would require an extension of the larger KCATA Route 39 (east-west) and/or Route 107 (north-south).
For the extension of the above transit routes to the community center, five options are presented below starting and ending at Adams Street & 39th Street. These extension routes could be utilized in a variety of ways with service ranging from every 30 minutes to service only during part of the day or upon request. To allow for bus maneuverability along 39th Street, travel lanes should be 11 ft wide and radius for curb returns at intersections along the route should be 15 ft at a minimum.

**Option 1 - Turn Around using Community Center Parking Lot**
1. Does not require additional investment in infrastructure
2. Integrates with new parking lot

**Option 2 - Construct Circulation Drop off around the Proposed Building**
- Shorter circulation path than Option 1 by 35%
- Requires construction of pavement that reduces green space of the park
Option 3 - Reconstruct the Park Cul-de-Sac
1. Shorter circulation path than Option 1 by 25%
2. Requires construction of pavement that reduces green space of the park

The cul-de-sac with an island that currently exists in the park has an outside radius of 42 ft which would present a challenge for bus maneuvering and is not ideal for bus unloading/loading since the bus could not pull up adjacent to the circular curb. Redesign of this turnaround in coordination with the parking lot could provide sufficient space for bus maneuvers.

Option 4 - Turn Around via Booth Street to W 38th Avenue to Springfield Street
1. Shorter circulation path than Option 1 by 40%
2. May require additional investment in infrastructure
Option 5 - Construct Roundabout at 39th Street & Springfield Street

1. Shorter circulation path than Option 1 by 85%
2. Requires construction of roundabout that may not fit within planned roadway space
3. Bus stop would be further away from community center
PUBLIC OUTREACH AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
Rosedale Public Meeting #1
Meeting Summary
Monday, June 26, 2017
6:30-8:00 PM
Rosedale Development Association
1403 Southwest Blvd.
Kansas City, KS 66103

Project Team Members
Chip Crawford, Forum
Matt Maranzana, Forum
Tyler Meyr, Forum
Jim Schuessler, CFS
Paul Wojciechowski, Alta Planning
Zach Flanders, Unified Government
Lauren Garrott, Shockey Consulting
Erin Dougherty, Shockey Consulting

Welcome and Project Introduction - Unified Government of Wyandotte County (UG) / Mid America Regional Council (MARC)

Zach Flanders welcomed the meeting attendees and introduced the consultant team. Following introductions Zach presented background information on how this planning project came to fruition. He stated that this one of the projects that is an implementation step of the Rosedale Master Plan. This is a grant funded project that is part of MARC Planning Sustainable Places (FSP) program. The following are the goals of this project:

- Create a transit oriented development plan that allows Rosedale’s population to grow, increase amenities and services available to residents, and promotes a walkable, vibrant, urban neighborhood.

- Improve the area’s parks, trails, and recreational amenities including options for a community center or library branch.

- Pursue housing strategies to accommodate diverse housing needs including students, professionals, families, seniors and affordable housing.

- Refine multimodal transportation strategies that accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, transit and vehicles.

- Promote high quality development that enhances the Rosedale image

Design Team Introductions - Forum Studio, Alta Planning & Design, CFS Engineers, Development Strategies, Shockey Consulting

1. Project Presentation
• The team gave a presentation discussing goals and ideas related to the Discovery and Analysis phase.

• See Attachment A for full presentation

2. Questions & Concerns

• KU Med is parking throughout the neighborhood

• Don’t develop into our neighborhood

• Existing land use

• Rozarks trails removed?
  o We like this green space
  o substations cause cancer
  o Has environmental impact study been done?

• What would go where the substation is?

• Timetable on the substation?

• No need for parking in front of Five Guys.

• KU Med influence, employees live in Johnson County, I don’t want to live in suburbia

• We don’t have mass transit

• Will KU provide housing for students? How much residential?

• What is fairness? In the past that meant 70/30.

• We have affordable housing now, but what’s next?

