SHAWNEE COUNTY RESOLUTION NO. 2002-97

CITY OF TOPEKA ORDINANCE NO. 17818

A JOINT SHAWNEE COUNTY RESOLUTION AND CITY OF TOPEKA ORDINANCE introduced by Mayor Harry Felker pertaining to an amendment to the text and map of the Topeka-Shawnee County Comprehensive Metropolitan Plan.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Shawnee, Kansas, on this 15th day of April, 2002;

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Topeka, Kansas, on this 9th day of April, 2002;

Section 1. Chapter 7, Part J, of the Topeka-Shawnee County Comprehensive Metropolitan Plan recognizes additional planning and community development issues which require specific detailed area plans as part of the ongoing planning process for those areas undergoing land use transition or evidencing the need for redevelopment.

Section 2. The East Topeka Neighborhood Revitalization Plan, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein, provides long-range guidance for the future growth and development of the area generally bounded by I-70 on the south, railroad lines to the north, SE Bunner Trafficway to the west, and Deer Creek to the west. The East Topeka Neighborhood Revitalization Plan sets forth a 15-year vision with goals and strategies relating to land use, housing, parks and open space, circulation, infrastructure, economic development, image, and safety in a comprehensive manner that recognizes the desire to increase the livability of the East Topeka neighborhood. The East Topeka Neighborhood Revitalization Plan is representative of the collective input provided by stakeholder organizations in the area, which include the East Topeka North Neighborhood
Section 3. The Topeka-Shawnee County Comprehensive Metropolitan Plan is hereby amended by the addition of the East Topeka Neighborhood Revitalization Plan as a separate Plan Element.

Section 4. This resolution/ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage, approval and publication in the official City and County newspaper.
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Introduction and Purpose
I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide long-range guidance and clear direction to the City and its agencies, residents, and private/public stakeholders for the future revitalization and development of the East Topeka neighborhood. The Plan should be fluid, not static. The scope of the East Topeka Neighborhood Revitalization Plan comprehensively addresses land use, housing, corridor development, infrastructure, parks and open space, economic development, and community building issues. It establishes a 10-15 year vision with supportive goals, strategies and actions. This Plan provides the policy basis from which to identify appropriate zoning, capital improvements, programmatic funding, and design standards for implementation.

Background

In July of 2000, Topeka City Council and Shawnee County Board of Commissioners adopted the Neighborhood Element of the Topeka-Shawnee County Metropolitan Comprehensive Plan 2025 identifying a majority of East Topeka as a “high priority” area for planning assistance and re-investment. East Topeka is the eighth neighborhood plan to be undertaken since 1997 by Metro Planning.

Planning staff selected the boundaries of the East Topeka South and East Topeka North Neighborhood Improvement Areas as the study area. A timeline of events follows:

Organizing and Visioning

Jan.-Feb., 2001  Metro Planning staff and Kansas State students (community development class) walk area to perform land use and housing condition survey. March 3rd workshop is advertised

March 3  Metro Planning staff facilitates Neighborhood Planning Workshop at Scott Magnet School for community to review existing neighborhood conditions, identify assets obstacles, and vision for the future.

March-April  As a follow-up to workshop, staff conducts interviews of 15 stakeholder organizations to gain further insight into their needs and goals. Interviewees and workshop participants are invited to a meeting on April 2.

April  1st meeting of the stakeholder committee held. Committee membership reflects major stakeholder organizations in East Topeka. Committee decides to meet monthly as a committee of the whole and address a different topic each month. They make “housing” their first priority. City makes $400,000-$500,000 available from 2001 Consolidated Plan for in-fill housing in East Topeka.

Drafting of Plan

May  Binders are distributed to Committee. They reach general consensus on housing target areas. Ask for infrastructure...
costs. Hear presentation from Kansas State on HUD outreach
grant application (COPC) for East Topeka.

June

Advise City to move forward on pre-development work
(infrastructure) to support infill housing on blocks around
Chandler Field using CDBG infill housing funds.

July

Draft land use plan presented by Metro Planning staff. Final
infrastructure scope of work presented (estimate is
$440,000; City Council approves later in July).

August

Public Works and Parks/Recreation Departments explain
long-range CIP projects for East Topeka to Committee.
Committee takes visual image survey ranking various images
of East Topeka. Planning staff works with children from
Abbott Community Center summer program on future ideas
for Chandler Field.

September

Committee discusses economic development needs, micro-loan
programs, proposed Highland Meadows development, and
retail market study for Eastboro Shopping Center. COPC
grant is not approved by HUD.

October

Committee discusses public safety and street lighting issues.

Nov-Dec

Draft Goals and Guiding Principles are distributed to
Committee. Members are asked to share these with their
respective organizations and give feedback as to “what”,
“where”, and “how” they can be achieved. Two meetings are
held to develop outline of Plan. In-fill housing infrastructure
work completed east and west of Chandler Field.

Review and Adoption of Plan

January, 2002

Committee receives 75% draft Plan. Committee decides to
host a community meeting on Feb. 9th to present draft Plan.
70% draft Plan presented to Planning and Policy Committee
of the Metropolitan Planning
Commission on Jan. 15. NIA
send out flyers for Feb. 9th
meeting to residents and
businesses. Architect One
completes illustrative graphics.

February

Approximately 50 people attend
community-wide meeting held at
Salvation Army on Feb. 9th to
present draft Plan. Attendees vote
for priorities and preferred in-fill
housing designs. Planning Policy Committee hears results of
meeting and recommendations of 90% Plan on Feb. 18th.

March

Eastboro retail study contract signed with BBC Research.
Implementation section completed. Stakeholder committee
reviews 100% draft plan and recommends approval of plan.
Planning Policy Committee approves on March 18 and full
Planning Commission recommends approval at public hearing
on March 25.

April

Topeka City Council and Shawnee County Commission
unanimously approve the Plan on April 9 and April 15,
respectively.
Relation to Other Plans

The Plan is a comprehensive community-based approach to neighborhood planning that constitutes an amendment to the Metropolitan Comprehensive Plan and is regularly monitored, reviewed, and updated as needed. It is consistent with the Neighborhood Element of the Comprehensive Plan which recommends a neighborhood plan for East Topeka be developed in the year 2001. The Plan is also intended to be consistent with other elements of the Comprehensive Plan, including the Trails and Greenways Element, Parks and Open Space Element (future), and Transportation Plan (future).

Groups Interviewed or Represented on Stakeholder Committee

- Abbott Community Center
- Antioch Missionary Baptist Church
- Business – Debackers, Inc.
- Business – Mike’s Frame Shop
- Business – Pride Trophy
- City of Topeka – Housing and Neighborhood Development
- City of Topeka – Parks and Recreation
- City of Topeka – Police
- City of Topeka – Public Works
- Community Action
- East End NIA
- East Topeka Action Program (ETAP)
- East Topeka North NIA
- East Topeka South NIA
- East Topeka United Methodist Church
- East Topeka Weed and Seed
- El Shaddai Church
- GodLives
- Habitat for Humanity
- Jackson Memorial Church
- Metropolitan Planning Department
- Salvation Army
- Scott Magnet School
- Stardusters
- Topeka Cemetery
- Topeka City Council (Harold Lane and John Alcala)
- Topeka Community Development Corporation
- Topeka Unified School District 501
- True Foundation
Neighborhood Profile
II. NEIGHBORHOOD PROFILE

A. LOCATION AND CHARACTER

Setting For purposes of this plan, the East Topeka Neighborhood is bounded by the BNSF rail line to the north, I-70 to the south, Shunga Creek to the west, and Deer Creek to the east. East Topeka is a mixture of urbanized and non-urbanized areas that primarily consist of single-family residential uses. Major portions of the planning area remain undeveloped. East Topeka is surrounded by Downtown to the west, the Oakland neighborhood to the north, the East End neighborhood to the east, and Central Highland Park neighborhood to the south. The 6th Street corridor (old State Route 40) bisects the planning area from east-west funneling traffic into and out of Downtown. This planning is comprised of nearly 1,500 acres.
In the early days of Topeka's history, the term "East" Topeka never existed. The area now known as East Topeka was simply "Topeka." Downtown was anchored along the river by the railroad depots, and people lived mostly east of downtown. Early residents in the area were mostly immigrants from Germany and Russia who worked in the nearby rail yards. Most of the area extending from the Shunganunga Creek east to the Topeka Cemetery was annexed into the city in 1889.

Topeka, long known for its anti-slavery stance during the days before statehood, continued to pronounce its message of freedom and welcome to new settlers to Topeka. East 6th Street was known as the Liberty Highway, which followed the historical route of the Oregon Trail. This was the only entrance to the city by means other than river or rail. Because of this, America's westward expansion during the latter days of the 19th Century paraded down 6th Street, which was lined with stores offering services, products, restaurants, and hotels.

Over the years, 6th Street became US Highway 40, which resulted in a vast increase in automobile traffic, and even more life and commerce for the residents of Topeka. Some remnants of this era are still visible today, such as some of America's earliest examples of "motor hotels," which stand at the southwest corner of 6th and Golden Streets.

The role of East Topeka as the primary entrance to the City was not to last, however. By all historical standards, this area of Topeka has declined in its prominence during the latter half the 20th Century. There are several factors that have contributed to the decline, beginning with the horrific flood of 1951. This flood, described by those who witnessed it as the "flood of the Century," inundated much of Topeka. Although the Kansas River rose to cover nearly all of the City north of the river, the lesser known Shunganunga Creek also left its banks and left nearly everything north of SE 10th Street between the Creek and SE Golden Street under water. The losses and prospects for recovery were
too great for many residents of the area, who chose simply to relocate to other areas of town.

As a direct result of the flood of 1951, the Army Corps of Engineers created a levee along the banks of the Shunganunga Creek. This project channelized and maximized the flow of water through the creek, but also left the area with only a few streets by which to connect to neighborhoods on the other side. This action began a process of isolating East Topeka from downtown and areas further west.

In the early 1960’s US Highway 40 was diverted away from E 6th Street with the construction of the Interstate Highway System. Completed in 1963, the construction of I-70 split the area in two. What had been a single residential neighborhood now became two, each separate and isolated from each other. In addition, the path of I-70 through Downtown Topeka forced the displacement and relocation of one of Topeka’s poorest neighborhoods. Most of these families were relocated within East Topeka, which further depressed the area between downtown and the Topeka Cemetery.

As if the area had not suffered enough, the northwest corner of East Topeka was devastated by the June 8, 1966 tornado. The path of this tornado ripped through downtown, across Branner Street, and over to Ripley Park before continuing on through Oakland. This area in the path of the tornado has never fully recovered from this devastation.

As disparaging as the recent history of East Topeka seems, however, many of the landmarks which have helped define East Topeka still stand, and still offer an immediate connection to the past and to better days ahead. East Topeka Jr. High School, while no longer open, still stands, and is an architectural monument that can be restored and re-used as an integral part of life for area residents. Parts of the Topeka Cemetery have been added to the National Register of Historic Places. This action alone promises to increase the awareness and recognition of the area for both Topeka residents, and for visitors, as well. In 1996, Topeka Public Schools built the $7 million Scott Magnet Elementary School for computer technology which has become a major source of pride and stability attracting students from throughout Topeka. Lastly, the area is once again a destination for new immigrant populations, as residents from Mexico and other Latin American countries are establishing enclaves of new businesses and residential neighborhoods.
B. EXISTING CONDITIONS

For purposes of better understanding the variety of issues that exist in East Topeka, the planning area was broken down into smaller geographic sub-areas – Northeast, Northwest, Southeast, and Southwest (see map below). These sub-areas represent neighborhood units of the bigger planning area and are referenced throughout this document.

