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The following serves as a guide for the reuse/redevelopment of the Bingham 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 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

Originally constructed in 1960, Bingham is an excellent example of a Modern Era school with a sprawling plan, curtain wall, fenestration, and long glazed corridors. Designed by Kivett and Myers, one of Kansas City’s leading architecture firms of the post-World War II period, the building appears eligible for listing in the National Register. Closed since 2001, the building served as the KCPS warehouse for many years. The building is in fair condition, but the building envelope is in need of extensive repairs.

Bingham is 101,640 ft² on 3 floors on a 7.57-acre site in the Waldo Business District. The school site is zoned R-2.5/M1-5 with single-family homes bordering the site to the east and multi-family to the south. Located in a vibrant residential/commercial area, the site presents exciting opportunities for commercial, residential or mixed use redevelopment as outlined in the next section – 2.0 Reuse Assessment. For additional information about the building, floor plans, land use, etc, see Appendix A – Site Profile.
2.0 REUSE ASSESSMENT

Bingham’s prime location is in the heart of the Waldo Business District, as well as the size of its lot, make the school site a strong candidate for redevelopment. While the building itself still presents opportunities for reuse, the market potential for the site is stronger under a demolition and new construction scenario. The following outlines the technical assessment, as well as the community feedback received for several reuse categories.

Commercial Use: Bingham’s location and size make it a desirable site for commercial redevelopment. While local stakeholders are generally supportive of a commercial reuse of the site, they have stressed that any commercial redevelopment should address the following community concerns:

- Traffic – impact on residential development (especially along Wyandotte)
- Access – concern about how/where the main access point to Wornall Rd would be (crossing the Trolley Track Trail, impacting traffic flow on Wornall)
- Height, proximity, scale and design need to be a fit with the community (stemming from some concerns about whether a big box facility would be compatible with the adjacent residential area)
- Trash, noise, light pollution
- Buffers to the residential area are desirable.

Community members have also indicated that any commercial redevelopment should compliment/support the 75th/Wornall hub. There is also some concern from community members about adding commercial space as the area already has some vacant office/retail space.

Residential Use: Currently, the building size and layout are not readily adaptable for multi-family housing. Residential reuse would likely require demolition. Land use surrounding Bingham is a mix of single-family housing to the east and multi-family to the south. As such, residential redevelopment could support a combination of residential types or a mixed-use development. Community members have identified market rate residential as the preferred type of residential reuse, although many local stakeholders have expressed support for mixed income, affordable or senior housing.

Community Use: While the large gymnasium, open fields and other features of the building would be attractive for community reuse, the costs associated with rehabbing the current structure makes this a less marketable option. Community members have expressed support for a community use of the site, but acknowledged that the cost of demolishing or rehabbing the building may make this reuse cost prohibitive. Community members also stressed that continued community use of the fields only was not an acceptable option as the building has proved to be a blighting influence on the neighborhood.

Educational Use: While the building was originally constructed for use as a school, the technical assessment suggests that educational reuse of the building is not the most viable reuse of the site. This
is due in large to the cost of rehabbing the building and the marketability/value of the site for other uses. Community members have, however, expressed support for an educational reuse of the site.

**Demolition:** As previously stated, the site offers multiple opportunities for reuse under a demolition and new construction scenario. While community stakeholders have indicated that they would be open to proposals that include reuse of the existing structure, they have also expressed support for redevelopment opportunities that require demolition. Above all, community members have stressed that leaving the building in its current state for any length of time is not an acceptable option, as it has had a negative impact on the adjacent neighborhood.

**3.0 REUSE RECOMMENDATION & ACTION PLAN**

As outlined in the reuse assessment and the feedback received from the Bingham Site Tour and Phase II meetings, several acceptable and viable reuse options exist for the Bingham school site. As such, KCPS listed Bingham with Block Real Estate Services on November 28, 2011 in order to effectively market the site to interested parties. Proposals were due on February 15, 2012.

In total, the district received seven proposals for the site. In evaluating each of the proposals, the KCPS review committee used the following 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.

