# **REUSE STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN**

## **ASKEW SCHOOL SITE**

2630 Topping, Kansas City, Missouri 64129





KANSAS CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

August 28, 2013

# CREDITS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

#### **Board of Directors**

Kyleen Carroll Carl Evans Gunnar Hand Jon Hile Joseph Jackson Marisol Montero Crispin Rea Curtis Rogers Airick L. West

#### Superintendent of Schools

R. Stephen Green, Ed.D.

#### **Repurposing Initiative Office**

Shannon Jaax, AICP Jesse Lange Nicole Collier White

#### **Technical Assessment Conducted By**

Rosin Preservation SWD Architects Development Initiatives

#### **Technical Advisory Committee**

Andrew Bracker Stuart Bullington Walt Clements Greg Franzen Gwendolyn Grant Jomy John Jim Potter Elizabeth Rosin John Schwaller Chris Vukas Missy Wilson Tim Wilson Brad Wolf John Wood

#### **Community Advisory Committee**

Linda Anderson Tom Usher Elizabeth Barker Zach Bassin Cynthia Canady **Gwen Davis** Mickey Escareno Becky Forest Katie Greer Cathy Hernandez Elise Jackson Barbara Johnson **Delores Johnson** Dave Kimmis Antoine Lee Brad McCormick Thomas Randolph Joyce Riley Dennis Robinson Terry Rodeghier Jacky Ross Arnold Shelby Paul Tancredi

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION	2
2.0 REUSE ASSESSMENT	3
3.0 REUSE RECOMMENDATION & ACTION PLAN	4

APPENDIX A: SITE PROFILE

APPENDIX B: TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

**Reuse Summary** 

Site Assessment

Market Assessment

## APPENDIX C: COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Site Tour

Phase II Meeting

## APPENDIX D: REPURPOSING GUIDELINES

The following serves as a guide for the reuse/redevelopment of the Askew school site. The reuse recommendations/information found herein are supported by the building and market assessments that have been conducted for the site (see Appendix B), reflect the feedback and priorities of the Kansas City Public Schools (KCPS) community (see Appendix C), and are consistent with the Board adopted Repurposing Guidelines (see Appendix D). This repurposing strategy also includes an action plan to effectively move the site toward productive reuse that both supports the goals of the KCPS and benefits the district's neighborhoods and residents. The document has been designed to both assist the KCPS administration and policy-makers in the solicitation and evaluation of reuse proposals for the site, while also serving as a valuable resource for entities interested in acquisition/reuse of the site.

#### **1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Askew served as a kindergarten through eighth grade elementary school when it closed in 2010, and has a capacity for more than 350 students. Originally constructed in 1923, the school was expanded at least twice with additions built in 1956 and 1968. Askew is an interesting example of a Progressive Era School that was constructed on primarily a single floor level. The building is currently in good condition and appears to be eligible for listing in the National Register and thereby eligible for historic tax credits that could be used to finance the reuse/redevelopment of the structure.

Askew is 58,190 ft<sup>2</sup>, with an auditorium, gymnasium, cafeteria and many classrooms that have direct exterior access and skylights. The 3.86-acre site is zoned R-2.5 and is on the eastern end of the Blue Valley neighborhood. The 238.5 acre Blue Valley Park borders the site to the east. While Askew has vehicular access on residential streets from major thoroughfares such as Van Brunt, Interstate-70 and 27<sup>th</sup> Street, the site has limited visibility at best, limiting viable reuse opportunities.



## 2.0 REUSE ASSESSMENT

Askew's condition, moderate size, and layout provide great opportunities for reuse; however, it is critical that a future entity has the capacity to make physical improvements to the building. The reuse assessment and community feedback for Askew are outlined below:

Mixed-Use: The size and layout of Askew are readily adaptable for multi-family housing (23 +/- units) or a combination of housing + community services/office use. Classroom size converts well into single bedroom apartments or combines well into two bedroom apartments. Community members that attended public meetings were supportive of residential reuse for senior living or a mixed-income project. There was a concern that there were already several affordable multi-family developments in the area, and new developments might concentrate additional units in the area. And while Askew's location would not be ideal for community service providers/non-profits needing a visible presence, the direct exterior access from many classrooms could enhance several reuse scenarios and the building layout could be adapted for office occupancy or an agency that provides community services. Community members have been very supportive of a reuse that would benefit the community, such as a community center/multipurpose organization.