**Health**  
The Neighborhood Element of the Comprehensive Plan establishes a neighborhood health rating system for all neighborhoods in Topeka to prioritize planning assistance and resource allocation. All of East Topeka is either designated as intensive care (most seriously distressed conditions) or at risk (emerging negative conditions). Both the Northwest and Southwest Sub-areas are considered a high priority for re-investment due to their declining intensive care status and revitalization potential (Scott Magnet School, Abbott Community Center, etc.). The Northeast Sub-area is a stable intensive care area and considered an above average priority while the Southeast Sub-area rates as an average priority.
East Topeka - NW

1990 Population = 1,133 (Census Tracts 2.1, 11.3, 11.4)
2000 Population = 1,047 (Census Tracts 11.2027-2038, 11.3000-3015, 11.3022-3028, 40.1020-1030)

Vital Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Rate (90):</th>
<th>31%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crimes Reported Rank (96-98):</td>
<td>above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Residential Property Value (98):</td>
<td>$14,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Homeownership (01):</td>
<td>54%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarded Houses (97-98):</td>
<td>below average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on Shawnee County Appraiser listings

Stability Indicators

| Population Change (90-00): | -9% |
| New Residential/Demolition Ratio (90-97): | 1.6 |
| Median Residential Sale Price Change (90-98): | -22% |
| School Attendance Rate Change (96-00): | 1.0% |
| School Enrollment Change (96-00): | -12.5% |

Revitalization Potential:

High number of vacant lots north of the Shunga Creek, many which have been incorporated into yards of adjacent houses, indicate most distressed housing has been demolished over the years. Combination of vacant lots, major deterioration of remaining homes, proximity to more sound blocks and future trail, make area south of 4th Street potential for new in-fill housing development. Many homes show signs of pride in terms of ongoing renovations although appear to lack the means to adequately complete work. Sidewalks and curbing are in place, but some blocks have sidewalks in disrepair or are covered with growth. New ramps have been recently put in. Some truck traffic conflicts with residential streets along 2nd Street. Scott Magnet School provides a stabilizing force in the area and is a major anchor to focus re-investment around it. Ripley Park is a major amenity but is not central to make access easy for the rest of the neighborhood. Salvation Army completed significant new expansion on 6th Street and is major asset to build from.

Diagnosis: INTENSIVE CARE declining

Notes:
## East Topeka - SW

1990 Population = 1,270 (Census Tracts 11.5, 12.1, 12.4)
2000 Population = 1,315 (Census Tracts 11.3016-3021, 11.3029-3041, 12.1, 40.2000, 40.2050, 40.2051)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vital Signs</th>
<th>Stability Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (90): 30%</td>
<td>Population Change (90-00): +3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Residential Property Value (98): $14,950</td>
<td>Median Residential Sale Price Change*(90-98): -22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Homeownership (01): 53%*</td>
<td>School Attendance Rate Change (96-00): 1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarded Houses (97-98): high</td>
<td>School Enrollment Change (96-00): -12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on Shawnee County Appraiser listings

### Revitalization Potential:
Urban street infrastructure standards are sporadic with some areas having full sidewalk, curbs, and gutters while other blocks have none. Area west of Chandler Field has several new in-fill homes scattered amongst older homes in need of significant renovation. Good area for housing conservation. Area east of Chandler Field has an extremely high number of vacant lots indicating demolition of the most deteriorated structures has already taken place; potential exists as “new” neighborhood. Vacant East Topeka Jr. High building is a tremendous asset for an adaptive re-use and is a central focal point in the community’s history. Freedom Valley Park appears to be another great open space asset, but is isolated and does not have good natural surveillance. Chandler Field could be better utilized by neighborhood and youth programs at Abbott Center. Abbott Center is centralized, but small. Topeka Cemetery (picture above) has the only building in East Topeka on the National Register of Historic Buildings.

### Diagnosis: INTENSIVE CARE

### Stable

### Notes:
**East Topeka - NE**

1990 Population = 1,426 (Census Tracts 11.1, 11.2)
2000 Population = 1,667 (Census Tracts 11.1, 11.2000-2026)

**Vital Signs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Rate (90):</th>
<th>23%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crimes Reported Rank (96-98):</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Residential Property Value (98):</td>
<td>$20,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Homeownership (01):</td>
<td>50%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarded Houses (97-98):</td>
<td>below average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stability Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Change (90-00):</th>
<th>+17%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Residential/Demolition Ratio (90-97):</td>
<td>1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Residential Sale Price Change*(90-98):</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Attendance Rate Change (96-00):</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Enrollment Change (96-00):</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on Shawnee County Appraiser listings

**Revitalization Potential:**
Small post-War housing is coupled with poor street infrastructure along with large undeveloped tracts of land. The concentration of subsidized housing in the northeast corner of the sub-area appears to have attracted higher than average crime while repelling investment. This area has potential for new in-fill for housing development. Eastboro Shopping Center has undergone a minor facelift and is only retail center in area. Potential use of Deer Creek Trail in the future. Bentwood Apartments has significant vacancies and is in need of drastic investment for rehabilitation (or demolition) as it is source of many crime problems. Census population has grown an astounding 17% although significant amount of housing has been built over the last 10 years (vacant apartment buildings as of 1990 Census may explain increase).

**Diagnosis: INTENSIVE CARE**

**Stable**

**Notes:**
**East Topeka - SE**

1990 Population = 1,524 (Census Tracts 31.1, 31.3)
2000 Population = 1,345 (Census Tracts 31.1028-1038, 31.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vital Signs</th>
<th>Stability Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (90): 45%</td>
<td>Population Change (90-00): -12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Residential Property Value (98): $26,740</td>
<td>Median Residential Sale Price Change* (90-98): -22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Homeownership (91): 57%*</td>
<td>School Attendance Rate Change (96-00): 1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarded Houses (97-98): above average</td>
<td>School Enrollment Change (96-00): -12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*based on Shawnee County Appraiser listings

**Revitalization Potential:**
High number of vacant lots indicates that the most troubled housing has been removed over the years. Setting is mostly rural. This area in general has a relatively good homeownership rate, with the pride in owning a home reflected by the majority of the blocks with sound to minor deterioration of housing conditions. The high number of vacant lots coupled with the stability of the housing conditions makes the area south of 7th Street and east of Highland Street a decent candidate for in-fill housing. Street infrastructure (streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks) throughout the SE area is severely lacking of urban standards and poses the biggest barrier to revitalization.

**Diagnosis:** AT RISK  
Stable

**Notes:**
## EAST TOPEKA

**FACT SHEET #1 - Land Use and Housing**

### LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Land Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family Residential</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/Utility</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>1,052 ac. (net)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,493 ac. (gross)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Property Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>9,787 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family</td>
<td>9,639 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>84,558 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>15,035 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwellings</th>
<th>2,275 units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Conditions (prop.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Deficiencies</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Deficiencies</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Deficiencies</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>4.5 units/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family</td>
<td>9.3 units/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>13.1 units/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied Units</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Units</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Units</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appraised Property Values (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$16,753</td>
<td>($91,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family</td>
<td>$18,101</td>
<td>($43,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>$264,863</td>
<td>($2,082,700)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FACT SHEET #2 - Demographics

### East Topeka vs. City of Topeka

**2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Topeka</th>
<th>1980-2000</th>
<th>City of Topeka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2705</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2592</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Non-black/white)</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>352%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>63618</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24 years</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64 years</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years or over</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Age</strong></td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSEHOLDS</strong></td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>30822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ children &lt; 18</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Couple</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-Headed (no husband)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ child. &lt; 18</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per Household</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per Family</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographic Summary

Incredibly, preliminary Census figures show East Topeka (Plan Area) actually grew by 9% in the 1990s outpacing the City as a whole by 7%! The Northeast and Southwest sub-areas contributed to this growth while the Northwest and Southeast sub-areas continue to lose population albeit at a reduced rate from the 1980s. The other major Census finding is the tremendous influx of residents of Hispanic Origin (142%). Those of Hispanic Origin are also becoming more concentrated in East Topeka accounting for 18% of the City's Hispanic population in 2000 as compared with 11% in 1990. Population age became younger during the 1990s due in part to people 55 years and older dropping from 24% to 19% of the population. This indicates families are moving back in to replace older age cohorts although household make-up is decidedly female-headed with children.
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III. VISION and GOALS

A. Vision Statement

In the year 2016, a Payless Shoe information technology executive bikes home one summer evening after a hard day at the office. Prior to taking the rustic Deer Creek Trail connection to the Shunga Trail, she stops by the Eastboro Walgreens drug store to pick-up her grandmother’s prescription. The store is a-buzz with talk of her 20-year Scott Magnet School class reunion being held at the new hotel and conference center down the street off of I-70 and Deer Creek. She hops back on her bike and follows the Shunga Trail till it reaches her new townhouse that overlooks the Shunga Trail greenway with a view of the Jayhawk Hotel sign and Capitol dome out her back window. She says hello to her new neighbors who just moved here from Lawrence and “hola” to her old neighbors who own one of the many Mexican-run businesses on 6th Street. On her way to her grandparents, she drives down 6th Street enjoying how beautiful it is now that the Bradford pear trees are in full bloom on the landscaped medians. As she stops at Abbott Community Center to see if her son is back from summer camp, she gazes out to see him taking a turn in the water park spray. She calls out to him to meet her over at his great-grandparents’ apartment in the historically renovated East Topeka Jr. High Senior Living Center. As she walks over to the apartment she signs-up to volunteer in this year’s Housing Rehab-A-Thon. Her grandparents remind the young executive of the sacrifices that were made to bring East Topeka back and they share a moment of satisfaction as grandpa gets ready to go catch some carp at the East Topeka Fishing Lake.
B. Goals and Guiding Principles

**LAND USE**

**Goal** – Preserve the viability of single-family residential blocks from higher intensity and/or incompatible land uses, allow for healthy commercial service development, and improve accessibility/use of public open space for residents.

**Guiding Principles**

- Locate commercial development nodes on perimeter of sub-areas near heavy traffic thoroughfares; allow for “mom and pop” stores within interior of sub-areas.

- Locate higher density residential land uses near commercial nodes.

- Enhance neighborhood public park space so that it is more central and functional for residents, youth, and civic/cultural events.

- Prohibit expansion of industrial uses into viable residential blocks.

- Fortify mixed-use development along 6th Street corridor and improve its image.

- Support community gardens on vacant land in advance of their development.

**HOUSING**

**Goal** – Increase density of population by substantially upgrading amount of quality housing stock that attracts new homeowners/residents of all incomes.

**Guiding Principles**

- Increase homeownership levels in all sub-areas by placing a high priority on assisting blocks to achieve greater than 50% owner-occupancy.