After evaluating the seven proposals, the review committee invited three short-listed teams to make presentations to community stakeholders on March 24, 2012 at a public meeting that was coordinated with the Tower Homes Neighborhood Association and the Waldo Area Business Association. While several of the other proposals were in line with the reuse assessment/community priorities, they were not short-listed for one or more of the following reasons: 1) proposal did not demonstrate the team had the organizational capacity to carry out/finance the project; 2) team did not demonstrate it had conducted sufficient due diligence to determine if the proposal was viable; 3) offer price was significantly below appraised value and as such, would not meet the criteria established by the District’s bond insurer necessary to approve a sale of a closed school site.
The following outlines the key steps KCPS should take to ensure a reuse of the site that meets the overall goals of the repurposing effort:

**Step 1: Negotiate Sales Agreement with Contingencies**

Each short-listed proposal was for commercial use of the site. Based on the stakeholder feedback received during the public presentations, one or more of the proposals were acceptable to/supported by the community. As the District considers moving forward and entering into negotiations for the purchase of the property, it will work to address the following concerns outlined by community stakeholders:

- **Traffic/Access**: How will traffic congestion/access be addressed to mitigate the impact on the surrounding residential streets: 77th and Wyandotte?
- **Trolley Track Trail**: How will the proposal address access to the site without causing safety/aesthetic issues or disruption to the trail?
- **Site plan consistency with neighborhood scale/adjacent land uses**: What is the site orientation? Will there be a landscaping buffer to shield the adjacent residential neighborhood? What is the building massing/type of construction materials used? How will the project mitigate run-off onto surrounding residential properties? How will the site be landscaped? Will the development provide community space (green space, community room, etc, community garden, farmers’ market, etc)?
- **Noise/Trash/Light Pollution**: What are the hours of operation? How will the group address trash around/on the site? How will the project work to mitigate the impact of light pollution on the surrounding neighborhood?
- **Use of public incentives**: Will the project impact local tax revenues, i.e., TIFF, tax abatement, TDD? Project shall also ensure that any pursuit of public incentives does not include an abatement or recapture of funds that directly or indirectly impacts funding for the Kansas City Public Schools.
- **Community feedback**: What will be the role/involvement of the community as the team works to finalize its site plan?

If one of the short-listed teams 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 shall include: securing necessary financing and entitlements (rezoning, etc), demonstrate that the site plan adequately addresses community concerns, and that the community is consulted during site plan development.

**Step 2: 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 3: Monitor Progress in Securing Financing/Entitlements**

Each short-listed team requested a lengthy inspection period in order to secure financing and entitlements. As the sales contract will also include some seller contingencies related to planning criteria, the district shall monitor the status as the necessary city/agency approvals to ensure that the project adequately addresses the community concerns as represented during public meeting presentations.
Additional Recommended Actions

- **Community coordination:** Since the project is still in an early stage of site planning and the inspection period may be 6 months or more, the KCPS should provide regular updates to local stakeholders so that they are apprised of progress and opportunities to provide feedback.

- **Contingency planning:** If KCPS is unable to reach an agreement with one of the short-listed teams, or if a selected team is unable to secure the necessary entitlements/financing prior to closing on the sale, the District should assess the contributing factors, and then determine if another short-listed team’s proposal could avoid/overcome those issues. If yes, then the District should proceed with negotiations. If not, KCPS will need to determine if a team that was not short-listed should be reconsidered or if the KCPS should accept additional proposals for the site.

- **Environmental considerations:** Based upon the short-listed proposals and RSMo sections 447.700 to 447.718, the site appears to be eligible for financial incentives through the Missouri Department of Economic Development’s Brownfield Redevelopment Program. The program provides tax credits for environmental remediation, including demolition which is an element of all short-listed proposals. Tax credits provided through the Brownfield Redevelopment Program could potentially negate the need for the selected development team to pursue additional public incentives. The District should coordinate with the selected development team to ensure that State Brownfields Tax Credits are considered as a potential funding source and all necessary prerequisites are fulfilled to ensure eligibility.
APPENDIX A: SITE PROFILE
Bingham
7618 Wyandotte Street  Kansas City, Missouri 64114