• • •

#### **REUSE POTENTIAL RATING**

#### Med

- Mixed-use
  - Community services/nonprofit offices
  - Residential + community services
- Multi-family residential

#### Low

- Education
- Retail/Commercial Uses
- Demolition

*Educational:* Due to the building's original purpose and current condition, it could be reopened as an elementary school with moderate renovations. And while the northeast part of Kansas City has a large school-aged population, Askew is considered on the outer edge of this area, and has not been considered a preferred location. In addition, KCPS has two elementary schools within 1.25 miles of Askew.

**Retail/Commercial:** Askew's limited visibility and access is not conducive to a retail/commercial use. In addition, community members expressed concerns about the traffic and access that would be associated with a commercial entity.

**Demolition:** The building is not a strong candidate for demolition at this time for multiple reasons: a) the building is in fair condition; b) currently an entity has expressed interest in the site; and c) the community's highest priority for reuse can be accommodated using the existing structure. If any of these factors change, KCPS and the community will need to reassess whether demolition is an appropriate action.

## **3.0 REUSE RECOMMENDATION & ACTION PLAN**

As outlined in the reuse assessment and the feedback received from the Askew Site Tour and Phase II meetings, several acceptable and viable reuse options exist for the Askew school site. As such, KCPS listed Askew with Block Real Estate Services in November of 2011 in order to effectively market the site to interested parties. As of the approval date of this document, Block has actively marketed the site for almost 19 months; however, no viable proposals have been received. Therefore, the district should take a two-pronged approach going forward:

#### A. CONTINUE MARKETING THE SITE

If a proposal(s) is received the KCPS review committee will use the following evaluation criteria:

1) Overall Project Feasibility (Financeable and Sustainable)

2) Respondent Team's Qualifications/Track Record in completing similar projects and/or financial and organizational capacity to complete the project

- 3) Consistency with community goals/reuse priorities as identified during the repurposing process
- 4) Benefits to the district.

If a proposal meets the aforementioned criteria, the KCPS should take the following steps to ensure that that meets the overall goals of the repurposing effort:

#### Step 1: Obtain Stakeholder Feedback on Reuse Proposals

The Blue Valley neighborhood would like to be engaged during the solicitation process. While the district has received some valuable insight from attending neighborhood association meetings, additional community feedback is necessary. As such, if a proposal meets the district's evaluation criteria, the district, in coordination with the Blue Valley Neighborhood Association, should organize an opportunity for community stakeholders to learn more about the short-listed proposal and provide their feedback to the district. Feedback garnered during the meeting will assist the district in its evaluation/decision-making process.

#### Step 2: Negotiate Sales Agreement with Performance Criteria:

If a short-listed project is in line with community goals/priorities and can effectively address these concerns as well as meet the District's other requirements (qualifications/track record, project feasibility, benefits to the district), the KCPS should enter into a sales agreement that is contingent upon performance criteria. Criteria will be finalized after the district evaluates the additional submittal and receives community feedback on the proposal, however, it may include: securing necessary financing and entitlements (rezoning, etc.), demonstrate that project adequately addresses community concerns, and that the community is consulted during any necessary site plan development.

#### Step 3: Secure Necessary Approvals

Once a sales agreement is negotiated, it shall be presented to the KCPS Board and the Board of the Building Corporation for approval. Any additional bond insurer/trustee approvals shall also be coordinated in a timely manner.

#### **Step 4: Monitor Progress in Securing Financing/Entitlements**

As any sales contract would include some KCPS contingencies/post-closing requirements to ensure performance/project viability, the District shall monitor the status of necessary city/agency approvals, if applicable, and to ensure that the project secures sufficient financing.

#### B. TAKE NECESSARY STEPS TO SECURE & MOTHBALL

Community members have indicated that they are not supportive of the building remaining in its current vulnerable state for any extended period. If a viable buyer is not found in the near-term, to ensure that the school building does not have a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood, the district should take a few necessary actions:

#### Step 1: Identify Costs of Mothballing

The district should begin investigating the cost of effectively mothballing the site. While the building has not been a serious target for vandalism (aside from graffiti), it must be determined if the site could be mothballed in such a way to deter future break-ins and preserve the integrity of the structure.

#### Step 2: Solicit Community Feedback on Next Steps

Prior to any moving forward on any mothballing activities, the district should work with community members to determine which solution best addresses community needs. Community feedback should be integrated into final decision-making.

