

Rockhill Greens Summit – Outcomes

Participants:

Emmanuel Obi, Obi Consulting & Engineers	Will McCarther, RMC Brookside
Roger Metz, Community Constituent	Craig Colbert, Habitat Kansas City
Jim Giles, City of Kansas City	Tim Hyder, VNA Kansas City
Chris Brewster, St. Peter’s Church	Bill Blanck, Oak Meyer Gardens
Erika Devore, KC Healthy Kids	Jacob Dobsch, City of Kansas City
Marti Lee, Southtown	

Organizations: The Net Giver, Slaggie Architects, HCA, and Husch & Blackwell.

After a thorough introspection, The Rockhill Greens Advisory Committee has identified several opportunities. Considering the challenges surrounding these opportunities, a better understanding was gained into the underlying needs of the larger community. And in order to satisfy these needs and take advantage of the opportunities, the following top Priorities were identified:

Top Priorities:

1. **The Plan:** Within the natural dynamics of this type of development initiative, provide a complete plan about the “larger” master-plan. Answer the question: “What are we going to do?” A central part of this priority is ensuring our plan promotes the core values of social, environmental, and fiscal responsibility (People, Planet, and Profit).
2. **The Funding:** Ensure we maximize funding options from the incentives process. Research possible stimulus funding and local, state, and federal funding options such as grants and related funding opportunities.
3. **Effective Communication:** Community, neighboring communities, key stakeholders, the media, and municipal leaders.
4. **The KCMO Dynamic:** Make sure we consider the unique factors about Kansas City and what caused other redevelopment efforts from failing or stagnating. This includes a deeper understanding of the “personalities” of the City, the political leaders, the communities, and the constituents at all levels.
5. **Engage Stakeholders:** Create a sense of ownership and positive opportunities for political leaders to “Champion” the initiative as a part of their platform. Also engage community leaders and other local leaders in a way that provides mutual gain for both the stakeholder and the community.

Call To Action:

Rockhill Greens Development Team: Integrate needs and priorities throughout the development process. Continue to engage and gain ongoing feedback from the Rockhill Greens Advisory Committee.

Rockhill Greens Advisory Committee: Support the development team in the incentives process and continue to provide your feedback and insights as we move forward.

Rockhill Greens – SWOT Analysis

STRENGTHS

- Existing strategic plans
- New facilities like the new YMCA
- Good transportation
- Strong communities
- HCA commitment and partnership
- Desired location (activities/entertainment)
- Parks and boulevards
- Schools and churches
- Availability of strong institutions
- Community leadership and organization
- Diversity
- Relative safety
- Brookside culture

OPPORTUNITIES

- Create the “Model Community”
- Create a community “Gateway”/“Identity”
- Senior housing development
- Rapid transit
- Flooding mitigation planning and tactics
- Focused rehab housing / revitalization
- Plenty of available land / properties
- Expand diversity in housing (age/income)
- New community partnerships
- Developments bridging the “Troost Barrier”
- Create opportunity for other developments
- Create a platform for political “Champions”
- Attract resources from outside KC
- New jobs and economic catalyst
- Stabilizing anchor
- Reduce blight
- Motivate more HCA/RMC investment

WEAKNESSES

- Lack of quality / diverse shopping
- The “Troost Barrier”
- Lack of options for aging population
- Loss of some institutions
- Aging infrastructure, housing, and commercial buildings
- Vacant housing east of Troost and newly vacant or vacating housing west of Troost
- Flooding and underground stream
- Lack of enough good jobs
- 3rd tier tenant mix
- Poor public schools perception (some)
- Economic development stagnation
- Speculators and absentee landlords

CHALLENGES

- The funding / limited resources
- Poor economic conditions (City budgets)
- Acquiring enough incentives
- Politics (bureaucracy, buy-in, support)
- Development constraints (existing TIF)
- Regulatory environment
- CON process
- Existing perceptions
- Apathy turning into opposition
- Other priorities (competing for attention)
- Greed (speculators / squatters)
- Gaining local support / buy-in
- Negative publicity
- Effective communication to all stakeholders
- Optimizing / managing rollout “timing”
- Competing housing and senior housing
- “Over-management” of committees

Underlying NEEDS Based on this Analysis

- Economic development (job creation)
- Incentives and financial resources
- Political champions
- The “larger” master plan
- Senior housing and mixed income housing
- Rapid transit / transportation infrastructure
- Break-down or cross “barriers”
- Community enhancement
- Engage KCMO school districts
- Address political considerations
- Grass roots support and campaigns
- Change perceptions