Historical Brief

Architect:
Kivett, Myers & McCallum

Architectural Style:
Modern

Year Built:
1960

Designation:
Eligible

Site Overview

Acreage:
7.57 acres

Square Footage:
101,640 square feet

Number of Floors:
3 floors

Neighborhood:
Tower Homes

Zoning:
R-2.5/M1-5

Deed Restrictions:
TBD

Site Details

Closed in 2001
Served as district’s warehouse
Auditorium
Gymnasium
Cafeteria
Elevator

Reuse Assessment

Condition Rating: 3 out of 5

Historic Rating: 5 out of 5

Reuse Potential Rating:

High
- Demolition + Redevelopment
- Mixed Use (Commercial + Residential)
- Commercial

Med
- Residential
- Community Use/Open Space
  - Could also be as a complimentary use

Low
- Education

Cost Management

Utility Costs:
$9,600/month (FY09-10 avg)

Appraisal/Fair Market Value:
$3.2 million (2008)
Floor Plans:

Basement Floor

First Floor

Second Floor

Roof Plan
APPENDIX B: TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

Reuse Summary
Site Assessment
Market Assessment
## REUSE ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Site Assessment</th>
<th>Market Assessment</th>
<th>Community Feedback</th>
<th>Overall Appropriateness</th>
<th>Disposition Alternatives (Lease/Sale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L or S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care/Early Childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMERCIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction - Office</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction - Retail</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Garden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIXED USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial + Residential</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMOISH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUILDING/SITE ASSESSMENT:
Building is structurally sound and in fair overall condition; but the building envelop is in need of extensive repairs. The sprawling plan and numerous stairs provide excellent circulation and opportunities for multiple tenants or mixed-use although the building size and layout are not readily adaptable for multi-family housing. The building condition and the large floor plate make this a potential candidate for demolition. The site's size and location present opportunities for new development (mixed use or commercial), however, any redevelopment of the building or new construction would need to be sensitive to the impact on the residential neighborhood south and east of the building. The large play fields north and south of the building offer opportunities for community use of the grounds, particularly for recreational activities.

### HISTORIC ASSESSMENT:
Building is an excellent example of a Modern-era school with a sprawling plan, curtain wall fenestration, and long glazed corridors. Designed by Kivett and Myers, one of Kansas City's leading architecture firms of the post-World War II period, the building appears eligible for listing on the National Register.

### MARKET ASSESSMENT:
Closed since 2001, Bingham has since served as the District's warehouse facility. The large site is located in the Tower Homes neighborhood and Waldo Business District. Despite its adjacency to Wornall Rd, accessibility is a constraint for the Bingham site. Primary access is located on a residential street (Wyandotte) to the east; any commercial reuse would have to obtain an access easement through the adjacent commercial shopping center to the north or across the Trolley Track Trail to the west. At more than 7.5 acres in a vibrant residential/commercial area, the site offers a viable opportunity for commercial, residential and mixed-use redevelopment, provided the existing facility is demolished.

### LAND-USE AND ZONING ASSESSMENT:
Land-use surrounding Bingham is mixed with single-family residential to the east, multi-family to the south with commercial uses on the north and west. The current M1-5, R-2.5 zoning classification supports a variety of potential uses, including education, community center, and certain low density residential uses. Most public/civic uses, commercial uses, agriculture uses, and accessory services are permitted along with certain industrial uses.

### COMMUNITY FEEDBACK (Site visit May 19, 2011): The participants indicated that any reuse would need to be sensitive to the adjacent residential area as traffic and access are a concern. In addition, the scale and design of any reuse would need to be consistent with the neighborhood (i.e., big box stores were a concern). Several uses, including retail, office, residential, school, community, open space were discussed as possible options; however, participants requested the community have an opportunity to provide feedback (through the Tower Homes Association & Waldo Business Association) on any proposals submitted to the District.
GENERAL NOTES
• Masonry requires repointing
• Curtainwall in poor condition, requires repairs to framing and reglazing
• Large gymnasium and auditorium in good condition
• Large grassy play areas north and south of building
• Sprawling plan allows for division of building by wing for multiple users
• Site has sufficient parking

KEY NOTES
1. Former pool
2. Courtyard
3. Trophy case
4. Not used
5. Glazed corridor
6. Vault
7. Display case
8. Auditorium with folded plate ceiling structure
9. Classrooms with built-in work stations