#### Step 3: Identify Interim Reuse Possibilities

Regardless of whether mothballing is determined to be the preferred action, the district should work with community members to identify interim reuse possibilities of the site such as multi-purpose fields, community garden, playground, etc., and to identify if any partnerships may exist to help realize and sustain the interim use.

#### Step 4: Identify Long-term Ownership Option

If a long-term reuse of the school site cannot be identified, the district should explore transferring ownership of the site (even in a mothballed state) to a third party such as the newly established Land Bank or the Land Clearance Redevelopment Agency, which specializes in the redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels throughout Kansas City. The Blue Valley Neighborhood Association should be involved in the decision-making to determine if any contingencies should be addressed as part of the transfer.

APPENDIX A: SITE PROFILE

### 2630 Topping Avenue

# Historical Brief

Architect: Charles A. Smith Architectural Style: Gothic Elements Year Built: 1923-1956-1968 Designation: Eligible

# Site Overview

Acreage: 3.86 acres Square Footage: 58,190 square feet Number of Floors: 3 floors Neighborhood: Blue Valley Zoning: R-2.5 Deed Restrictions: TBD

# Site Details

Closed in 2010 Capacity for 358 students Partial A/C 2 steam boilers replaced in 1995 Roof repair (\$632,000 - 2009) Auditorium Gymnasium Cafeteria

# Cost Management

Utility Costs (as an Open Facility): \$6,850/month

## Kansas City, Missouri 64127



## Draft Reuse Assessment

Condition Rating: 4 out of 5 ★★★★★☆☆

Historic Rating: 4 out of 5

 $\star \star \star \star \star \Leftrightarrow$ 

#### **Reuse Potential Rating:**

#### Med

- Mixed-use
  - o Community services/nonprofit offices
  - Residential + community services
- Multi-family residential

#### Low

- Education
- Retail/commercial uses
- Demolition



# Aerial View: Askew



Kansas City Missouri 64127

100

## Final Recommendations & **Community Priorities**



## 2630 Topping Avenue



# Exterior Photograph



Interior Photograph



# Interior Photograph

# APPENDIX B: TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

**Reuse Summary** 

Site Assessment

Market Assessment

#### 2630 Topping

RELISE ASSESSMENT

#### Kansas City, Missouri 64129

KEUSE ASSES	2///E	IN I			
	SITE ASSESSMENT	Market Assessment	COMMUNITY FEEDBACK	Overall Appropriateness	Disposition Alternatives (L)ease) / (S)ale
EDUCATION	4	2	2	2	L or S
Elementary					
Middle/High					
Day Care/ Early Childhood					
RESIDENTIAL	3	3	3	3	S
Market Rate					
Affordable					
Senior					
Mixed-Income					
New Construction					
	2	1	2	2	L or S
Office	3				
Retail	1				
COMMUNITY USE	3	3	5	3	L or S
Community Center		3	5		
Open Space		1			
Community Garden		1			
MIXED USE	4	3	4	3	L or S
Residential + Community services					
Multi-tenant					
DEMOLISH	1	2	2	2	S



BUILDING/SITE ASSESSMENT: Building is in good condition. Is size and layout are readily adaptable for multi-family housing (23 +/- units) or a combination of housing + community services/office use. Classroom size converts well into single bedroom apartments or combines well into two bedroom apartments. Classrooms could also be converted into multi-person office space, although inefficient in the amount of circulation space relative to leasable area. The building's exterior and interior design limit the visibility necessary for retail use but could work for office occupancy or as a business incubator. Direct exterior access from many classrooms could enhance several reuse scenarios, including multi-tenant uses. There is only partial air conditioning, which will limit many reuses under a short-term lease scenario. Any use other than office or education will typically require installation of a fire sprinkler system (a community center may not require this depending on overall square footage and location of exits). The large play area (paved and grass) north of the building offers opportunities for community use of the grounds (garden, farmers' market, open space, playground, etc.)

HISTORIC ASSESSMENT: Building is an excellent example of an early 20<sup>th</sup> century Progressive Era school. Direct exterior access and skylights in many classrooms are unique features. Alterations have left the original design substantially intact. The most notable changes include replacement of windows and updated interior finishes. Building appears eligible for listing in the National Register.