• Have you done comparable projects?

• Can you project our rental rates?

• Master Plan- increase population, accommodate other housing types

• Is 39th going to be wider?

• Minnie has no bike connections

• Car and traffic control from Johnson County

• Funding?
• KU Med Center and the University are parking throughout the neighborhood. Residents feel that KU growth and development has been bad for the neighborhood in increasing traffic and parking problems.
• With any new development, infrastructure issues need to be addressed such as for electric service and water and sewer.
• Do not want wider street for cars. Additional street width in neighborhoods is not appealing.
• ADA accessibility is critical to residents.
• Tree removal is a concern. We need to maintain the trees we have. Preserve park areas.

3. Breakout discussions

Group 1

• Keep
  o Affordability- property taxes and multiple bedroom houses
  o Community center behind school?
  o Mission Cliffs- green connection along 39th
  o Where is the critical mass?
  o Diversity and longevity of neighbors- how do we encourage people to stick around

• Create
  o BPU substation
  o Transit- KCATA route plans
  o Fairness for families that live here in terms of affordability- rental rates and affordability

Group 2

• Bring in local businesses
  o Services- barbershops, sandwich shops etc
  o No more chain fast food
  o Need to cater to existing residents-not just KU professionals
• Want to be able to stay in single family houses
• We are comfortable with the density in the area
• Parks need better amenities
• Reassurance that plan will last and not be revised to be more dense in 10 years
• What is your goal on percentage apartments vs. houses?
• Make “our” 39tj 10x better in appearance- not shabby
• Neighborhood service uses
• Parks with amenities that draw people
• Schools
• Sidewalks need improvement
• Quality of infrastructure needs to improve. This includes both water and sewer

Group 3

• Project Goals
  o The goal needs to be high density on 39th and Rainbow with residential Fisher Park and west
  o Develop Fisher Park into a central hub it should be a connection between high density and residential
  o It should be a park that serves everyone
  o Small library and community center similar to Roanoke
  o Small gym with membership
  o Keep it at the community scale
  o Expand the park and cut down on traffic speed

• Keep
  o Fisher Park
  o Biking trails
  o Rozarks
  o Residential feel on the edges
• Create
  o Library
  o Community center
  o Bikeable/walkable sidewalks and streets
  o Develop area off Rainbow add mixed use
  o hotel
• Lose
  o Nonexistent businesses and empty buildings on Rainbow
• Challenges
  o Educating people on the benefits of the project
  o Fix the perception of the schools in order to attract new young families to the area
• What can we do right?
  o Keep high density near arteries and keep single family separate

Group 4
• Project Goals
  o Need to create spaces for students because it appears that the area is not catering to students. Ex. 5900 per month rent
  o Low rent housing for anyone including students
  o Create assisted living housing retirement housing
  o Create more stores and shops
  o Create a community center with a pool
  o Children amenities
• Change (Lose)
  o More parking on KU’s property
  o Better sidewalks
  o Good acceptable streets
  o Need to replace street lights that are broken
More amenities for existing apartments

Biggest challenge
  - Traffic is a huge problem
  - Parking

Single most important tasks to accomplish
  - Have meetings to get people talking
  - Transit at 39th & Rainbow
  - How do we fix security along 39th?
  - Need to present timelines
  - Fix slide – P & R is waiting to fix until the plan is complete
  - Affordable housing – provide data on current rent rates
  - Add subsidized housing

Final Thoughts

CONNECTIVITY

- We don’t have mass transit. 107 Transit Route is limited in service at one bus per hour. Attendees noted that they would like to see more service to the south.
- Some attendees want some type of connectivity for vehicular traffic of 39th Street and 40th to Southwest and Mission respectively, and let access occur to I-35.
- Stakeholders feel that a retail corridor will have more success if 39th street does not dead end – connection to Mission, Southwest, Cherokee? Possibly via 40th Ave, but may require a bridge over the valley.
- Residents feel that there are not enough regional transit lines that serve the neighborhood
- Children walking home from Rosedale Middle School through neighborhood, cause some vandalism
- Currently medical students are parking on residential streets and cutting through the neighborhood (along Minnie St., Fisher Park)

HOUSING
- Residents are very concerned about being displaced, that rental rates and property taxes will increase. What specific policies and incentives for affordable housing will address this problem?