CONDITION NOTES
A. Water stain on ceiling
B. Hollow metal curtain wall system is rusted and deteriorated typical
C. Damaged masonry
D. Damaged concrete
E. Damaged soffit
F. Mold odor
G. Roof leak
H. Peeling paint on canopy
I. Damaged downspouts
J. Peeling paint on foundation
K. Graffiti
L. Hollow metal entry doors typically in poor condition
M. Water damaged ceilings
N. Water damaged floor
O. Mold present
P. Plant growth present

Basement
GENERAL NOTES
- Masonry requires repointing
- Curtainwall in poor condition, requires repairs to framing and reglazing
- Large gymnasium and auditorium in good condition
- Large grassy play areas north and south of building
- Sprawling plan allows for division of building by wing for multiple users
- Site has sufficient parking

KEY NOTES
1. Former pool
2. Courtyard
3. Trophy case
4. Not used
5. Glazed corridor
6. Vault
7. Display case
8. Auditorium with folded plate ceiling structure
9. Classrooms with built-in work stations

CONDITION NOTES
A. Water stain on ceiling
B. Hollow metal curtain wall system is rusted and deteriorated typical
C. Damaged masonry
D. Damaged concrete
E. Damaged soffit
F. Mold odor
G. Roof leak
H. Peeling paint on canopy
I. Damaged downspouts
J. Peeling paint on foundation
K. Graffiti
L. Hollow metal entry doors typically in poor condition
M. Water damaged ceilings
N. Water damaged floor
O. Mold present
P. Plant growth present

POSSIBLE LOCATION FOR TENANT SEPARATION IN MULTI-USE SCENARIO

First Floor
GENERAL NOTES
- Masonry requires repointing
- Curtainwall in poor condition, requires repairs to framing and reglazing
- Large gymnasium and auditorium in good condition
- Large grassy play areas north and south of building
- Sprawling plan allows for division of building by wing for multiple users
- Site has sufficient parking

KEY NOTES
1. Former pool
2. Courtyard
3. Trophy case
4. Not used
5. Glazed corridor
6. Vault
7. Display case
8. Auditorium with folded plate ceiling structure
9. Classrooms with built-in workstations

CONDITION NOTES
A. Water stain on ceiling
B. Hollow metal curtain wall system is rusted and deteriorated typical
C. Damaged masonry
D. Damaged concrete
E. Damaged soffit
F. Mold odor
G. Roof leak
H. Peeling paint on canopy
I. Damaged downspouts
J. Peeling paint on foundation
K. Graffiti
L. Hollow metal entry doors typically in poor condition
M. Water damaged ceilings
N. Water damaged floor
O. Mold present
P. Plant growth present

Second Floor
PHOTOGRAPHS

Exterior

Auditorium

Corridor

Exterior

Gymnasium

Classroom
PHYSICAL BUILDING ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY:

Rosin Preservation and SWD conducted a site visit to the building on May 19, 2011. The site visit examined the school grounds, the exterior and all floors on the interior of the building. The roof was 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 12/6/2006) - dialogue was incomplete; building conditions remain similar to those noted in 2006.
- CADD floor plans -- basically accurate.

CONDITION RATING: ***

The building is structurally sound. The exterior envelop is in good condition with remaining usable life for some of the envelop components. Building envelop requires repair to or replacement of the majority of the glazing systems and to masonry repair in multiple areas. Interior finishes are in fair condition with typical wear from use. The mechanical and electrical systems appear to be sufficient and in fair condition for immediate building use. The exterior site requires repairs to damaged areas, including parking and playground areas.

HISTORIC RATING: *****

Excellent example of a Modern-era school with a sprawling plan, curtain wall fenestration, and long glazed corridors. Designed by Kivett and Myers, one of Kansas City’s leading architecture firms of the post-World War II period. Building appears eligible for listing on the National Register.

PHYSICAL OBSTACLES TO REUSE: Structure is sound, but curtain wall is heavily deteriorated in multiple locations.