**MARKET ASSESSMENT:** Askew sits within a residential neighborhood bordering Blue Valley Park to the east. While Askew has good vehicular access from Van Brunt, Interstate-70 and 27<sup>th</sup> Street, the site has limited visibility at best, such that reuse opportunities may be more limited. While population loss around Askew has historically been less than in other parts of the district, the area suffered a significant decline in the last decade. While the area has a high vacancy rate for residential homes/lots, local residents have indicated new homeowners have begun to make investments.

LAND-USE AND ZONING ASSESSMENT: Land-use surrounding Askew is primarily single-family residential. The current R-2.5 zoning classification supports a variety of potential reuses, including education, community center, and low density residential uses. Commercial reuses would require rezoning unless the building receives national or local historic designation. Higher density residential reuse would also require rezoning.

**COMMUNITY FEEDBACK** (*Site visit June 2, 2011*): Attendees were supportive of many reuses that would complement the area: senior housing, community/resource center, commercial use. They expressed concern that the district would sell to the highest bidder and then the site would remain vacant or reused in a way that wouldn't benefit the neighborhood. Participants stressed the need to focus on identifying an entity that has the capacity to use the facility.

#### 2630 Topping

#### Kansas City, Missouri 64129



23 August 2011

Askew - 2

#### 2630 Topping

**KEY NOTES** 

#### Kansas City, Missouri 64129



BUILDING SERVICES **CIRCULATION HORIZ. CIRCULATION VERT.** RESTROOMS

ADMINISTRATION CLASSROOMS

GYMNASIUM CAFETERIA MEDIA

AUDITORIUM



#### 2630 Topping

later additions in concrete in good foundation in good condition, with

Original building has stone

**GENERAL NOTES** 

#### Kansas City, Missouri 64129



- Manual fire alarm system c. 1999 Play equipment in fair to good
  - Exterior fencing in fair condition Exterior metal railings in poor condition
    - condition
- apartment or combines well into two SF. This size of classroom converts Typical classroom size is 750-850 well into a single bedroom
  - Large operable windows allow natural light and ventilation bedroom apartments
    - Easy access to parking
- Large gymnasium and auditorium in good condition
- separation between lower floors and multiple uses, for example it could be divided vertically into multiple areas or horizontally providing Building could be divided into
  - Site has sufficient parking upper floors





## 2630 Topping

## Kansas City, Missouri 64129

## **PHOTOGRAPHS**





Main entrance

Exterior



Auditorium







Gymnasium

Classroom



## PHYSICAL BUILDING ASSESSMENT

#### Assessment Methodology:

Rosin Preservation and SWD conducted a site visit to the building on June 2, 2011. The site visit examined the school grounds, the exterior, and all floors on the interior of the building. The roofs were not accessible for review, and mechanical and electrical systems were not reviewed. No invasive or destructive review techniques were employed.

The team also reviewed written information provided by the owner. These documents included:



- 2006 Building Dialogue dated 11/9/2006. Dialogue was incomplete. Building conditions are still similar to those noted in the 2006 dialogue.
- CADD floor plans. Basically accurate, but noted with numerous missing items including windows, door, etc.
- Kansas City Historic Inventory Form (dated 3/89)

#### CONDITION RATING: \*\*\*\*

The building is structurally sound. The exterior envelop is in good condition with remaining usable life of the envelop components. Building envelop requires only minor repairs. Interior finishes are in fair condition with typical wear from use. The mechanical and electrical systems appear to be sufficient and in good condition for immediate building use. The exterior site requires repairs to damaged areas, including parking and playground areas and stone retaining walls.

#### HISTORIC RATING: \*\*\*\*

Building is highly intact and retains many built-in and decorative features, as well as skylights in several classrooms, although a roof was added above them. Building appears eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

**PHYSICAL OBSTACLES TO REUSE:** Layout is slightly confusing with multiple levels in different parts of the building.

#### DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING ELEMENTS/FEATURES AND VISIBLE ISSUES

#### **Building Structure**

- Foundation: Concrete at newer additions and stone in the original building.
- Floor Framing: Concrete slab. Framing undetermined.
- Roof Framing: Multiple types including concrete, steel and wood.

Note: No items were noted for further in-depth review by structural consultant.

#### **Exterior Envelope**

- Exterior Wall Construction: Red brick with limestone and painted terra cotta accents. Masonry is generally in good condition with limited areas requiring repointing.
- Exterior Windows: Aluminum replacement windows. One-over-one windows that fill the entire masonry opening or smaller windows with a fixed sash above. Windows are generally in fair condition.