- Make a priority any housing improvements where... they are targeted to make the most visible impact, sound infrastructure is in place, they build off of an existing community asset or anchor, and they prevent the spread of blighting influences into stable residential blocks.
• Target rehabilitation efforts around new in-fill housing.

• Ensure that new affordable in-fill housing maintains high quality standards that compliments existing or preferred design character of the neighborhood.

• Encourage mixed-income development/rehabilitation of apartment complexes.

• Increase quality elderly housing options that are affordable.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**Goal** – Increase opportunities within East Topeka for employment and wealth generation.

**Guiding Principles:**

• Support local entrepreneurship within context of the plan.

• Recruit businesses to the area that can utilize the skills and abilities of the existing workforce.

• Provide land in sufficient quantities for the location of larger commercial and industrial developments in targeted locations within the area.

• Increase opportunities within the area for workforce training for the unemployed and the underemployed.

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND PUBLIC FACILITIES**

**Goal** – Make available modern infrastructure and public facilities to support increased infill housing, commercial, and institutional development.

**Guiding Principles:**

• Target infrastructure and public facility improvements to support areas planned for infill housing starts and to connect neighborhood anchors.

• Recognize increased capacity demands placed on infrastructure and public facilities in areas targeted for business and employment growth.

• Enhance the functionality of SE 6th Street as the primary link between the Oakland Expressway and Downtown Topeka.

• Increase the safety and accessibility of neighborhood parks and open spaces.
• Discourage heavy truck traffic from residential streets.

**Goal** – Communicate “images” for East Topeka that reflect positively on the people who live and do business there.

**Guiding Principles**

- Create more opportunities for residents to take pride in their neighborhood.
- Work to counter any negative press about the neighborhood with news of positive actions and happenings.
- Better influence local government and Topeka leadership by presenting a unified voice that represents the broad interests of East Topeka stakeholders.
- Establish gateways, corridors, and edges that reflect a positive first impression of East Topeka.
- Strive for high standards in new development that will enhance property values in the neighborhood.
- Mobilize residents to take a more active role in influencing the decisions that affect the neighborhood.
- Protect and promote remaining historical assets.

**YOUTH AND EDUCATION**

**Goal** – East Topeka should be “kid-friendly”, desirous for parents to raise their children, and a place where children want to be.

**Guiding Principles**

- Develop challenging after-school, mentoring, and work programs that enable youth to enhance their academic and leadership skills.
- Include youth, to the greatest extent possible, in the decision-making process of the neighborhood.
• Increase the variety, quality, and accessibility of recreational amenities for youth.
• Expand community center space.
• Support the continuous improvement and success of Scott Magnet School as the neighborhood's educational anchor of the community.

SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT

Goal – Create a safe and clean environment for all those in East Topeka to live, learn, work, and play.

Guiding Principles

• Organize volunteer resident resources to take a more organized and proactive role in safety/environmental prevention.
• Improve pedestrian lighting for better feeling of safety.
• Create volunteer "neighbor to neighbor" programs that can address smaller housing maintenance issues – painting, porches, gutters, etc. – that prolong life of existing housing stock and prevent the "broken window" cycle.
• Promote educational efforts to know "what to look for" in detecting/preventing crime.
• Enhance safety of all pedestrian linkages, especially in areas where children must walk or ride bicycles.
Land Use Plan
IV. LAND USE PLAN

The East Topeka Land Use Plan (Map 6) graphically illustrates a conceptual guide for future development and re-development that embodies the vision and goals presented in Section III. The map is conceptual and should not be used to determine precise zoning boundaries. The following land uses, zoning districts, and densities are the “maximum recommended” and assumes less intensive land uses, zoning districts, or densities are appropriate.

**Residential – Low Density:** This category reserves lower density non-urbanized areas of East Topeka that primarily front “local” low volume streets where larger lot single-family uses exist. These areas originally developed less compact due to infrastructure or topographical constraints and exhibit rural-like characteristics (deep road-side ditches, narrow roads, very low density). These areas have significant infrastructure needs that have to be addressed before they could develop into a **Residential – Low Density (Urban)** category. They are not expected to develop into urban densities over the 10-year horizon of this plan. New development in this area should be compatible with the existing single-family character, which could include such uses as churches, daycares, and institutional uses.

*Primary Uses:* single-family dwellings  
*Zoning Districts:* R-2 (Single Family)  
*Density:* 1-4 units/acre (net)

**Residential – Low Density (Urban):** This category reserves lower density yet urbanized areas of East Topeka that primarily front “local” low volume streets where the highest concentrations of single-family uses exist without a significant mixing of two/multiple-family uses. These areas originally developed as more compact single-family areas than the rest of East Topeka since they have a more urbanized road/utility infrastructure. New development in this area should be compatible with the existing single-family character, which could include such uses as churches and small-scale daycares. Density levels in these areas reflect a higher density than the **Residential - Low Density** areas, but with the same use characteristics.

*Primary Uses:* single-family dwellings  
*Zoning Districts:* R-2 (Single Family)  
*Density:* 5-7 units/acre (net)
Residential – Medium Density: This category is applied exclusively to residential blocks that either are transitioning from a higher intensity land use area to a lower density single-family area or where viable two to four-unit complexes already exist. This category is applied to the vicinity of Pine Ridge Apartments and area north of 10th Street, and the area north of 6th Street in the northeast sub-area (2-4 unit complexes may also be appropriate in the Mixed Use categories). These uses are characterized by their medium densities, affordability, and proximity to public transportation lines. The purpose of this category is to allow medium density residential uses while protecting against the spread of higher density development into the single-family preserve areas.

Primary Uses: Two to four-unit dwellings
Zoning Districts: “M-1A” (Limited Multiple-Family), “PUD” (M-2 Multiple-Family)
Density/Intensity: 8-14 dwelling units/acre (net)

Residential – High Density: This category is applied to exclusive multi-family residential blocks that are comprised of existing or potential apartment complex developments. Sites best suited for high density residential include those areas closest to activity zones such as major thoroughfares with public transportation and employment/shopping areas (e.g., Bentwood Apartments and Paradise Plaza). Adaptive re-use of special landmark buildings are another consideration (e.g., former East Topeka Jr. High building). Blocks on the interior of predominantly single-family area are not ideal and should not be promoted for high density use in the future (e.g., Timberlee Apartments) nor should any new sites on the edges of East Topeka (see Land Use Guiding Principles). High density multi-family dwellings may be conditionally appropriate within Mixed Use categories.

Primary Uses: Multi-family dwellings (5+ units)
Zoning Districts: “M-2” (Multiple-Family)
Density/Intensity: 15-29 dwelling units/acre (net)

Mixed Use – Neighborhood: This category promotes the integration of neighborhood commercial uses with medium density residential uses on blocks that front minor and major arterials generally at neighborhood edges. Neighborhood-scaled office, institutional, and commercial retail/service uses could be designed to accommodate residential uses within the same structure or on adjacent property. Residential standards should accommodate “zero-lot line” designs. High density residential (5+ units/lot) may be appropriate based upon its compatibility to the site and quality of design.
Since all of these blocks front major image streets (6th Street, 10th Street, and Branner Trafficway), parking lots should be effectively screened from street frontages or placed at the side or rear of properties. Quality of design should be emphasized by orienting buildings close to the street, making sites pedestrian friendly, softening views where possible, restricting large pole signage, ensuring visual integrity, minimizing points of access, and buffering physical impacts from adjacent residential blocks. Adaptive re-use of residential buildings should be highly encouraged. Current C-4 commercial zoning allows high intensity uses that renders 6th Street to a life of “strip commercial” and visual clutter if left unchecked. It would be the purpose of this classification to provide for healthy mixed-use development and re-development along an aesthetically pleasing regional urban corridor.

**Primary Uses:** Single to four-unit dwellings; neighborhood commercial

**Zoning Districts:** X-1 (Mixed Use); C-2 (Commercial)

**Density/Intensity:** 8-22 dwelling units/acre (net)

**Mixed Use – High Intensity:** This designation is recommended for those areas that currently display an industrial presence within a residential environment, have large tracts of open or vacant land, and/or that are transitioning from heavier industrial-types areas. Those areas include a portion of land between Ripley Park and Golden Avenue and the southwest corner of California and 10th Street in the vicinity of the Palmer News building. The objective of this designation is to promote development or redevelopment of these areas as employment areas while mitigating site-related impacts that affect more viable, cohesive, and stable residential use districts. It is not the intent of this designation to blanket reclassify an area for industrial usage that allows piecemeal industrial development. Instead, it is the desire of this designation to promote a healthy balance of residential, institutional, commercial, and light industrial that blends together within a unified plan of development. New heavy industrial uses are prohibited.

**Primary Uses:** light industrial, commercial, high density residential

**Zoning District:** X-2 (Mixed Use)

**Intensity:** High

**Commercial:** The purpose of this category is to define concentrated commercial districts, or nodes, that will support commercial retail or entertainment development. Higher intensity nodal areas are located intermittently at high traffic intersections along 6th Street – Branner Trafficway, California/10th, and Deer Creek – so as not to perpetuate “strip commercial” characteristics. Smaller neighborhood commercial nodes are typically located at corner intersections.
These areas should be reserved for larger-scale shopping needs of the community that attract customers from outside the immediate area. These areas are more appropriate to support higher intensity shopping/entertainment needs since they are either already within existing commercial developments and because they are reasonably separated from more sensitive single-family residential blocks. High quality site design should also be emphasized since these areas front a major image corridor.

One exception to this category is the "Forest Park" development along the future Deer Creek Trail in the Southeast sub-area. This large property, nestled in a wooded setting, has historically been used as church retreat/camp. Commercial activities here should be limited to conference, retreat, recreational ventures, etc. that preserve its natural setting to the greatest extent possible (including easement dedications for the Deer Creek Trail).

**Primary Uses:** Commercial retail and entertainment
**Zoning Districts:** C-4 (Commercial); X-3 (Mixed Use); C-2 (Commercial)
**Density/Intensity:** medium to high

**Industrial:** This designation recognizes both light and heavy industrial use areas located within proximity to Interstate entrance/exits and/or rail lines without encroachment upon the residential interior of the neighborhood. This includes existing and future industrial expansion areas. Heavier industrial uses such as manufacturing and large trucking operations would be appropriate as employment generators for East Topeka. Some attention to site buffering and traffic calming will be needed for those existing industrial areas adjacent to single-family residential blocks such as in the northwest sub-area where Midway Wholesale is located.

**Primary Uses:** Heavy and Light Industrial
**Zoning Districts:** I-2 (Heavy Industrial); I-1 (Light Industrial)
**Density/Intensity:** high

**Institutional:** This designation recognizes existing schools, churches, non-profit service agencies, medical services, and utilities. Major expansion of existing institutional sites should be reflected on the map. Anticipated expansions are within very low-density residential areas and should not pose any negative impacts on surrounding blocks. The renovation of East Topeka Jr. High for non-residential uses should only be considered to the extent it does not duplicate social services already being offered by the City and existing non-profits.