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING ELEMENTS/FEATURES AND VISIBLE ISSUES

Building Structure

- Foundation: Concrete, generally in good condition.
- Floor Framing: Undetermined. Assumed to be concrete.
- Roof Framing: Roof framing where visible is steel.

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

Exterior Envelope

- Exterior Wall Construction: Blond brick walls; concrete spandrel panels have heavy aggregate; some brick exposed on interior. Masonry is generally in good to fair condition with multiple areas requiring repointing, as noted. Rear (SW) corner of CMU greenhouse addition is failing.
- Exterior Windows: Curtain wall window system contains horizontal bands of windows. Each opening has three vertically stacked parts consisting of two smaller sashes flanking a larger sash. Bottom sashes are operable hoppers, most retain screens. On most elevations a heavier mullion divides the wall into bays of
paired window openings. Materials appear to be in poor condition.

- Exterior Entrances: Entries have pairs of glazed aluminum doors. Main entrance (on north) is fully glazed along the corridor flanking the doors; two concrete slabs form a canopy in front of this entrance. Loading dock with overhead door on west end of north elevation. Materials appear to be in fair to poor condition.

- Roof: Most sections of the roof are flat with tight eaves. Eaves at main entrance corridor are wide and flat concrete. The auditorium and gymnasium have folded concrete plate roof structures. The folded plates of the auditorium roof are legible at the ceiling of the auditorium. All eaves are metal-wrapped. Condition unknown.

Building Interior

- Corridors: Blond brick and painted CMU walls, terrazzo floors, and acoustical grid ceilings with lay-in tiles and integral light fixtures. Ceilings are dropped to varying degrees. High windows in the corridor walls at some classroom locations. Banks of lockers (some lockers have been removed). Some walls have a recessed metal base; others have terrazzo base. Some classrooms have storefront glazing. Materials appear to be in fair condition.

- Classroom Entries: Aluminum doors with glazed sidelights and transoms in fair condition.

- Classrooms: Painted CMU walls; carpet, vinyl or linoleum flooring; and dropped acoustical grid ceilings with lay-in tiles and integral light fixtures. Materials appear to be in fair condition.

- Trim: Marble slab window sills. A few classrooms have built-in floor-to-ceiling metal cabinets. Materials appear to be in fair condition.

- Stairwells/Egress: Metal structure with terrazzo treads and landings; thin wood handrails supplement metal railing with thin pickets. Materials appear to be in fair condition.

- Restrooms: Terrazzo floor, high ceilings with concrete beams exposed, and glazed block walls; modern fixtures and stall partitions. Materials appear to be 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 is a simple manual system with horns, strobes and pulls located in corridors. Some corridors have smoke detectors. (Information from the 2006 Building Dialog)

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

- Two Kewanee boilers provide steam for heating. Unit ventilators with steam heating and OA ventilating capabilities are located on the perimeter wall in each classroom, and other academic areas to provide space heating and ventilation. Fin-tube radiators are located in administration offices, hallways and vestibules. An AHU provides heating and outside ventilation for science labs on the first floor. A rooftop gas-fired MAU provides ventilation in the greenhouse. Partial air-condition by AHU’s for the library, cafeteria, administration offices, and computer room. All equipment appears original and in below average condition. Operational condition is unknown.

- Electrical system consists of a 2000A 208Y/120V service with a 2000A main breaker. The service and distribution equipment are entirely original and appear to be in good condition.

Site

- Sidewalks: Concrete, generally in fair to poor conditions. Poor conditions were noted along the south side of the building and along the north parking lot. The stair at the north parking lot is damaged. City owned sidewalks surrounding the site are generally in fair condition.

- Parking Lots: Asphalt is in poor condition. In need of plant removal, milling, topping, resealing and striping. The northwest corner of the lot ponds a significant amount of water. This area should be
regraded to provide positive drainage.

- Playground: Asphalt is in poor condition. In need of plant removal, milling, topping, resealing and striping.
- Playground Equipment: There is no playground equipment.
- Lawn and Landscaping: Fair condition, with a significant amount of weeds in the lawn areas. Landscaping is minimal mostly located along the southeast corner of the building and in fair condition. Both courtyard spaces are completely overgrown.
- Fencing: Chain link in fair condition. Galvanized coating has worn off large portions of the fencing.
- Exterior railings: Typical steel pipe, fair to poor condition. Some areas require repair, all require painting.