#### 2630 Topping

- Exterior Entrances: Metal framed doors with three upper lights, generally in fair condition. Interior vestibules have wood-framed openings with multi-light transoms and sidelights and non-historic doors. Tile floors.
- Roof: Flat roof has rubber membrane or gravel, condition good. Mansard-type roofs installed over the skylights above the north and south wings have asphalt shingles, condition good. The roof was repaired in 2009.

#### **Building Interior**

- Corridors: Corridors in the original (1926) building have polished concrete floors with an integral concrete base, wood chair rail, wood picture rail molding, and plaster ceilings. There are built-in cabinets and trophy cases with woodwork stained to match the other trim. Corridors in the 1956 addition have vinyl composition tile floors, vinyl bases, plaster walls, and acoustical ceiling grids with lay-in tiles and integral light fixtures. Materials are generally in good condition.
- Classroom Entries: Non-historic wood slab doors with a narrow vertical light and metal kick-plate. Materials are generally in good condition.
- Classrooms: 1926 classrooms Plaster walls, linoleum tile floors, concrete base, wood chair rail and picture rail molding. Acoustical ceiling grids with lay-in tiles and integral light fixtures hang below the plaster ceilings. The north and south wings (1926) have wood skylights. Built-in cabinets with multi-light doors; recessed areas for coat storage (doors missing); some recesses have been filled with non-historic laminate cabinets, counters and sinks. 1956 classrooms have CMU walls, vinyl composition tile floors, vinyl bases, and acoustical ceiling grids with lay-in tiles and integral light fixtures. Floating partitions with metal posts and tack board panels in front of coat area. Materials are generally in good condition.
- Walls: Plaster or CMU. Materials are generally in fair condition.
- Ceilings: Grid ceiling with lay-in acoustical panels and recessed florescent light fixtures. Plaster ceiling and picture rail molding are often intact above the dropped ceilings. Materials are generally in good condition. There are a few small areas of water damage in the gym and second-floor classrooms.
- Trim: Stained and painted wood chair rails, crown molding, frames around chalk boards, built-ins, and window frames. Materials are generally in good condition.
- Floors: Polished concrete and vinyl composition tile. Kitchen has ceramic tile. Materials are generally in good condition.
- Stairwells/Egress: Plaster walls, polished concrete floors, wood handrails. Materials are generally in good condition.
- Restrooms: Modern finishes and fixtures, generally in fair condition.

#### **Conveying System**

• The building has an elevator. It was not operational for review during the site visit.

#### Fire Protection Systems

- Fire Alarm system was noted as renovated in 1999 in the 2006 Building Dialog. Fire Alarm system appears to be a simple manual system with horns, strobes and pulls located in corridors. Smoke detectors were noted in the corridors.
- Fire sprinklers are not provided.

#### Mechanical / Electrical Systems (Information from the 2006 Building Dialog)

• Two low pressure steam boilers installed in 1995 provide heat for the building. Steam radiators and fin tube heaters are located throughout the building. Hot water heating with fan coil units is also provided for the cafeteria and three kindergarten rooms in the northwest corner of the building. Hot water is provided by steam to hot water converter. Building ventilation is provided by ventilation blowers located on the ground level with steam heating coils to heat outside air from a tunnel system for supply to the blowers.



- Air- conditioning is partially provided by a rooftop DX cooling unit installed in 1995.
- Electrical system was renovated in 1999-2000. The main panel is dated 1996. There is no information detailing the size of the service in the 2006 Dialog.

#### Site

- Retaining Walls: Cast in place concrete walls along the south side and at various stairs and area wells were generally noted in fair condition with a few minor areas of damage. Stone retaining walls throughout the site are generally in fair to poor condition with multiple areas noted that require repointing and some areas of stone replacement. Tie backs had been added to a section of stone wall on the east to try and stabilize the rotation of the wall.
- Sidewalks: Concrete, generally in fair condition. Some damage was noted at the east stairs. Interior courtyards require weed removal. City owned sidewalks surrounding the site generally in fair condition.
- Parking Lots: Asphalt and concrete is in fair-poor condition. The asphalt parking areas on the west should be milled, overlaid, sealed and stripped. The concrete drive area on the west should have the north apron replaced and damaged areas within the drive. The asphalt parking lot on the south requires weed removal, crack repair, resealing and stripping.
- Playground: Asphalt playgrounds on the south and north are generally in fair condition. All areas require weed removal, crack repair and resealing. The asphalt playground area on the east at the main entry was noted in good condition. The wood chip area on the north side is in poor condition. It requires weed removal and replacement of wood chips.
- Playground equipment: The only equipment remaining is the base of a merry-go-round and two basketball goals. The basketball goals are in good condition.
- Lawn and Landscaping: Fair condition. The entire site is overgrown. Shrubs and trees are located on the south and east elevations. All require pruning.
- Fencing: Chain link is in fair condition with some areas of damage noted.
- Exterior railings: Typical steel pipe, fair to poor condition with multiple damaged areas. Repainting recommended.