**Primary Uses:** Schools, churches, etc.
**Zoning Districts:** primarily R-2 (Single-Family)
Intensity: Medium (limited occurrences)

Open Space - Parks: This designation represents those active open space areas with elements such as playgrounds, athletic fields, or other recreational or cultural enhancements. Current parks in East Topeka include Ripley Park, Abbott Community Center/Jackson Park, Freedom Valley Park, Topeka Cemetery, and Eastborough Park. Future park space should include the Shunga Trail, Deer Creek Trail, Chandler Field (see picture below), and Jackson Memorial Church open space. Under this category, open space could be public or privately owned as long as it is accessible to the community for some form of recreation or cultural activities. It recognizes that the development of these sites are reserved for public recreational space and should not be developed for non-park uses.

Primary Use: Parks
Zoning District: OS (Open Space)
Intensity: Low

Open Space - Greenspace: This designation represents those passive open space areas without structural or recreational elements. These areas provide visual respite and are either in a naturally occurring state or maintained in a more formal setting with landscaping, trees, and ground covers. They are most commonly formed as greenways, gateways, and wooded areas. The only current formal greenspaces just west of the Topeka Cemetery - the Biddle Creek drainage basin and a large portion of Freedom Valley Park. Future greenspaces should include the portions of the Deer Creek Trail, a triangle gateway at California/6th Street, a gateway at 6th/10th Streets, and a greenway along Branner Trafficway. Under this category, greenspace is publicly-owned and maintained as right-of-way for street or drainage purposes. It recognizes that the development of these sites are reserved for public purposes and shall not be developed.

Primary Use: Greenspace
Zoning District: OS (Open Space)
Intensity: Low
Revitalization Strategy
V. REVITALIZATION STRATEGY

"The needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few."
Mr. Spock

A. Revitalization Themes

✓ **Comprehensiveness** – Improving the quality of life in East Topeka is more than just a simple “magic bullet” solution. Crime, which is often cited as a singular cause of keeping people and investment out of East Topeka, is in reality more a symptom of a complex series of causes. Revitalizing East Topeka will only be as successful as everyone’s ability to “treat the patient” comprehensively and not just the symptoms.

✓ **More People (demand)** – East Topeka must increase its density and overall population to compete as a liveable area. The number one indicator of an area’s health is whether or not there is a demand to live there. Bettering the supply of public and private services (homes, stores, parks, jobs, etc.) greatly depends on having a sufficient and employable population to demand such improvements. It also improves a sense of community and safety when there are greater numbers of neighbors.

✓ **Think Big (supply)** – Images play a large part in the ultimate success of East Topeka’s revitalization. These images must be visible, lasting, large, and mind-altering enough to change perceptions. “At risk” and “intensive care” health ratings cover the entire planning area which indicate no quick fixes. While there is certainly nothing to lose in making small incremental improvements (this is in fact a vital part of the overall strategy), long-term revitalization efforts must include big changes to re-introduce market forces back into the community.

✓ **Create Linkages/Re-connect** – The East Topeka planning area is separated from Downtown and adjoining neighborhoods by physical barriers such as I-70, railroad tracks, creeks, and topography. These physical barriers are also psychological barriers to residents and the general Topeka population. Physical (e.g., trails) and non-physical (e.g., partnerships) connections need to be made to overcome isolation affects on the community.

✓ **Teamwork** – A unified voice that can represent East Topeka’s vision is paramount in achieving successful long-term revitalization. A commitment must be made by all stakeholder groups involved (including schools and local government) to work together as a team by “keeping your eyes on the prize”: a better neighborhood. Nobody’s self-interest should stand above the interest of the community as a whole. There are many wonderful people in East Topeka that are trying to make a difference on their own. If they were to all pull together, the whole would be greater than the sum of their parts. East Topeka is a large area and therefore has many different needs or priorities. Highest support should be given to stakeholders who are willing to advance the guiding principles of the Plan in sync with other stakeholders’ efforts.
B. Housing

The revitalization principles of “More People” and “Think Big” dictate that new infill housing must be the focus of the housing strategy. The planning area has the capacity (i.e., vacant land) to realize between 700-800 new housing units based on a density of 3 units/acre. The reality of achieving that goal depends on millions of dollars invested in infrastructure upgrades and major shifts in market values. This area will not reach the goal of this much housing if it is all low and moderate-income affordable housing. For mixed-income developments to be part of the long-term housing strategy, stabilization of the housing stock is the first step. The current housing stock is insufficient to attract quality investment for rehabilitation alone.

Where should new housing be targeted? The idea is to concentrate a critical mass of housing improvements in a 2-3 block area so that it stimulates additional investment by adjacent property owners, increases property values, and leaves behind a visible transformation of the area. Upgrading houses in a randomly dispersed pattern only dilutes the impact upon the neighborhood and will not lead to any spin-off effect on the block or neighborhood. If the improvements are not visible or concentrated enough, then the stabilization of that 2-3 block area is marginalized and future investments to the area are not leveraged.

Priorities for housing improvement locations, as stated in under the Housing Goals/Guiding Principles of Section III, includes the following criteria:

- Targeted to achieve critical mass
- Visible impact
- In-place infrastructure
- Build upon existing anchor/asset
- Eliminate blight; protect stable blocks from blighting influences
- Attractive for residents of all incomes

Opportunity Areas

Seven (7) “Opportunity Areas” were examined for viability of future housing development (see Map #7, Table #1, and Appendix). Each Housing Opportunity Area was identified as having a substantial amount of development or redevelopment potential based on amount of vacant land or dilapidated conditions. A brief description of each area is followed by a recommendation on housing improvement priorities for the next 10 years.

Area 1 – Located in the Southwest Sub-Area, this area has a high percentage of vacant land as a result of years of demolitions. 10th Street is a major image street with a poor “front door” for housing. Abbott Center/Jackson Park anchor the center of this area and is a great asset to build from. Investment in new housing has already taken place by Startdusters and Habitat for Humanity south of 10th Street during the 1990s. A substantial number of vacant parcels are still owned by Startdusters including many tax delinquent parcels. Use of Chandler Field for future neighborhood park space is critical to attracting new residents and providing outdoor recreational opportunities central to the population. New water lines (correcting “red water”), mill and overlay of streets,
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sidewalk, curb/gutter, and alleys were completed in 2000-2001 south of 10th Street (see picture). Some in-fill potential exists on City-owned land in Freedom Valley Park which has some of the better housing stock and would make the park less prone to vandalism. East Topeka Jr. High could be potentially re-used for elderly housing apartments, but does not appear likely given the current ownership situation.

Priorities: Target housing improvements beginning in blocks closest to Abbott Center/Chandler Field south of 10th Street and make visible impact on 10th Street. Target Freedom Valley Park in-fill site as public-private venture.

Area 2 — Located in the Southeast Sub-Area, this area also contains a high percentage of vacant land. This area is not nearly as urbanized as Area 1 and costs are prohibitive to upgrade infrastructure to support new housing developments. Location of Palmer News distribution facility in middle of area also undermines long-term viability of new housing at urban densities. Short-term revitalization opportunities exist in the southernmost portion for rehabilitation of Paradise Plaza Apartments that project a poor image along 1-70.

Priorities: Target rental rehabilitation or redevelopment of Paradise Plaza that includes de-densification of buildings and creation of internal green space.

Area 3 — Also located in the Southeast Sub-Area, Area 3 is similar to Area 2 in that it severely lacks standard infrastructure. Local streets are undersized with deep road-side ditches. Upgrading infrastructure is also cost prohibitive due to street reconstruction. Opportunities for new housing lie closer to 6th Street where vacant land is available and cost of street/utility improvements are reduced. Location of the Pine Ridge public housing complex south of 10th Street discourages any significant housing investment around it absent approval of a major HOPE VI application. El Shaddai Church is investing in this area and could be a future sponsor for new housing.

Priorities: Market City-owned land along 6th Street for possible elderly housing or medium density residential.

Area 4 — Located in Northeast Sub-Area, Area 4 resembles Area 2 as being sparsely developed and severely lacking standard infrastructure. Upgrading infrastructure is also cost prohibitive due to street construction. Opportunities for new housing lie closer to 6th Street where vacant land is available and cost of street/utility improvements are reduced. New private 16-unit elderly development is proposed between Alkire and Woodland. A major impact could be made with the redevelopment or major rehabilitation of the Bentwood Apartments behind the Eastboro Shopping Center. This 147-unit complex is more than two-thirds vacant and a major source of crime in the area. New ownership and proven management must soon eradicate crime from these apartments or surrounding blocks and shopping center are looking at a downward spiral they may never recover from. Acquisition and demolition must be explored in the best long-term interests of the neighborhood. Extension of Deer Creek Trail would give a "new" Bentwood safer amenity.
Priorities: Preferably redevelop Bentwood Apartments for new construction (e.g., elderly?) or subsidize major rehab to achieve full occupancy while incorporating crime prevention through environmental design changes.

Area 5 – Located in both the Northeast and Northwest Sub-Areas, this area is anchored by Scott Magnet School. School playground and greenspace used as de facto neighborhood park. Upgrading streets and sidewalks to urban standards is a necessity to the east, north, and south of the school particularly. Potential exists to redevelop intersection of 6th and California for “gateway” to school with new housing along California. Pedestrian bridge at Market will connect area to Shunga Trail as it is extended east in the next 5 years.

Priorities: Target blocks surrounding Scott Magnet School to the east to prevent spread of blight to more stable streets (Burr and Gray). Remove blighted structures along California to create “gateway” to school and build new in-fill housing to make visible impact from 6th Street.

Area 6 – Located in Northwest Sub-Area, Area 6 will have very good access and visibility along the Shunga Trail once it is extended east. Infrastructure needs are fairly minimal as this is a smaller area than those discussed earlier. The area has probably the highest concentration of boarded-up homes in East Topeka. The poorly designed Timberlee Apartments can be seen as discouraging any new investment in the single-family housing stock around it and will need to be addressed if Area 6 is to be viable for new housing. This area must be completely redeveloped (demolition and land assemblage) to have any chance of success. Nearby industrial-type uses must also be mitigated from spreading further east. Several viable residential blocks exist to the north on Lime and Lake.

Priorities: Target whole area for large-scale redevelopment. Over time, acquire and demolish dilapidated housing in order to market for large-scale new low-density housing development.

Area 7 – Covers the 6th Street corridor areas designated as “Mixed Use – Neighborhood” on the Future Land Use map. Salvation Army’s new building is major anchor. Various opportunities exist to redevelop portions of 6th Street for single-family townhouse, moderate density apartment units, or work-live units that fit the character of the street. Blighted commercial properties (e.g., open storage lots) could be acquired and combined with vacant lots to develop for housing purposes. This would have an immediate and visible impact along the neighborhood’s primary regional corridor. Infrastructure costs would be incurred to repair/replace alleyways for rear access and install landscaped medians.