Key Public Spaces
- Auditorium: Wood seats with decorative metal end plates; concrete beam ceiling reflects folded plate roof structure; Modern-style can lights; painted plaster walls. Raised stage has a wood floor and plain painted proscenium.
- Gym: wood floor; beamed concrete ceiling; brick walls.
- Cafeteria: beamed concrete ceiling; glazed block walls; terrazzo floor.
- Library: in basement; carpet, low dropped ceiling; building originally had a swimming pool in this location.
- Office: glazed corner windows; large walk-in safe; carpet; dropped ceiling.

Other Special/Distinct Features
- Sprawling plan with multiple building components linked by long, glazed corridors and organized around a central courtyard.
- Curtain wall windows have heavily textured concrete spandrel panels and metal fin sun screens.
- Flat concrete awning at main entrance and wide flat concrete eaves on roof.
- Distinctive asymmetrical blond wood display case in main corridor.
- Science rooms have built-in lab stations with long L-shaped counters, lower cabinets and drawers and some upper shelves.
Kansas City Public Schools
Repurposing Initiative - Market Assessment

School: Bingham
Address: 7618 Wyandotte

Market Potential: ★★★★
Market Reuses: Demolish, Commercial/Retail, Community/Recreational

Proximity to Parks: 0.4 mile (Tower Park)
Proximity to Comm. Ctrs: 3.4 miles (New Swope Park)
Proximity to Major Arterial: 0.12 mile (Wornall)
Nearest School: 0.46 mile (Cook)
Proximity to Bus Route & Route: 624' (Blue Ridge Express)
Proximity to Bus Stop: 626'
Located in a Food Desert? No
High Need Zip Code-Education: No

1.0 mile Stats (2010) District Wide
Population: 13,190 197,361
Pop. Growth (00-10): -3% -9%
Pop. <18 yrs: 2,127 45,231
% Pop. <18 yrs old: 16% 25%
% 65+: 11% 11%
Households (1.5 mile): 13,058 89,759
Median Income(*): $57,921 $28,188

*American Community Survey 05-09

Comments:
Built in 1960 and closed in 2001, Bingham has since served as the District’s warehouse facility. The large site is located in the Tower Homes neighborhood and Waldo Business District. Despite its adjacency to Wornall Road, accessibility is a constraint for the Bingham site. Primary access is located on a residential street (Wyandotte) to the east, any commercial reuse would have to obtain an access easement through the adjacent commercial shopping center to the north, or across the Trolley Track Trail to the west. At more than 7.5 acres in a vibrant residential/commercial area, the site offers a viable opportunity for commercial, residential and mixed-use redevelopment, provided the existing facility is demolished.
APPENDIX C: COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Site Tour

Phase II Meeting
Bingham Site Tour

Thursday, May 19, 2011
5:30 – 7:30 pm
18+ Attendees

BREAKOUT SESSION (SB, DB)

Site significance
  • It was so cool when it was new – brand new

Strengths
  • Structurally sound, pillars, masonry block
  • Land use, lots of ground
  • Middle of neighborhood
  • Sports teams use land, mows it, pays for it
  • Proximity to businesses
  • Prime property
  • Demand for building
  • Demographics- people, families now stay in neighborhood longer
  • Many classrooms

Challenges
  • Cost to bring building up to date
  • Irritation to neighborhood
  • Rumors of people trying to buy and being turned away
  • Empty for decade- eyesore
  • Strange things going on at night- cars in back parking lots at odd hours
  • Drug deals?
  • Aided in decline of area- “this spot pulls us down”, especially on street to the south
  • Facade deteriorated
  • Who wants to look at this?
  • Outside fence line, not taken care of
  • Elderly lady twisted ankle because of lack of maintenance (sweet gum balls on sidewalk)
  • Leaves not cleared from last fall
  • Limited access- can’t cross Trolley Track Trail
  • Must have access to Wornall Road to support commercial use
  • Access must be part of plan
  • No visibility from Wornall would need to clear trees
  • Parking on street causes traffic jam for neighbors on east side of building (even now with kids dropped off for athletics – it causes problems for local residents)
Community Needs