#### Key Public Spaces

- Auditorium: Sloped concrete floor with linoleum tile "runners"; historic fixed wood seating; coved plaster ceiling and decorative gothic arches above the proscenium; historic pendant light fixtures; raised stage with wood floor; small movie projection room on back wall.
- Gym: Wood floor; plaster walls with wood chair rail, high ceiling; concrete bleachers line the east wall and are accessible only from the corridors metal railings separate the bleachers from the gym floor. There are some areas of water damage at the north and south ends of the gym.
- Office: Corridor entrance has flanking sidelights. Other finishes similar to classrooms.
- Library: Plaster walls; acoustical grid ceiling; red brick fireplace with wood mantel and flanking built-in cabinets; window seats opposite fireplace.
- Cafeteria: Modern finishes and fixtures.

#### **Other Special/Distinct Features**

- Decorative plaster molding and shallow arched openings at the main entry vestibule; main entry retains operable transoms and tile floor.
- Many classrooms have individual exterior entrances in addition to entrances from the corridors.
- Many classrooms have built-in cabinets and plumbing.
- 1926 classrooms on first floor have vaulted ceilings with wood skylights.
- Enclosed courtyards between the wings at the rear of the building.



#### Kansas City Public Schools Repurposing Initiative - Market Assessment



#### School: Askew Address: 2630 Topping

Market Potential: Market Reuses: ☆☆☆ Community Recreation, Mixed-Use



Proximity to Parks: Proximity to Comm. Ctrs:	100 M	Blue Valley Park) 2 miles (What-so-ever)	State of the second sec
Proximity to Major Arterial		4 mile (Hardesty)	Liste And Human
Nearest School:	0.5	2 miles (Rogers, PK-6)	the second secon
Proximity to Bus Route & R	oute: 0.2	5 mile (27th Street)	4 4 4 5 0 000 5 00 4 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
Proximity to Bus Stop:	0.2	6 mile	and the second s
Located in a Food Desert?	Yes		Control of the second s
High Need Zip Code-Educat	ion: Yes		E 27th St E 27th Se
			Borita St
1.0 mile Stats (2010)		District Wide	g (% eg (299) S1 g (299) S1 g (299) S2 g (29
Population:	12,477	197,361	hist E Link St E 23th Temace
Pop. Growth (00-10):	-16%	9%	g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g
Pop. <18 yrs:	4,495	45,231	2 2 2 E 3 Jos St US 40 Hwy E US-40
% Pop. <18 yrs old:	31%	25%	bing a Estand St
% 65+:	9%	11%	Facility Location
Households (1.5 mile):	9,459	89,759	

\*American Community Survey 05-09

#### Comments:

Median Income(\*):

\$24,267

Closed in 2010, Askew sits within a residential neighborhood bordering Blue Valley Park to the east. Askew offers great vehicular access from Van Brunt, Interstate-70 and 27th Street. While access is good, the site is not located on any primary arterials and visibility is limited at best. While population loss around Askew has historically been less than in other parts of the District, the area suffered a significant decline in the last decade. Demographics indicate an increasing senior population and a normal <18 year old population. Currently, within 1/2 of the site approximately 84 abandoned single-family residences and 29 acres of vacant single-family residential lots exist. While the area has a high vacancy rate for residential homes/lots, local residents have indicated new homeowners have begun to make investments.