Priorities: Target blocks closest to Salvation Army and/or blighted lots where image could be greatly improved along 6th Street with new construction.
## Housing Improvements (10 year phasing)
### Table #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Op #</th>
<th>Public Infrastructure Needs</th>
<th>Housing Needs</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE I (1-5 yrs.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Field East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor (sidewalks)</td>
<td>New SF ownership (20)</td>
<td>New infrastructure work done; properties currently being acquired by City and Habitat; need to accelerate Abbott Center expansion and conversion of Chandler Field to neighborhood park; City ready to implement Habitat street lighting plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major (park and Abbott Center expansion)</td>
<td>Rehab SF (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Field West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor (sidewalks)</td>
<td>New SF ownership (10)</td>
<td>New infrastructure work done; housing delayed until Stardusters and City resolve legal and organizational issues; need to accelerate Abbott Center expansion and conversion of Chandler Field to neighborhood park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major (park and Abbott Center expansion)</td>
<td>Rehab SF (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkire/ Woodland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minor (extension of water and sewer lines, sidewalks to 6th)</td>
<td>Elderly (16)</td>
<td>Privately-owned tax credit project awaiting financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentwood Apartments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None anticipated; close off Eastboro Shopping Center access onto Arter</td>
<td>Rehab apartments (40 existing occupied; 107 new unoccupied)</td>
<td>Major rehab can only work with state tax credit and CDBG subsidies; potential new buyer with successful similar experiences could start construction by summer of 2002; would help Eastboro Shopping Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Magnet East (Market and Davies)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Major (street and sidewalk reconstruction)</td>
<td>New SF ownership (8)</td>
<td>No property acquired yet for housing sites; some demolition required; infrastructure needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Magnet Gateway (California and Liberty)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Major (street, sidewalk, alley and acquisition)</td>
<td>New SF ownership (5)</td>
<td>No property acquired yet for housing or gateway; demolition required; redevelopment should greatly enhance property values; new housing sites could be kept as open space if acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE II (6-10 yrs.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Valley Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moderate (extension of Illinois Street)</td>
<td>New SF ownership (5)</td>
<td>City-owned land with platted street; houses to front park and make park less isolated and vandalized; should be public-private venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Topeka Jr. High Elderly Apts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None anticipated</td>
<td>Adaptive re-use for elderly (50-75)</td>
<td>Very difficult venture considering current ownership; reportedly still in decent shape; could become more feasible if put on National Historic Register for tax credit purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Plaza</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None anticipated</td>
<td>Rehab apartments (100)</td>
<td>Privately-owned; seek tax credits and/or funding through City; redevelop/rehab; reduce density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Street Parcels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor (local street off of 6th)</td>
<td>Elderly (20)</td>
<td>City-owned property; potential for HUD 202 or private owner development; mitigate sound from gas utility station on Wear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunga Trail View</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Moderate (various including site acquisition)</td>
<td>Redevelopment - mix of new ownership and rental (40-60)</td>
<td>Must be done on large enough scale to create viable market; major redevelopment that likely will take longer than 10 year horizon; could be accelerated if Shunga Trail opens up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Street Mixed Use</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Minor (alley repair) Moderate (streetscape)</td>
<td>New SF townhouses or live-work units (12)</td>
<td>Could have most visible impact of all housing improvement areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Single-Family Infill Design Guidelines**

A guiding principle of the Plan states, "ensure that new affordable in-fill housing maintains high quality standards that compliments the existing or preferred design character of the neighborhood".

To do that, we must identify the existing neighborhood character and a preferred character where there is none. In some instances, existing neighborhood character is probably not worth respecting because of the marginal design used in its construction, severe dilapidation, or general obsolescence. These guidelines should apply to those areas where housing character is stronger and intermingling of new and old houses is likely to occur. These guidelines do not apply to those areas projected for wholesale redevelopment where a new design standard could be established.

**Lot Sizes** – With the exception of Area 4, almost all identified housing opportunity areas involve older platted subdivisions with 25'-125'-130' lots. Typical single-family homes on urbanized blocks range from 50'-62.5' wide. More recent subdivisions in Area 4 and adjacent to Freedom Valley Park have 60' frontages. Most newer Habitat for Humanity Homes are on 75' wide lots. If a typical block was redeveloped with 75' frontages (14 homes) as opposed to 50' frontages (22 homes), it would not be as consistent with existing lot configurations nor would it be as an efficient use of land to increase population which is a stated revitalization principle of the Plan. Since most blocks will accommodate a mix of new and old house, **lot frontages for infill housing should not exceed 62.5' (2 1/2 lots).**

**Setbacks** – A recent zoning regulation amendment now permits administrative variances to front yard setbacks so long as they align with existing structures in the block and that it meets the stated goals of the Comprehensive Plan or particular Neighborhood Plan. As new infill housing intermingles with existing housing, it is particularly important to keep front setbacks uniform to give the redeveloping area market appeal and avoid front porches in neighbor's bedroom windows. It is **recommended that front setbacks be uniform within their block based on existing block front yard setbacks.**

**House Orientation** – Existing lot configurations dictate the orientation of the house. Since lots are at least half as wide as they are deep, so too should the house be typically narrower in width than depth.
Lot Access and Garages - Most new homebuyers want attached garages which usually dictate wider frontages. Very few existing homes in East Topeka currently have garages in line with the front of the house. Based on the above lot size recommendations, it will be difficult to attain an attached front loaded two-car garage. Image surveys given to the community indicate a greater preference for one-car garage or no garage in the front of the house. Two-car garages could still be attached to the side (wrap-around) or rear of the house. Accessing driveways from the street should be limited to those blocks without alleys or to one-car width for those with alleys. Where alleys are present, it is recommended that garage access be taken from the rear of the lot. Lots along 6th Street, 10th Street, and other major thoroughfares should only have driveway access from the alley if there is one. By keeping garage access limited to one-car width in the front, pedestrian circulation will be enhanced from narrower curb cuts, smaller concreted front yards, and a design more in keeping with surrounding homes.

Features - Based on community surveys, new infill homes should have a functional front porch, basement, proportionate front window/wall space, at least one steeper front-gable roof pitch, and a garage that doesn’t dominate the front of the house. While one-story homes are preferred, two-story was also rated as acceptable.

Examples of Preferred In-fill Housing Designs*

*based on community survey taken on February 9, 2002
C. Parks and Open Space

The quality of life in East Topeka is directly influenced by the quality of the neighborhood's environment, its scenic beauty, and the variety of its cultural and recreational opportunities available to area residents. Collectively, these resources not only contribute to the physical, mental, and emotional well-being of the neighborhood, but also greatly influence the perception of this neighborhood throughout the entire city.

It is the purpose of this plan to redefine and sustain new growth in the East Topeka neighborhood through a multitude of opportunities. However, left unchecked and unplanned, growth can also lead to the loss of familiar landscapes, community character, valued open spaces, and historical and treasured landmarks. Therefore, it is also the purpose of this chapter to encourage the preservation and enhancement of the area's environmental quality, and to ensure the provision of safe and functional open spaces and recreational facilities.

Needs & Recommendations

1. **Abbott Community Center** – Located at the western end of the 2.6-acre Samuel C. Jackson Park, Abbott Community Center is the primary recreational program and service provider in the East Topeka area. Because of the Center's status as a major service provider for both youth programs and senior programs alike, the Topeka Parks and Recreation Department has recognized the need for expansion to the facility, and has planned for this expansion in the City's 2008 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget.

Through preliminary evaluations, it has become apparent that an on-site expansion of the facility would be difficult, at best, due to its proximity to Jackson Park and ADA upgrades. Several options have been presented that would accommodate the needs of the Community Center in terms of space, and greatly enhance its services to the community:

- **Acquisition of the Former East Topeka Jr. High School Building** – This option would accomplish several objectives toward the revitalization of the East Topeka neighborhood. The building is located north of the current Abbott Community Center across SE 8th Street, and has been vacant since the school's closure in 1983. East Topeka Jr. High School is a valued and recognized part of the history of the East Topeka area. Its restoration and re-use as a community center would provide a singular identity to the neighborhood, and would re-connect the residents of the neighborhood with a treasured part of its past. The building is well equipped for use as a community center, and possesses such facilities as a kitchen, gymnasium, locker rooms, and athletic fields.

Although this option would require the building's re-acquisition by the City of Topeka from its current owner, and complete restoration and remodeling, such action would provide a useable, functional option for the expansion of Abbott Community Center, while simultaneously accomplishing other revitalization
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goals. However, under its present ownership, it is highly unlikely to produce a true “community” building for the public and would be more likely to compete or duplicate services already provided by Abbott.

Expansion of Abbott Community Center into Jackson Park — This action is currently being considered by the City of Topeka as the default option for the expansion of the Community Center. It has a preliminary price tag of $350,000 which is very conservative and could easily double. Expansion to the Center in its current location may have several drawbacks. Foremost among these is the fact that any expansion of the center will displace either residential homes to the west of the Center, or open-space within Jackson Park. Either option would be counter-productive to the goals and objectives of this plan. Additionally, expansion of the Center at its current location will not afford the Center any outdoor playing fields, such as football or soccer. And, finally, expanding the current facility would require additional parking, which would further erode the appearance and quality of Jackson Park.

An additional recommendation for the Abbott Community Center includes improved pedestrian access to the Center, particularly from the Shunga Trail. Pedestrian crossings should be placed across the Branner Trafficway at both SE 8th Street and SE 10th Street, with additional sidewalk improvements occurring within the neighborhood leading to the Center.

Acquisition of Parkdale Pre-School Building — Parkdale Pre-School is operated by USD 501 Public Schools and is located south of the current Abbott Community Center across SE 10th Street. USD 501 has indicated that the preschool is in need of additional space, and is seeking options for expansion or re-location of that facility. A possible solution to the expansion needs of both Abbott Community Center and Parkdale Pre-School is to swap properties. This would allow Parkdale Pre-School the opportunity to move into a larger building, while providing the relocated Abbott Community Center the needed space for expansion.
Parkdale-Pre-School is currently located adjacent to Chandler Field, also owned and operated by USD 501. If this proposed swap of properties were to occur (Abbott for Parkdale), it is possible that some portion or all of Chandler Field could be acquired by the City of Topeka for use as a park in conjunction with the relocated Abbott Community Center. Under this scenario, a gym could be added to Parkdale and achieve something the current Abbott building could not—a full size gym. Also, ADA upgrades and senior activities would be better accommodated at Parkdale because of its ground level entries. This option appears to be in the best interest of the community, City, and school district and should be pursued.

II. Chandler Field

Chandler Field is located south of Parkdale Pre-School between Chandler and Indiana Streets. The Field is owned and operated by USD 501 for use as practice fields for Topeka High School football and encompasses approximately 15 acres. The school district has expressed a willingness to move the practice field to a more central location, or perhaps to the proposed sports complex on the grounds of the former Topeka State Hospital. If the use of the field is discontinued by USD 501, the area could then be used for more public and accessible recreational uses. Therefore, it is the recommendation of this Plan that efforts be made by the City of Topeka to pursue acquisition of Chandler Field for conversion into a public neighborhood park.

Currently, the field is surrounded by a high chain-link fence that poses an unsightly barrier between the residential areas located to the east and west. The presence of the fence also prevents its use as a recreational area for area residents. Removal of the fence would allow immediate access by area residents for spontaneous recreational activities. If acquired from USD 501, the park could then be a natural asset to either Parkdale Pre-School, and/or Abbott Community Center. At the very least, a portion between the current football fields and Parkdale School have been offered to the City for use as athletic/soccer fields. This would require a lease arrangement by the City as well as some grading the site to a level playing condition.

Area children attending Abbott Community Center summer program participated in a visioning exercise with Planning Staff to project some possible uses for
Chandler Field if converted into a public park. Some of the uses identified by the children were football and soccer fields, basketball courts, BMX track, and a skateboarding area.