- Projected impacts on rental rates? Property Values? Property Tax Increase?

- Numbers would be appreciated for allocation of program—housing types and number of units

- BPU’s plans are unclear; residents and property owners are concerned the location of the substation will adversely impact views, property value, and public health.

- Has environmental impact statement been completed for relocation of BPU substation?

- Plans should show continuity and development from previous Rosedale Master Plan effort, most of the same residents were engaged.

- Most in attendance were looking for diverse housing types with reasonable rental rates, home ownership, and price of housing for a wide range of people.
ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Rosedale University Town Plan – Public Meeting No. 2
September 14, 2017

Summary

The public meeting was attended by approximately 30 people. The meeting consisted of an open-house where attendees could view 14 informative display boards. The displays were dedicated to: project goals, housing strategies, open space and amenities, density and character, circulation and the Transit Center. Attendees were greeted, encouraged to sign in and take a meeting guide and comment cards. The project team was available near the displays to answer general questions from the attendees. Attendees were encouraged to submit written comments on the forms provided. Comment forms were collected that night.

Highlights of Comments Submitted (Summarized to Determine Major Themes)

Housing Strategies
- The majority of the group was in favor of higher density along the edge of the community.
- There isn’t clear guidance on whether the community wants to keep a community scale.
- The majority of the group was in favor of keeping higher density along the edge of the community.

Open Space & Amenities
The majority of residents want Fisher Park to be protected and remain a park.

What should Fisher Park offer to the community? (Choices ranked from most dots to least)
- Reading rooms (3)
- Trail head (3)
- Meetings paces (2)
- Outdoor basketball courts (2)
- Open Lawn (1)
- Auditorium (1)
- Library shelves (1)
- Meeting rooms (1)

Should Fisher Park have and indoor recreation center? (Choices ranked from most dots to least)
- Meeting spaces (3)
- Seating areas (3)
- Lobby space (2)
- Fitness room (2)
- Wooded trail (1)
- Auditorium (1)
- Reading rooms (1)
- Gym (1)
• Indoor basketball court (1)

**Density and Character**
• The community likes the idea of locating higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads

**Circulation and Transit Center**
• Consensus on keeping locating the transit center at 39th and Rainbow. The community feels Fisher Park should remain a green space.

**Housing Strategies**
Tell us what you think about the following strategies.

1. **Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing.**

   ![Like: 13, Neutral: 4, Dislike: 1]

2. **Maintain community scale**

   ![Like: 7, Neutral: 4, Dislike: 3]

3. **Higher density along the edge of the community.**

   ![Like: 12, Neutral: 5, Dislike: 1]
**Open space & amenities**

Tell us what you think about the following strategies

- **Connecting 39th Ave corridor by green space**
  - Like: 16
  - Neutral: 2
  - Dislike: 0

- **Create a central hub at Fisher Park with community center, open space and trails.**
  - Like: 13
  - Neutral: 1
  - Dislike: 3

**Density & Character**

Tell us what you think about the following strategies

- **Improve neighborhood by rezoning to reflect current land ownership**
  - Like: 9
  - Neutral: 2
  - Dislike: 7
Improve existing neighborhood—by connecting 39th Avenue corridor by retail

Keep single family separate—transition from University/Business to single family by using missing middle housing.

Locate higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads (39th and Rainbow)
Circulation & Transit Center

Which location do you like for the transit center? Why?