\$28,188

# APPENDIX C: COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Site Tour

Phase II Meeting

#### Askew Site Tour

Thursday, June 2, 2011 5:30 -7:30pm 14+ attendees

#### **BREAKOUT SESSION (DC)**

#### **Site Significance**

- Hard knowing the building is being abandoned
- Three generations of family that attended here
- Lots of attempted vandalism
- Lots of activity
- Homeless kids slept in building during the winter; neighbors saw them leave building in the mornings with the backpacks as they went to catch the school bus
- Father went to school here
- Provided the original design for mosaic of children in the atrium

#### Strengths

- Long-term community
- Strong vibrant community
- Security patrols a lot
- Basketball court
- Families are coming back
- In good shape
- Plenty of parking
- Electricity has not been vandalized
- Diverse community
- Building is handicap-accessible
- Built to public code
- Multipurpose usage
- Plumbing in the classrooms
- Versatile for multi age levels

#### **Challenges (Interim Solutions in blue)**

- No parking signs, upkeep of lawn, yellow lines
- City not taking care of Blue Valley Park (Possible partnership with Audubon Society, Vote in Community improvement District, possible partnerships with local business, leverage with KCSD)
- Forgotten neighborhood (Possible partnership with Audubon Society, Vote in Community improvement, possible partnerships with local business, leverage with KCMSD)

- Security walks around building, but not really investigate (KCMSD security should patrol at random times, possible KCPD Patrol on foot, KCMSD security should consult with neighbors)
- Maintenance of property by KCMSD, cut grass (Regular grass cuts)
- Not many children in neighborhood
- Lot of vacant houses
- Historic label would limit repurpose
- Topping Street is challenge because it in narrow and hilly
- Snow clearance on area roads is not as good since school closed

#### **Community Needs**

- Staying in community important, want a seniors living facility/housing here
- Entertainment
- Shops/grocery stores
- Beauty
- Jobs
- Health clinics
- Transportation
- Somewhere for kids to learn
- Safe haven for kids
- Computer training
- Child care
- ELL services
- Community center that provides info and able to mobilize
- Community
- Meeting spot for neighborhood associations
- Activities for youth
- Emergency shelter
- Housing (upscale)

#### **Reuse Options (that could address community needs)**

- Senior facility
- City parks
- Nonprofits
- Community center
- Service center for many agencies (one stop shop for services)
- Resource center
- Senior and youth center
- Retail shops
- Tornado shelter included in the multipurpose of building
- Housing development

#### **Community Response to Informal Proposals**

If site can't be maintained prefer vacant lot Possible homeless teens housing There is no good reason for demolition Focus on someone who can really make it happen with a plan We are concerned that the building going to the highest bidder could be a salvage deal Best use of building is preferred Senior housing is okay, but we should be mindful of other needs and creating a vibrant community Not a good area for group homes

#### Parking Lot (Technical or other questions to address at the next meeting)

- How many children are in the community?
- Community demographics?

### McCoy and Askew – Phase II Meeting

Tuesday, August 23, 2011 St. Paul School of Theology 5:30 -7:30pm 14 participants

The following is a summary of the discussion/feedback from the Phase II meeting for the McCoy and Askew closed school sites.

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

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

Askew

- Feeling that it is a "forgotten neighborhood" which is a challenge for redevelopment
- Concerns that the district will sell the building to the highest bidder and then the site not be redeveloped in a way that benefits the community
- Desire for the district to focus on someone who can really make it happen with a plan
- Variety of reuse options identified: senior housing, community center (one-stop services), nonprofit offices, shops

#### McCoy

- Site used to serve as a center of community activity
- Want reassurance that organization that acquires the site will have resources to make project work long term
- Desire for the district to focus on someone who can really make it happen with a plan
- Variety of reuse options identified: senior housing, charter school, community center, day care, demolition of building and rebuild new housing

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

#### **REUSE FEEDBACK**

Askew and McCoy have received little to no interest to date from potential buyers/tenants. As such, the participants discussed and provided feedback on general reuse categories:

#### Community feedback on Residential Use:

 Participants were supportive of residential reuse of both Askew and McCoy for senior living or for a mixed-income project. They were not supportive, however, for a redevelopment that was solely affordable. The group indicated that there were already several affordable multi-family developments in the area and they were concerned about concentrating additional units in the area. Community feedback on Community Use:

• Participants were very supportive of reuse of the sites as facilities that benefited the community, such as a community center/multi-purpose/one stop shop that served as a public space and provided services to the community. Participants indicated that a center that provided services/training to the community was much more important and desirable than a recreational center.

Community feedback on **Commercial Use:** 

- While the technical assessment has indicated that neither site is a strong candidate for traditional office/retail use, one participant expressed interest in providing retail services at the sites in combination with other uses.
- In general, the participants feedback was mixed about whether commercial uses such as office/retail/grocery store would be a good fit at these sites. They expressed concerns about traffic and access since both sites are surrounded by single family homes. They also were concern about whether the buildings could effectively accommodate retail with their existing layouts.