III. Freedom Valley Park — Freedom Valley Park is located just east of SE Indiana Street on the north side of I-70. The Park is approximately 32 acres in size, and is northern half of a large undeveloped open space that is bisected by I-70. Located to the south of I-70 is Hillcrest Park.

Freedom Valley Park is improved with a circuit trail system, a play ground and several picnic tables and grills. The most prominent feature in the park, however, is a water retention dam at the park’s northern end in which Biddle Creek flows under. Because this park is subject to flooding during periods of heavy rains, much of this park is not dependable for useable open and recreational space. It is also physically isolated from neighborhood surveillance and is often subjected to vandalism and litter. Therefore, it is recommended that the lower portions of the park be converted into a fishing lake with retention of an active playground on the elevated portion to be surrounded by new housing (see Housing section).

Although complete engineering and hydrology studies must be completed, it appears conceivable that the water retention dam could be converted to a water detention dam to permanently hold water and form a lake. The lake could then be stocked with fish to provide recreational fishing opportunities to area residents.

Additionally, because Freedom Valley Park is north of and adjacent to Hillcrest Park, pedestrian access linking the two parks is vitally important in order to provide the community-wide resources available at Hillcrest Park to residents north of I-70. It becomes increasingly important to provide various linkages to other nearby resources to reduce the isolation facing the residents of East Topeka.
IV. Ripley Park — Located between Shunga Creek and the BNSF Railroad yards, the 13-acre Ripley Park has a long history as a community gathering place, not only for residents of the East Topeka area, but for the city as a whole. Ripley is improved with lighting, a shelter house, tennis courts, a basketball court, baseball field, and a play area. The park is, however, terribly isolated.

A major factor is determining the use and success of a park designed and intended to serve the community at large is its location, visibility, and ease of access. Ripley Park, as a community park, meets none of these criteria. Several efforts can be (are being) made to use the park more — conversion of baseball diamond for soccer fields, conversion of tennis courts playing surface to basketball court, and additional picnic facilities. The extension of the Shunga Trail past Ripley Park in the next 5 years and rebuilding of a pedestrian bridge across the Shunga will also greatly help. However, the park’s inherent location and proximity to the Timberlee Apartments have severely hampered its chance at long-term success as a community park.

In order to increase the visibility and ease of access to the park, it is proposed that the alignment of SE 2nd Street be straightened across the northern portion of the park to accommodate a new employment area for light industrial uses. While the park would lose approximately 5 acres of land, the new alignment of SE 2nd Street would cause this street to be used much more as a connector street between SE Branner Street and SE Golden Street. This scenario would make the park more visible, elevate the prominence of the park in the eyes of users, and make it more cost-effective to maintain/improve for the City. Implementation of this idea would be business-driven and should not be done as speculative development.
V. Water Park – it is noted that the population of East Topeka is not sufficient to warrant many of the community recreational facilities that other nearby community centers are able to provide. None-the-less, recreational needs of East Topeka residents remain, the demand for which are compounded by the isolation of the area. During the summer months, there is a tremendous need by East Topeka residents, especially among children and young adults, to have access to a swimming pool, or other water-based recreational amenity. To substitute for a swimming pool, it is recommended that a “water park” be created next to Abbott Community Center, either in Jackson Park or in Chandler Field depending on the community center’s future location.

Water parks are above-ground facilities, equipped with fountains and spraying water jets that allow users to cool off in the water. Since the facilities are designed with no standing water, they therefore do not require the staffing needs associated with public swimming pools and are more capital intensive than staffing intensive. This would be great accessory to the Abbott Community Center and a fantastic amenity when trying to attract families to buy new housing in the targeted housing areas around Chandler Field.

VI. Shunga and Deer Creek Trails – Work is already underway by the City of Topeka to acquire the easements and rights-of-way necessary to construct a new recreational trail along the banks of Deer Creek, and also to construct the East Topeka portions of the Shunga Trail. The intent to build both trails has been
established within the adopted Trails and Greenways Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Deer Creek Trail will be located along the eastern-most boundary of the East Topeka area covered by this plan, and will provide a natural recreational resource for the entire city. As plans for the trail are completed, however, special attention should be given to pedestrian mobility across the creek, to link area residents to many of the resources lying on either side. Such resources to be considered would be the Eastboro Shopping Center, Rice Community Center, and Eastborough Park. Its eventual link to the Shunga Trail will likely be across a vehicular bridge at Golden or Strait.

The Shunga Trail will be extended within the near future eastward from its current terminus at SW Topeka Boulevard. Funding as been secured through a TEA-21 grant to extend it to SE 10th Street. From there, its location on top of the Shunga Creek levee will provide a quick, inexpensive extension through the East Topeka area to its ultimate connection with the Kansas River.

A pedestrian bridge is being constructed that will link the north and south sides of the Shunga Creek at SE Market Street. This connection will provide much improved access for area residents to both Scott Magnet Elementary School and Ripley Park. Additional pedestrian bridges should also be considered. Some accommodations for pedestrian mobility can be included with redesign and reconstruction of bridges over the Shunga Creek at SE Golden Avenue, SE 4th Street, SE Branner Street, and SE 6th Street. However, an additional pedestrian bridge should be considered between SE Golden Avenue and SE Rice Road.
VII. **Proposed Scott Magnet School Gateway** – In order to increase the prominence and visibility of Scott Magnet Elementary School to the rest of the community, a small gateway is proposed for a triangular-shaped piece of land located north of SE 6th Street, between SE California Avenue and SE Lamar Street. This ground is currently divided into three parcels, but could be acquired and converted into a public greenspace “gateway” to Scott Magnet School. California is currently under-improved and housing is very blighted on the east side of the block. It is anticipated that a traffic signal, currently located on SE 6th Street at SE Lamar Street, can be relocated to SE California Avenue and recognize SE California Avenue as the principle north-south arterial from I-70. The idea is to open up the view from the regional corridor along 6th Street and clean up it’s “front door” image so passers-by can see the wonderful investment and importance the community as placed upon Scott Magnet School. There is also an option to replace some of the blighted buildings with new housing that faces the new greenspace.

VIII. **Eastborough Park** – The 3.5-acre Eastborough Park is currently located between SE Arter Street and Deer Creek, just south of SE 3rd Street. The Topeka Parks and Recreation Department is currently in the process of acquiring additional land surrounding this park for two separate purposes. The first purpose is simply to expand the park to provide additional useable open space for area residents. The second purpose is to provide right-of-way for the construction of the Deer Creek Trail. It is anticipated that the expansion of Eastborough Park will be completed in 2002. Some other minor improvements, such as new play equipment, have been funded and needed to enhance the park since this is the only open space that serves the Northeast Sub-Area of East Topeka.
IX. Topeka Cemetery –

Although not a public recreational area, the Topeka Cemetery, none-the-less, is a valuable, familiar open-space that should be preserved and maintained along with the surrounding neighborhood. The Cemetery has beautiful grounds and spectacular elevated views of the Capital dome. The Central Highland Park Neighborhood Improvement Association recently was awarded CDBG funding to erect a decorative fence along the perimeter of the Cemetery along SE California Avenue and SE 6th Street. It is the purpose of this fencing to prevent vandalism and further deterioration of this historic cemetery and enhance its appearance.

Efforts must be supported to increase the visibility and awareness of the historical importance of this treasured landmark. The Cemetery is currently in the process of placing several structures within its grounds on the National Register of Historic Places. Once this process is completed, consideration should be given to placing the entire cemetery on the Register. In addition, in order to increase the awareness of the historical significance of this cemetery on a local, regional, and national scale, it is recommended that a “Friends of the Topeka Cemetery” be established. Such a group could aid in fund-raising to compliment restoration efforts for certain structures, and could also provide tours of the cemetery to local residents and visitors.
6th Street is the major corridor through the East Topeka neighborhood, both in terms of traffic movement and in terms of image projection of the neighborhood. 6th Street is a minor arterial street in the transportation system of the City and as such carries a significant amount of traffic, both local and commuter. The street has a blend of commercial and residential uses throughout its length in the neighborhood. 6th Street was old State Highway 40 up until the Oakland Expressway was completed in 2001 and therefore, has played an important economic development role in the history of the neighborhood and City.

This role will likely take a new direction in the future as fewer cars depend on 6th Street to get in and out of Downtown Topeka. In many ways, 6th Street is being returned back to the neighborhood. Realizing the goals of the Revitalization Plan depends in large part to the perceived health of 6th Street as the neighborhood’s most important image corridor. As part of an examination of 6th Street, issues have been raised in two categories – functionality and redevelopment strategy.

**Functionality**

In stakeholder meetings, concerns were raised that 6th Street does not function at its best when it comes to moving traffic. Where the street is only two lanes (Golden west to Branner), it seems wider than its two lanes would suggest. There can be confusion for motorists unfamiliar with the roadway and not knowing if there are two lanes or one. Also, left turn movements on the roadway tend to be problematic as cars have to stop and wait for the first car to make the left turn. This can impede traffic flow by causing cars to back up particularly when on-street parking is present.

There also are certain areas along 6th Street that could benefit by new engineering and construction. Below are recommendations related to improving the functionality of 6th Street:

**Raised Landscaped Median**

There are currently 9,000-10,000 cars per day traveling 6th Street between Golden and Branner. A landscaped median will give definition to the corridor and vastly improve this regional corridor’s image. Landscaped medians with trees were rated much higher compared to non-landscaped.

A raised median with left turn lanes will help delineate the roadway while allowing traffic to flow smoothly as cars make left turns into businesses or onto side streets. There are, however, constraints to producing this ideal situation as the width of the street will not accommodate a median, left-turn lanes and parking on both sides of the street. Between Chandler and Market the street is 50’ wide. From Market to Golden, the street is narrower than 50’. Given the current street width of 50’ back-of-curb to back-of-curb, the City’s Public Works Department has developed three options for the installation of a landscaped median on 6th Street between Chandler and Market.
**Option 1** – a landscaped median with left turn lanes and no parking on 6th Street. In the absence of parking on 6th Street, cut-back parking would be implemented on the side streets to accommodate the commercial businesses.

**Option 2** – an offset (not in the center of the street) landscaped median stubbed out (similar to Kansas Avenue downtown) with turn lanes delineated by striping and parking on one side of the street. Again, in the absence of parking on 6th Street cut-back parking would be implemented on the side streets to accommodate the commercial businesses.

**Option 3** – a landscaped median stubbed out (similar to Kansas Avenue downtown) with turn lanes delineated by striping and parking on both sides of the street. In order to get parking on both sides of the street, this option would require cutting into and paving over the grassy area on one side between the sidewalk and the street. This would provide the necessary space to add another parking lane to the street.
Lamar/California Intersection
The new Scott Magnet School (opened in 1996) sits obscured a block north of 6th Street even though it is the cultural symbol and anchor for this East Topeka neighborhood. The school lacks any sort of presence on the neighborhood’s regional roadway. A proposal has been developed that would:

♦ Relocate the traffic light from Lamar to California, making 6th & California the main signalized intersection for circulation. California is the neighborhood’s major north-south arterial street with Interstate access that should be the direct route to the school. Lamar would be a local street that dead-ends into 6th Street.
♦ Close Lamar at 6th Street and turn into greenspace.
♦ Widen California north of 6th Street from 30’ to 50’-60’ of right-of-way.
♦ Improve California from 6th Street to I-70 (3 lanes).
♦ Eliminate the dilapidated housing along California between 5th and 6th Street in favor of a new greenspace and potentially new housing. A sign for the school could be placed within the greenspace.