- Proposed Fisher Park: 8
- Alternative: 39th: 15

Tell us what you think about the following strategies:

- Increased on-street parking: 39th, Rainbow, Adams.
  - Like: 2
  - Neutral: 1
  - Dislike: 3

- Improved bicycle/pedestrian facilities on Rainbow Boulevard:
  - Like: 2
  - Neutral: 4
  - Dislike: 12

- Improved bicycle/pedestrian facilities on Adams Street:
  - Like: 2
  - Neutral: 2
  - Dislike: 15
Transit Center with people living above it

Transit Center with people working in offices above it

Bike share stations

More street trees
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies:

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  - like neutral dislike
  - Why?

- Maintain community scale
  - like neutral dislike
  - Why? I WANT DENSITY

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  - like neutral dislike
  - Why?
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies:

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  
  
  
  like neutral dislike

  Why?

- Maintain community scale
  
  
  like neutral dislike

  Why?

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  
  
  like neutral dislike

  Why?
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies:

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  
  **like** neutral dislike

  **Why?** There's too much division already going on in housing.
  Mix housing areas are more human centered and desirable

- Maintain community scale
  like neutral dislike

  **Why?** don't understand the question

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  **like** neutral dislike

  **Why?** High density near RU and makes sense.
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies....

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  
  like [ ] neutral [ ] dislike [ ]
  
  Why?

- Maintain community scale
  
  like [ ] neutral [ ] dislike [ ]
  
  Why?

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  
  like [ ] neutral [ ] dislike [ ]
  
  Why?
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies....

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  - like
  - neutral
  - dislike
  
  Why? This is an essential aspect but difficult for new
  construction. $90/sqft = $900 mortgage or
  $1300 rental.

- Maintain community scale
  - like
  - neutral
  - dislike
  
  Why? We must plan for inevitability.
  Why? Continued concentration of population.
  I used to rent to 7 adults—added bedrooms that
  qualify if the place now rents to 5 adults. They spend
  it.

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  - like
  - neutral
  - dislike

  Why?
  = this makes a good use of multi-use
development.
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies:

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  
  ![Like](like.png) neutral dislike
  
  Why? This is essential to preventing ghettos and displacement and to strong public schools.

- Maintain community scale
  
  ![Like](like.png) neutral dislike
  
  Why? It displaces fewer people and keeps the area diverse in terms of student, family, and elderly housing.

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  
  ![Like](like.png) neutral dislike
  
  Why? It's aesthetically pleasing and makes sense logistically.
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies....

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  like    neutral    dislike
  Why?

- Maintain community scale
  like    neutral    dislike
  Why?

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  like    neutral    dislike
  Why?
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies...

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing

  like neutral dislike

  Why? can't explain.

- Maintain community scale

  like neutral dislike

  Why?

- Higher density along the edge of the community

  like neutral dislike

  Why? maybe in the future (due to technology (mostly)) the people in their 20s, 30s, and 40s won't want anything but high-rise buildings if no green space.
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies:

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing

  like  neutral  dislike
  Why? Can’t keep the lower end when trying to upgrade neighborhood. Badge it all!

- Maintain community scale

  like  neutral  dislike
  Why?

- Higher density along the edge of the community

  like  neutral  dislike
  Why?
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies....

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing

  like  neutral  dislike

  Why?

- Maintain community scale

  like  neutral  dislike

  Why?

  I'm neutral because I'm not sure I understand the intent of the ?

- Higher density along the edge of the community

  like  neutral  dislike

  Why?

  As long as higher density stays East of Fisher Park
Tell us what you think of the following strategies:

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  
  Like  neutral  dislike
  
  Why?  Who doesn't want this?

- Maintain community scale
  
  Like  neutral  dislike
  
  Why?  Scale + intensity on edge - Rainbow, 39th
  
  Could increase - inner neighborhoods remain similar

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  
  Like  neutral  dislike
  
  Why?
Tell us what you think of the following strategies...

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  
  like  neutral  dislike
  
  Why?

- Maintain community scale
  
  like  neutral  dislike
  
  Why?