#### SOLICITATION PROCESS

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

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

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

Community feedback on the Solicitation Process:

- Participants saw benefits to both a sale and lease scenario: a sale would establish stability, where as a lease would enable the district to maintain ownership for possible reuse
- Due to the lack of interest in Askew and McCoy, the group agreed that the best option going forward would be to list the sites with a broker so that they could be better marketed and gain wider exposure.
- The participants expressed a desire to review and provide feedback on proposals that are submitted to the brokerage team/district. Participants expressed a desire for the district to obtain proposals and then contact the Blue Valley Neighborhood Association, which would coordinate with the local residents/businesses to provide feedback on the proposals. The Neighborhood Association will reach out to the Truman Rd Corridor Association for their feedback on McCoy
- Jackie Ross should be the point of contact for McCoy; Arnold Shelby for Askew

#### **INTERIM REUSES/ACTIONS**

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

Community feedback on Interim Uses:

- Some participants indicated that a community garden might be a good use of the grounds at McCoy. There was also an inquiry as to whether the district could allow the neighborhood association to use part of the buildings as a community resource center. The major question/concern is how would the utility costs be covered.
- The participants also discussed that the district might need to take additional steps to secure the windows/doors to prevent break-ins. The merits/issues associated with boarding up/bricking up the windows were discussed, but the group did not identify what steps should be taken.

#### DEMOLITION

For every site, the district is gathering community feedback on the possible demolition of the building.

Community feedback on **Demolition**:

- Participants indicated that their priority is to find a reuse for the structures, not to tear them down as part of a redevelopment project (note: while demolition was discussed as an option during the site tour, the participants of the Phase II meeting were not interested in actively pursuing demolition)
- The participants did indicate, however, that if the sites were vacant for some time and there was significant deterioration that would impact the neighborhood, then demolition should be considered

APPENDIX D: REPURPOSING GUIDELINES

- 1. Repurposing will not impair or impede the District's ability to achieve Global Ends Policy 1.0.
- 2. Repurposing will promote the financial strength and integrity of the District.
- 3. Repurposing will promote the well being of the community and neighborhoods surrounding District facilities.
- 4. Repurposing will be comprehensive. Reuse strategies will be developed for individual sites, however those reuse strategies must be consistent with the reuse solutions for all the District's surplus facilities.
- 5. Repurposing reuses will be driven by a comprehensive community engagement process however final decisions will be determined by the Board as guided by this policy.
- 6. The Board, guided by applicable Missouri statutes, may consider proposals from educational service providers on a case-by-case basis, provided:
  - a. Preference will first be given to schools sponsored by the KCMSD.
  - b. The educational service provider has a proven academic track record and an effective educational program that compliments District schools and programs.
    - i. For the purposes of these guidelines, "proven academic track record" is preferably defined as making progress at a pace similar to or exceeding the KCMSD towards "deep understanding" as measured through authentic assessment school-wide.
    - ii. For the purposes of these guidelines, "proven academic track record" may be defined as exceeding the KCMSD average MAP performance in both Mathematics and Communication Arts as a whole as well as for at least 80% of applicable subgroups in at least two of the preceding three academic years and exceeding the KCMSD average for such End-of-Course Exams as may be required by DESE.
    - iii. For education service providers without a "proven academic track record" the Board may consider proposals only if the education service provider's sponsoring organization commits to annual academic growth requirements.
  - c. Preference, in the form of more favorable lease terms, will be given to providers that seek buildings in high-needs geographies (The Paseo to I-435, 63<sup>rd</sup> St. to Independence Ave.) and programs that target specific high-needs populations; guidelines 6bi-iii remain applicable.

- d. The Board will not approve any proposal from an education service provider without soliciting and strongly considering the Superintendent's opinion and guidance.
- 7. The District will maintain ownership of some closed school sites based on strategic considerations, including but not limited to future enrollment growth. The District will consider lease proposals for these sites.
  - a. The District will consider both lease and sale proposals for properties it identifies as surplus and not needed for strategic purposes.
  - b. All proposals will be evaluated based on alignment with District goals and impact on District finances as well as the technical and financial capacity of the proposing entity.
  - c. Lease/sale agreements will include claw backs and/or other necessary provisions to mitigate risk to the District and ensure performance, including academic performance where applicable.

Revision Dates: March 9, 2011- Adopted

May 18, 2011