- Businesses- provide jobs, must be sensitive to neighborhood location
- No more bars, car lots, thrift stores
- People are in such need of green space, they pay for it and cut the grass
- Challenges of being in a residential area should encroach on neighborhood people
- Traffic jam already- football season, access is hard (only one side) parking is an issue.
- Timing has always been an issue in the past: people have sent in proposals in the past, but the district was never ready

Reuse Options (that could address community needs)

- Affordable housing
- Green space ( for events), amphitheater
- More coffee shops, restaurants, gyms- lifestyle business that support everyday life events
- Multi-use sports facility/complex- use field for athletics
- Dog park (not a community member, suggestion, but neighbors not opposed to it)
- Community gardens
- Senior housing
- Community park, etc

The following are the communities’ responses to informal proposals received by the Repurposing Office:

- Mixed use and retail: lots of ideas there
  - Office space: already a lot on the market in the neighborhood
  - Okay, if it were filled, but concern about whether there is market for it
- Neighborhood commercial development/retails
  - Okay, need to make sure it does not disrupt neighbors with heavy traffic
- Charter school
  - Strong charter school redeveloped close by and they have grown
  - That school is a strong part of neighborhood
  - Okay
- International Design Competition
  - Bring it on! That could be huge!
  - Too long of a timeline for redevelopment if wait for design competition
- Commercial Development -- Big box- no thanks
  - Storage mart was denied
  - Built up tall and boxy- no
  - Put a big block between neighbors, that doesn’t fit in neighborhood
  - Depends on height and proximity
  - Would depend on design
• Housing
  - Okay
  - Affordable housing not a stigma here
  - Curbs and sidewalks would need to be put in

• Demolition
  - Great!
  - Neighbors might contribute

** Thanks for including us in this process. Any proposal the district considers should include community feedback, both the Waldo Business Association and the local Neighborhood Association. Anyone who wants to cross the Trolley Track Trail would need to go through the Country Club Right-of-Way Committee

Parking Lot
• What was here before a school site?
• Is this the most valuable piece of property the district owns?
Bingham – Phase II Meeting

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

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

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

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

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

Community feedback on Commercial Use:

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

- The following additional concerns/comments were identified by one or more participant(s):
  - Trash
  - Noise
  - Light pollution
- There is already a lot of vacant office/commercial space – concern about adding square footage
- Historically, Kansas City lets developers do what they want (plans don’t reflect the desire of the community)
- Don’t need another pub
- Any commercial use at the site needs to complement/support 75th and Wornall hub
- There was mixed feedback on big box development. Some felt it was unrealistic at the site; others were open to well developed plan but scale/design would be an issue

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

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

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

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

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

- There was general interest/support from the participants for reuse of the site as playing fields, green space, community center with pool, fields, community garden; however, participants stressed concern about whether demolition of the building would be cost prohibitive. Participants were not supportive of the building remaining vacant for any length of time, and reuse of the grounds only was not a viable long-term option. In addition, access to the site/traffic would need to be addressed.
- A dog park was also mentioned, although it did not have the support of all participants
- Community use of the grounds, in conjunction with some private development was also identified as desirable
While the building was originally constructed for use as a school, the technical assessment suggests that educational reuse of the building is not the most viable reuse of the site (due to cost of rehabbing the building and the marketability/value of the site for other reuses). In the event a proposal for educational reuse was presented to the district, participants indicated that they would be supportive of an educational reuse of the site.

DEMOLITION

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

Community feedback on Demolition:

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

SOLICITATION PROCESS

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

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

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

Community feedback on the Solicitation Process:

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

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

Community feedback on Interim Uses:

- Can the Bingham parking lot be used when football/lacrosse teams are practicing/playing games on the fields? Typically, the gate to the lot is locked. This would help relieve parking congestion/traffic on residential streets
- Keep grounds (outside of fields) groomed
- A community member also asked for an update on the status of all the materials stored within the Bingham building
APPENDIX D: REPURPOSING GUIDELINES
Policy Category: Appendix C  
Policy Name: 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, 63rd 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