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  
  like  neutral  dislike
  
  Why?
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies....

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing

  like  neutral  dislike

  Why?

- Maintain community scale

  like  neutral  dislike

  Why?

- Higher density along the edge of the community

  like  neutral  dislike

  Why?
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies:

- **Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing**
  
  - like  
  - neutral  
  - dislike
  
  **Why?** Affordable housing to keep the neighborhood diverse and not making it unaffordable/undesirable. Also, reserving some affordable housing for non-students.

- **Maintain community scale**
  
  - like  
  - neutral  
  - dislike
  
  **Why?** It would be nice to have more multi-unit housing to try to bring more KO employees/students closer to the area to reduce traffic.

- **Higher density along the edge of the community**
  
  - like  
  - neutral  
  - dislike
  
  **Why?** Keeping some single family neighborhoods, but keeping an "urban feel" in an area for those who like it.
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies:

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  
  like  neutral  dislike
  
  Why?

- Maintain community scale
  
  like  neutral  dislike
  
  Why?

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  
  like  neutral  dislike
  
  Why?

Please integrate our KCCHA buildings seamlessly into amenities.
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies:

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  
  like  neutral  dislike

  Why? VERY STRONG EXISTING COMMUNITY THAT SHOULD be respected and not overwhelmed

- Maintain community scale
  
  like  neutral  dislike

  Why?

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  
  like  neutral  dislike

  Why? I THINK THIS IS A NECESSITY AND PROBABLY THE BEST WAY TO MINIMIZE THE IMPACT TO THE SINGLE FAMILY HOME
Housing Strategies

Tell us what you think of the following strategies....

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  - like neutral dislike
  - Why? provides for all socioeconomic statuses generates revenue
  - as long as you stick to the plan of diverse range

- Maintain community scale
  - like neutral dislike
  - Why? disperses people & keeps green space & a healthy community

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  - like neutral dislike
  - Why? keeps a community feel accommodates the locals, students & tourists
HOUSING STRATEGIES

Tell us what you think of the following strategies...

- Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
  like neutral dislike
  Why?

- Maintain community scale
  like neutral dislike
  Why?

- Higher density along the edge of the community
  like neutral dislike
  Why?
DENSITY & CHARACTER

Tell us what you think of the following strategies....

- Improve neighborhood by rezoning to reflect current land ownership.
  
  like  neutral  dislike

- Improve existing neighborhood -- by connecting 39th Avenue corridor by retail.
  
  like  neutral  dislike

- Keep single family separate -- Transition from University/Business to single family by using missing middle housing.
  
  like  neutral  dislike

- Locate higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads (39th & Rainbow)
  
  like  neutral  dislike
DENSITY & CHARACTER

Tell us what you think of the following strategies....

- Improve neighborhood by rezoning to reflect current land ownership.
  
  like [ ] neutral [ ] dislike [ ]

- Improve existing neighborhood -- by connecting 39th Avenue corridor by retail.
  
  like [ ] neutral [ ] dislike [ ]

- Keep single family separate -- Transition from University/Business to single family by using missing middle housing.
  
  like [ ] neutral [ ] dislike [ ]

- Locate higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads (39th & Rainbow)
  
  like [ ] neutral [ ] dislike [ ]
DENSITY & CHARACT ER

Tell us what you think of the following strategies...

- Improve neighborhood by rezoning to reflect current land ownership.
  
  like neutral dislike

- Improve existing neighborhood -- by connecting 39th Avenue corridor by retail.
  
  like neutral dislike

- Keep single family separate -- Transition from University/Business to single family by using missing middle housing.
  
  like neutral dislike

- Locate higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads (39th & Rainbow)
  
  like neutral dislike
DENSITY & CHARACTER

Tell us what you think of the following strategies...