10th Street Convergence
6th and 10th Streets converge just west of Golden Avenue. From a safety standpoint, this non-signalized intersection poses problems to those unfamiliar with the area, i.e. commuters and those visiting the area. Traffic flow is also hindered by the intersection. The Public Works Department is working on engineering designs to improve this merging point that could include:

♦ A round-a-bout.
♦ Re-routing 10th Street traffic onto 6th Street via a new northerly connection (a 45-degree "T" intersection east of Market).
♦ Making the major turning movements at the new signalized California and 6th Street intersection.
♦ Reservation of a public right-of-way area for a landscaped gateway feature with neighborhood signage.

Rendering of proposed change where 6th and 10th Streets converge

Deer Creek Trafficway Intersection
The City of Topeka Public Works Department is currently working on a plan to improve this intersection and make it function better with the adjacent Eastboro Shopping Center. The project will:

♦ Improve the right turn curve from Deer Creek Trafficway to 6th Street.
Line up Deer Creek Trafficway with the entrance to Eastboro Shopping Center.
Necessary conduit for a traffic signal light will be installed.
The City is working with a local engineering firm on a Traffic Impact Analysis to determine if and when a traffic signal will be warranted at this location. A new traffic signal will cost between $100,000 and $150,000.

Redevelopment Strategy
Comments were voiced by the stakeholders about the potential to redevelop portions of 6th Street to create an atmosphere that is more conducive to attracting quality businesses and more residents. The intent of a redevelopment strategy for 6th Street should be to help create an image of the corridor that says "this is the place to be". The key of the redevelopment strategy is to promote preferred real estate and economic development activity along the 6th Street corridor. The general goals of this redevelopment strategy for 6th Street are as follows:

- Enhance the pedestrian environment
- Beautify the area
- Restore a traditional theme in the commercial nodes
- Rehabilitate those businesses and residences that are still viable
- Raise design standards for 6th Street frontage
- Encourage residential consistent with its mixed-use character.

Several of these goals may be achieved ultimately through changing the zoning from its current "C-4" Commercial District to "X-1" Mixed Use District along most of the corridor (see Land Use Plan). However, the remaining goals may only be achieved through private or public intervention to redevelop parts of the corridor. In order to more easily describe 6th Street for purposes of discussing a redevelopment strategy, the corridor is broken down into three geographic sections:

- Branner to Lafayette
- Lafayette to Golden
- Golden to Deer Creek Trafficway

A. Analysis of Redevelopment Potential
The analysis of the redevelopment potential of 6th Street includes an examination of all the uses along the street. In particular, it was important to identify those uses that act as anchors or are viable enough to center new development around. The analysis also includes an examination of those uses that are no longer viable, as
well as vacant lots and vacant buildings. In addition, those land uses that have the potential to act as barriers to successful redevelopment were also identified. The following is a summary of the redevelopment analysis of 6th Street.

**Branner to Lafayette**
- The dominant use in this area is commercial and contains the remnants of what was once a viable community commercial area between Branner and Lawrence. The area now has a number of vacant lots, vacant buildings and underutilized properties.
- A few of the strengths of this section of 6th Street lie in the block between Lake and Lime Streets. Several buildings could benefit from rehabilitation work. Also included as a strength in this block is the building that currently houses the El Azteca Club, as it is a building that lends character to the area.
- The major anchor in this section of 6th Street is the Salvation Army. The Salvation Army recently completed a major expansion of its facility along 6th Street. Any redevelopment strategy along this section of 6th Street should build on the significant investment made by the Salvation Army.

**Lafayette to Golden**
- The dominant land use in this portion of 6th Street from Lafayette to Swygart is residential, although this area does contain a number of auto-related uses that are scattered throughout.
- The bulk of the residential uses from Lafayette to Swygart are still viable and would benefit from some rehabilitation activities. There are also a few vacant lots that if developed for new residential uses could make a positive impact on the area.
- There are properties in this section that will negatively impact the potential for successful residential rehabilitation and redevelopment. These properties (including some car lots and open storage places) don’t present a good image to the street and don’t respect adjacent residential uses.
- Moving west from Swygart, the land uses are more commercial in nature with a few residential uses.
- An anchor in this section of 6th Street is Scott Magnet School. As discussed earlier, this school could have a better presence on 6th Street. Another potential anchor in this area is the opportunity for a new gateway to the neighborhood created by the closing of 10th Street as it merges with 6th.

**Golden to Deer Creek Trafficway**
- This section of 6th Street contains a large amount of vacant land in addition to a concentration of commercial uses from Carnahan to Deer Creek, including the Eastboro Shopping Center.
- The roadway in this section has four lanes with a middle turn lane.
- Traffic turning movements in and out of Eastboro Shopping Center can be unsafe.
- A major barrier to successful residential development in this area is located at 6th and Wear. There is a gas utility station that hisses very loudly all year.
The effect of this is significant as there is a large amount of vacant land immediately adjacent to the property.

B. Redevelopment Scenarios

The actions listed in this section are offered to present potential scenarios for redevelopment of certain portions of 6th Street. The emphasis of this section is to provide alternatives for redevelopment that could benefit the neighborhood. It is important to note that a successful redevelopment strategy needs to include the City, non-profit organizations, and private entities. The City’s role should be in assembling property for developers, eliminating blight, making the necessary public improvements that will help foster redevelopment, and supporting those developers willing to take on a project that fits the goals of this plan.

Branner to Lafayette

Given the number of vacant buildings, underutilized properties and vacant lots, this area is a prime candidate for commercial/mixed use redevelopment that could make a positive impact on the 6th Street Corridor. The area west of the Salvation Army has the feel of a "main street" that once was. Many of the remaining commercial buildings are built right up to the street, which contributes to the pedestrian feel of the area. Any commercial/mixed use redevelopment in these blocks needs to build upon this design feature. In addition, the building which currently houses the El Azteca Club has a unique design which adds character to the area. Future buildings could build on the design theme offered by this building.

Any commercial development in this area must go hand-in-hand with new residential development, as getting more people living in East Topeka is a major goal of this neighborhood revitalization plan. A concentration of more people along the corridor will make commercial development more viable. Potential redevelopment ideas are listed below:

- One potential area for new development is the vacant L-shaped shopping complex on the northwest corner of side of 6th and Lake and the vacant lots west of it. Redeveloping this area by designing a building in the traditional manner so that it presents itself to the street will create a more pedestrian friendly environment that

Potential redevelopment of the northwest corner of 6th and Lake. Important design features to note are the parking lot placed behind the building and the front of the buildings built right up to the sidewalk.
is more like a traditional downtown setting. Placing the parking lot to the rear of the building will allow the building to have its doors right on the sidewalk. The following image shows a potential project at 6th & Lake.

- Another potential area for redevelopment starts on the southwest corner of 6th and Lime and includes the dilapidated houses and vacant lot to the west. This area could be redeveloped as a mixed-use development with retail/commercial uses at street level and residential above. Introducing more dense residential will contribute to the vitality of the commercial uses in the area and will also make the area more active at all hours. The following images demonstrate a potential project at 6th & Lime.

---

Potential redevelopment of the southwest corner of 6th and Lime. This shows a mixed-use project with street-level commercial on 6th with residential above, and residential in the southern building as well. Access to the residential will be from the interior courtyard. The photos below demonstrate this project.
The introduction of new buildings into an area will be more effective if accompanied by rehabilitation activities. Some of the buildings in this commercial portion of 6th Street, particularly those in the block between Lake and Lime, are still viable and should be preserved. These buildings could benefit from rehabilitation and façade treatment. As these buildings are improved along with the construction of new buildings a viable commercial/mixed use district should emerge.

Lafayette to Golden
Residential uses dominate this portion of 6th Street and therefore, residential redevelopment will be the goal in this area. The effective strategy here will include new construction on vacant lots, rehabilitation of existing residences and steps to eliminate the barriers to success in this area. The following are ideas for this area of 6th Street:

- There is a large vacant lot on the northeast corner of 6th and Liberty and another vacant lot across the street. The blocks that share these vacant lots are residential. New residential development would fit very nicely here.
- The Scott Magnet School gateway with greenspace and potential new housing that has been mentioned before.
- The commercial redevelopment of the “triangle” from east of California between 6th and 10th could be more easily accomplished with the suggested change in traffic turning movements and relocation of the traffic signal to California and 6th Street. A former grocery store and open lots of automotive related uses dominate these blighted blocks.

A priority for redevelopment in this area should be to purchase those properties that currently are barriers to successful redevelopment. Code enforcement has not been successful in getting these properties to contribute positively to the neighborhood and 6th Street. Out-right purchasing of the properties and marketing to private or non-profit developers will be the most effective solution to the problem.

Golden to Deer Creek Trafficway
As stated earlier, the dominant land uses in this area are vacant lots. 6th Street was improved in this area recently and has four lanes plus and middle turn lane. This area also includes the Eastboro Shopping Center and other commercial uses. Given the large amount of vacant land, build-out street infrastructure, and proximity to a large commercial area, this area could be developed for higher density residential uses.

- Prime places to start in this area are on the parcels of land already owned by the City, near 6th and Golden and 6th and Sherman. The problem, however, with the property at 6th and Sherman is the adjacency of the gas utility yard that hisses day and night. Steps need to be taken to mitigate the impact of
that on the surrounding properties before new residential is placed on the vacant property in the area.

Urban Design Recommendations

- Parking
  A parking lot should never be the focus from the street. Parking should be moved to the rear of buildings or be extensively screened from the street. Angled-parking should not be permitted along 6th Street.

- Pedestrian Lighting
  New decorative pedestrian lighting will help define the corridor as a special and safe place to be.

- Streetscape
  Public investment in a pedestrian oriented streetscape will complement redevelopment efforts. Landscaped medians, repaired/new sidewalks, brick crosswalks, decorative lighting, and neighborhood banners/signs should be included in the overall development strategy.

- Landscaping
  Landscaped setbacks and parking areas helps contribute to the pedestrian-friendliness of the corridor and its visual quality.

- Signage and wayfinding
  Signs for offering navigational assistance include road signs, kiosks, maps and other tools.
E. Circulation and Infrastructure

Traffic and pedestrian circulation within East Topeka is defined by street grid system that is adequate to meet most of the needs of the existing residential neighborhood, but lacks capacity to serve much future growth in the southeast and northeast sub-areas. A detailed infrastructure analysis for infill housing areas was performed by the Public Works Department and is found in the Appendix.