• Improve neighborhood by rezoning to reflect current land ownership.
  
  like  neutral  dislike

• Improve existing neighborhood -- by connecting 39th Avenue corridor by retail.
  
  like  neutral  dislike

• Keep single family separate -- Transition from University/Business to single family by using missing middle housing.
  
  like  neutral  dislike

• Locate higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads (39th & Rainbow)
  
  like  neutral  dislike
DENSITY & CHARACTER

Tell us what you think of the following strategies....

- Improve neighborhood by rezoning to reflect current land ownership. This wording is confusing to the average resident.
  - like  neutral  dislike

- Improve existing neighborhood -- by connecting 39th Avenue corridor by retail.
  - like  neutral  dislike

- Keep single family separate -- Transition from University/Business to single family by using missing middle housing.
  - like  neutral  dislike

- Locate higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads (39th & Rainbow)
  - like  neutral  dislike

as long as Rosedale Towers' residents aren't displaced or otherwise negatively affected.
DENSITY & CHARACTER

Tell us what you think of the following strategies:

- Improve neighborhood by rezoning to reflect current land ownership.
  
  like  neutral  dislike

- Improve existing neighborhood -- by connecting 39th Avenue corridor by retail.
  
  like  neutral  dislike

- Keep single family separate -- Transition from University/Business to single family by using missing middle housing.
  
  like  neutral  dislike

- Locate higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads (39th & Rainbow)
  
  like  neutral  dislike
DENSITY & CHARACTER

Tell us what you think of the following strategies...

• Improve neighborhood by rezoning to reflect current land ownership.
  like  neutral  dislike

• Improve existing neighborhood -- by connecting 39th Avenue corridor by retail.
  like  neutral  dislike

• Keep single family separate -- Transition from University/Business to single family by using missing middle housing.
  like  neutral  dislike

• Locate higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads (39th & Rainbow)
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Tell us what you think of the following strategies...

- Improve neighborhood by rezoning to reflect current land ownership.
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- Improve existing neighborhood -- by connecting 39th Avenue corridor by retail.
  - like  neutral  dislike
  - As long as there are good walkways!
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DENSITY & CHARACTER

Tell us what you think of the following strategies....

- Improve neighborhood by rezoning to reflect current land ownership.
  - like
  - neutral
  - dislike

- Improve existing neighborhood -- by connecting 39th Avenue corridor by retail.
  - like
  - neutral
  - dislike

- Keep single family separate -- Transition from University/Business to single family by using missing middle housing.
  - like
  - neutral
  - dislike

- Locate higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads (39th & Rainbow)
  - like
  - neutral
  - dislike
Can we add a grocery store in this new development? Having something like that close by could help people become more active/walk to the store/not need a vehicle. Even a small one on the ground level of one of the mixed retail/residential buildings planned on 39th west of Rainier.
ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Rosedale University Town Plan – Mobile Meeting
September 26, 2017

Summary
The mobile meeting was attended by approximately 25 people. The meeting consisted of an open-house where attendees could view 14 informative display boards. The displays were dedicated to: project goals, housing strategies, open space and amenities, density and character, circulation and the Transit Center. Attendees were greeted, encouraged to sign in and take a meeting guide and comment cards. A project team member was available near the displays to answer general questions from the attendees. Attendees were encouraged to submit written comments on the forms provided. Comment forms were collected that night.

Highlights of Comments Submitted (Summarized to Determine Major Themes)

Housing Strategies
- The majority of the group was in favor of maintaining a diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing
- There isn’t clear guidance on whether the community wants to keep a community scale.
- The majority of the group was in favor of keep higher density along the edge of the community

Open Space & Amenities
The majority of residents want Fisher Park to be protected and remain a park.

What should Fisher Park offer to the community? (Choices ranked from most dots to least)
- Reading rooms (5)
- Meetings spaces (3)
- Library shelves (2)
- Trail head (2)
- Open Lawn (1)

Should Fisher Park have an indoor recreation center? (Choices ranked from most dots to least)
- Gym (6)
- Indoor basketball court (5)
- Fitness room (4)

Density and Character
- The community likes the idea of locating higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads

Circulation and Transit Center
- Consensus on keeping locating the transit center at 39th and Rainbow. The community feels Fisher Park should remain a green space.
Housing Strategies

Tell us what you think about the following strategies.

Maintain diverse neighborhood while providing a range of affordable housing.

Maintain community scale

Higher density along the edge of the community.
Open space & amenities

Tell us what you think about the following strategies

Connecting 39th Ave corridor by green space

Create a central hub at Fisher Park with community center, open space and trails.
Density & Character

Tell us what you think about the following strategies

Improve neighborhood by rezoning to reflect current land ownership

![Chart showing preferences](chart1)

Improve existing neighborhood—by connecting 39th Avenue corridor by retail

![Chart showing preferences](chart2)

Keep single family separate—transition from University/Business to single family by using missing middle housing

![Chart showing preferences](chart3)

Locate higher density development on the edges of the neighborhood & near major roads (39th and Rainbow)

![Chart showing preferences](chart4)
Circulation & Transit Center

Which location do you like for the transit center? Why?

- Proposed - Fisher Park
- Alternative - 39th and Rainbow

Tell us what you think about the following strategies

Increased on-street parking - 39th, Rainbow, Adams.

Improved bicycle/pedestrian facilities on Rainbow Boulevard.

Improved bicycle/pedestrian facilities on Adams Street.
MOBILE MEETING

Transit Center with people living above it

Transit Center with people working in offices above it

Bike share stations

More street trees
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name: Greg La Rue
Email Address: LAUREGTOGMAIL.COM
Address: 4640 Cambridge
Phone Number: 816-486-8764

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?
"Looks great - I hope we can see more density and infrastructure and public transportation soon!"

How did you hear about this meeting?

☐ Email
☐ Mailer
☐ Website
☒ Word of mouth
☐ Other

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name  BENT CIPERSON  Email Address  bethciperson@gmail.com
Address  4535 CAMBRIDGE ST KKK 66103  Phone Number  913-262-1941

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?
1. DEVELOP MORE PHOTO REALISTIC RENDERINGS
2. MORE FUTURE PROOFING
3. HOW MUCH OF JOBS # IS DOE & BECOMES LOCAL

How did you hear about this meeting?
☐ Email
☐ Mailer
☐ Website
☐ Word of mouth
☐ Other ________________________________

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name  Sheila Sanders  Email Address: swbct02@yahoo.com
Address: 3729 Thompson Circle  Phone Number:

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?
I love the concept and appreciate all the hard work that has gone into planning this. I really hope that this project goes thrive.

How did you hear about this meeting?
☐ Email
☒ Mailer
☐ Website
☐ Word of mouth
☐ Other:

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM

Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name **Beth Ciperson** Email Address bethciperson@gmail.com

Address 4535 Cambridge St KCK 66103 Phone Number 913-262-1942

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?

1. Develop more photo realistic renderings
2. More future proofing
3. How much of jobs #1 is local & becomes local

How did you hear about this meeting?

☑ Email
☐ Mailer
☐ Website
☐ Word of mouth
☐ Other __________________________

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name: Paul Smith
Email Address: rspandling@kmc.edu
Address: 1234 MNC
Phone Number: 9135885000

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?

Great concept to create "campus" atmosphere for community and students. Hopefully will include local retail and dining environment.

How did you hear about this meeting?

☐ Email
☒ Mailer
☐ Website
☐ Word of mouth
☐ Other _______________________________

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name Janell Friesen Email Address jfriesen@wycokck.org
Address Phone Number

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?
Clarity criteria for affordable housing (Why 10% of housing? "60-80% of median income in the area"—what area? Rosedale? OK?). Excited for changes to Fisher Park (as long as we include existing Grove trees & plan).

How did you hear about this meeting?
☐ Email
☐ Mailer
☐ Website
☐ Word of mouth
☐ Other

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Ch

Name ______________________ Email Address ______________________

Address ______________________ Phone Number ______________________

By connecting Fisher Park to Frank Rosenthal School, consider connecting Fisher Park to Frank Rosenthal School.

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?

Please maintain our fruit trees in Fisher Park. I like the idea of making housing affordability a policy. I think it is very important to maintain a high amount of affordable housing. Love the amount of bike infrastructure.

How did you hear about this meeting?

☐ Email
☐ Mailer
☐ Website
☐ Word of mouth
☐ Other ______________________

Please make sure that is tied to appropriate bike parking at X.

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!

[Signature]

The
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name  Robert Christian  Email Address  rchristian@kumc.edu
Address  3133 W 44th Ter  KCK  Phone Number  785-5341-3111

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?
Don't destroy the trees in Fisher park (the fruit trees/giving grove), I like the walkability and bikeability, but please be sure to put bike racks in personal bike close to the bike lanes. Currently, KU's bike parking (especially at the new Health Education building) does not easy transition to the road, making it difficult to get back on the road (See Back 1)
How did you hear about this meeting?
☐ Email
☐ Mailing
☐ Website
☒ Word of mouth
☐ Other __________________________

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name
Debbie Sullivan

Email Address
udsullivan56@gmail.com

Address
1231 Lawton Ln

Phone Number
913-774-5334 Home
913-304-0106 Cell

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?

Thank you your plans look good for the future.
If you ever decide to run a bus route in all of the Rosedale Area - please let me know.

How did you hear about this meeting?

☐ Email
☐ Mailer
☐ Website
☐ Word of mouth
☐ Other

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name Cathlin M Reynolds Email Address ajollyyar@gmail.com
Address 4000 Adams St Phone Number 122-229-1956

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?
I love the idea of a library+gardening space + meeting rooms + getting the farmer's market a better home. I'm concerned about making sure that housing stays affordable for my neighbors+friends+family.

How did you hear about this meeting?
☐ Email ☑ Mailer ☐ Website ☐ Word of mouth ☐ Other _______________________

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name Terry Rouse Email Address trbkerke@gmail.com
Address 2303 S. Early St Phone Number 816 810 0987

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?
I like the basic concept. It is aggressive and if it becomes reality could really improve the area. Adding walkability and bikability are designable features. Adding a community center should increase use of Fischer Park and attract more side

How did you hear about this meeting?
☐ Email
☐ Mailer
☐ Website
☐ Word of mouth
☐ Other Facebook invitation from RDA

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name    Billy Brame  Email Address    billy.brame@gmail.com
Address  3725 Fisher St  Phone Number    918-206-3527

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?
Playground before everything else at Fisher Park

How did you hear about this meeting?
☑ Email
☑ Website
☐ Mailer
☐ Word of mouth
☐ Other ______________________

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name  Gill Pinto
Email Address  gil.pintar@gmail.com
Address  4178 Cambridge
Phone Number  913-314-7403

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?
Since the Fisher Park road is in the plan area and shows the existing bus route parking. I would think you’d need to discuss points out that the need for a station is further west/north and how is it?

How did you hear about this meeting?
☒ Email
☐ Mailer
☒ Website
☐ Word of mouth
☐ Other

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!
OPEN HOUSE FEEDBACK FORM
Tuesday | December 12, 2017 | 5:30-7:30 PM | Rainbow Mennonite Church

Name Andrea Carlson
Email Address andrew.m.riker@gmail.com
Address 4540 Adams St.
Phone Number (813) 669-8625
KCM 66105

Anything else you would like to share with us about Rosedale University Town?

Great plan. Plan was well thought out and is a good start towards improving an area that has so much promise. KCM is a great community asset and its stakeholders should be supported from a development perspective.

How did you hear about this meeting?

☐ Email
☐ Mailer
☐ Website
☐ Word of mouth
☐ Other _____________________

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!