The area has excellent Interstate access with three exits off of I-70 (Adams/Branner, California, and Deer Creek). Formerly State Highway 40, 6th Street is the principle east-west arterial and is used by local businesses and residents as access to downtown. Alleys are prevalent only in the southwest and northeast sub-areas. The Topeka-Shawnee County Transportation Plan identifies five arterials in the planning area – SE 6th Street, SE California, 10th, SE Deer Creek Trafficway, SE Branner Trafficway. Branner Trafficway is a principle arterial with the largest annual average daily traffic (AADT) volumes as summarized in the table below. Deer Creek Trafficway at 6th Street and the merging of 6th Street and 10th Avenue had the most accidents of any intersections in East Topeka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Accidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE Deer Creek Tfwy &amp; 6th</td>
<td>Principle Arterial</td>
<td>5,374**</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Gray St &amp; 6th &amp; 10th</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>7,235**</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE California &amp; 10th</td>
<td>Principle Arterial</td>
<td>5,764**</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Branner Tfwy &amp; 6th</td>
<td>Principle Arterial</td>
<td>9,419**</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Golden &amp; 6th</td>
<td>Principle Arterial</td>
<td>12,374**</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Topeka City Engineer (1997**) and (2000*)

Public transportation exists along three bus routes as depicted on the map below.
Sub-Area Recommendations
Improving circulation and safety for all modes of transportation is essential to the quality of life in any neighborhood. Discouraging major traffic through quiet residential settings and directing that traffic to employment and shopping areas is a guiding principle of the Plan. Similarly, commercial establishments in the area require ease of access for their customers. Several guiding principles of the Plan help set the priorities for circulation and infrastructure improvements. This section categorizes recommended improvements by sub-area as it relates to these priorities:

\[ S = \text{Safety} \]
\[ IH = \text{Infill Housing} \]
\[ ED = \text{Economic Development} \]
\[ P = \text{Parks} \]
\[ CA = \text{Community Anchors} \]

Many of the infrastructure improvements mentioned below have specific cost estimates as provided by the Engineering Division of the Public Works Department (see Appendix). Those cost estimates correlate to delineated “in-fill housing areas” as described in the Housing section of this Plan (Map #7).

Northwest Sub-Area

Boundaries: BNSF line, Shunga Creek, 6th Street, and Market.

Sidewalk Priorities

- Repair and construct as needed sidewalks/ramps leading to Scott Magnet School particularly for arterial/collector streets (e.g., 4th Street, California, 6th Street) and Housing Opportunity Area #5. (CA, IH)
- Repair and construct as needed sidewalks/ramps leading to Ripley Park and future Shunga Trail. (P)
- Pedestrian bridge at Swygart/Shungi Creek connecting area around Scott Magnet School to residences north of the Shunga Creek, Ripley Park, and the future Shunga Trail. (P)
- Reconstruct sidewalks as needed upon redevelopment of Housing Opportunity Area #7. (IH)

Street Priorities

- Return Lafayette Street and Leland Street to two-way circulation pattern to reduce speeding. (S)
- Establish “truck route” bypass for Midway Wholesale trucks and other heavy trucks to 2nd Street just east of Branner utilizing City-owned property. (ED, S) or
- (see right) Add islands or corner bump-outs at edge of local streets along 2nd Street (Lake, Lime, Lawrence, Klein, and Hancock) so that trucks cannot enter local residential streets. (S)
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✓ Extend 2nd Street east through Ripley Park and connect to California Street to support future development and to provide alternative route to Oakland Expressway/Interstate access. This extension should only be pursued to secure a bona-fide development that generates sufficient new jobs and tax base. It should not be done speculatively. Intersection of 2nd and Golden Street may require a traffic signal in the future. (ED)
✓ Smooth out railroad crossings at 10th Street and 4th Street. (S, CA)
✓ (see right) Cul-de-sac Lamar at 6th Street, relocate traffic signal from Lamar to California, and improve California to be the primary access for traffic to Scott Magnet School. Also refer to “Parks and Open Space”, “6th Street”, and “Housing” sections of the Plan for more detail. (CA, IH, S)

Infrastructure Priorities
✓ Concrete repair of 4th Street.
✓ Correct drainage on Lime between 2nd and 3rd.

Southwest Sub-Area

Boundaries: I-70, California Avenue, Shunga Creek, and 6th Street.

Sidewalk Priorities
✓ Repair and construct as needed sidewalks/ramps leading to Abbott Community Center and Chandler Field (future park) within Housing Opportunity Area #1. Those blocks identified as priorities for infill housing in the next 1-4 years should be top priority. (CA, IH)
✓ Repair and construct as needed sidewalks/ramps leading to Freedom Valley Park and Shunga Trail (e.g., 10th Street). (P)

Street Priorities
✓ (see right) Reconstruct 14th Street and Indiana Avenue configuration to improve lack of sight distances. (S)
✓ Improve California Street to three-lane minor arterial to link 6th Street/Scott Magnet School to I-70 while accommodating future development in the southeast sub-area. (ED, CA)
✓ Return Lime and Lawrence Streets to two-way circulation pattern to reduce speeding. (S)
Infrastructure Priorities
✓ Curb repair on Liberty between 6th and 10th Streets.

Northeast Sub-Area

Boundaries: Deer Creek, 6th, BNSF tracks, and Market.

Sidewalk Priorities:
✓ Repair and construct as needed sidewalks/ramps leading to Scott Magnet School from the east particularly for arterial/collector streets (e.g., 4th Street, 6th Street) and Housing Opportunity Areas #4. (CA, IH)
✓ Construct as needed sidewalks/ramps leading to Eastborough Park (see Arter/5th Street at right), Deer Creek Trail (future), and Eastboro Shopping Center. (P, CA)
✓ Construct new sidewalks in Housing Opportunity Area #5. Some streets are of inadequate right-of-way for a standard residential street with sidewalks classification. Additional donations (at no cost to the City) will be required on portions of the east side of Golden Avenue and on portions of the west side of Alkire Avenue. (IH)

Street Priorities
✓ Extend a street connecting Golden and Strait Street to support future industrial development. This extension should only be pursued to secure a bona-fide development that generates sufficient new jobs and tax base. It should not be done speculatively. 2nd Street and Golden intersection may require a traffic signal in the future. (ED)
✓ Realign intersection of 6th Street and Deer Creek Trafficway to better align with Eastboro Shopping Center. See “6th Street” section of the Plan for more discussion. Close access to Eastboro Shopping Center at 5th Street/Arter and re-locate TMTA bus route that currently goes through parking lot. (ED, S, CA)
✓ Extend High Street and Carnahan Street to 6th Street. There is no dedicated right-of-way for either street that must be acquired at cost to the City. (IH)

Infrastructure Priorities
✓ Concrete curb repair on Golden between 4th and 6th Streets.
Southeast Sub-Area

Boundaries: I-70, Deer Creek, California Avenue, and 6th Street.

Most of the streets in the southeast sub-area have inadequate right of way for standard residential streets with sidewalk classification. Additional donation of 10' of right-of-way will be required on both sides of all north-south streets except Highland Avenue, Golden Avenue and Deer Creek Trafficway. Likewise, an additional donation of 10' of right-of-way will be required on both sides of all east-west streets between Curnahan and the alley west of Gilmore (5' east to Golden Avenue). 6th Street is adequate. The cost of improving all these streets is extremely prohibitive based on stated priorities. Absent a massive housing redevelopment undertaken for most of the area or selected infill development over the next 10 years, sidewalk and street priorities are limited to the following:

Sidewalk Priorities:
✓ Construct as needed sidewalks/ramps leading to future Deer Creek Trail (e.g., 10th Street), Eastboro Shopping Center (e.g., Deer Creek Trafficway), and recreational fields (e.g., Golden). (P, CA)

Street Priorities
✓ Reconstruct 10th/6th Street intersection. Also see "6th Street". (S).
✓ Improve Deer Creek Trafficway from I-70 to SE 6th Street and re-align with Eastboro Shopping Center entrance. Install traffic signal at intersection. (S, ED, CA)
✓ Improve 10th Street east of Deer Creek Trafficway for new employment opportunities. (ED)
✓ Investigate need for traffic humps on Tefft past Eastboro Shopping Center. (S)

Infrastructure Priorities
✓ "Red-water" main replacement completed by 2001 from Highland to Curnahan.
✓ Mill and overlay of California Street from I-70 to 6th Street completed.
✓ Storm sewer improvement on Long Street south of 10th Street completed in 2001.
✓ Develop sanitary sewer interceptor in 2002 along Deer Creek and coordinate easement purchase for future trail.
F. Economic Development

(Note: Some of the following recommendations pertaining to commercial retail development may be revised dependent upon the outcome of a market study for the Eastboro Shopping Center.)

During the latter half of the 20th Century, the East Topeka area experienced a significant decline in its economic health. Although some jobs remain, the number of employment opportunities in the area has declined. Similarly, the numbers of people employed has also declined, as have average household incomes. Demographically, the East Topeka area has the highest percentage of households at or below poverty level of any area in the city of Topeka.

This lack of jobs and income is reflected in the general appearance of the neighborhood. A high percentage of homes are in deteriorated condition, and new investment in the community has been lacking. It is therefore of critical importance that a plan be established to reverse the economic trends of this area, and to encourage new growth and investment in East Topeka. This section of the Plan outlines several steps to encourage new employment opportunities for area residents, and to stimulate new investments from entrepreneurs, and from new and existing businesses.

In terms of economic development, the overall goal of this chapter is to increase opportunities within East Topeka for employment and wealth generation. Unfortunately, a high percentage of East Topeka residents are unemployed or underemployed. There are a number of reasons for this situation. Many unemployed or underemployed residents do not possess the skills required by area businesses. Many others lack transportation to jobs outside the area. Still others are faced with the decision of working, or looking after their families if they cannot find adequate child care services. Perhaps most significantly, however, is a lack of employment opportunities in the area that are available for area residents. In any case, low employment levels inevitably handicap the ability of the area residents to accumulate wealth and income.

Therefore, this plan is offering a set of strategies to encourage the development of new businesses and employment opportunities for area residents, and to better enable individuals to enter the workforce.

Strategy 1. Support Entrepreneurship Within the Context of the East Topeka Neighborhood Plan. A principle factor affecting the ability of area residents to start new businesses is easily affordable property that is zoned appropriately for commercial activity. It is the intent of this plan to establish the SE 6th Street corridor as a mixed-use development district that will allow one's ability to live and work within the same building/property, or within easy walking distance. The mixed-use concept will encourage adaptive re-use of existing buildings, and will allow the construction of new buildings that maintain the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood.
Go Topeka is working towards creating a one-stop small business loan program that offers a micro-loans targeted towards entrepreneurs. The City of Topeka and Shawnee County jointly have agreed to reserve 10% of a 1/4 cent sales tax for economic development initiatives exclusively for women and minority-owned businesses. This is especially vital to many immigrant entrepreneurs who are locating in the rapidly growing “Little Mexico” community of East Topeka and Oakland. With the influx of new Hispanic immigrants, a demand has been created for ethnic foods, clothing, and other goods.

In addition, a revolving loan fund dedicated just for East Topeka is being established through the repayment of $156,000 in CDBG funds that were used to improve the Eastboro Shopping Center in 1998. Another $94,000 targeted for that initiative remains unused at this time. It is imperative that this fund and accompanying program guidelines be implemented as soon as possible to jump start small business needs in East Topeka through a qualified management organization that may or may not be community-based.

**Strategy II. Recruit Businesses to the Area that can Utilize Skills of the Existing Workforce While Providing Needed Services.** While there is a need within East Topeka for workforce training, there still remains a sizeable portion of the population that does possess useable skills that can be used by area businesses. At the same time, however, the number of opportunities for these individuals to find work within the area is lacking. Because a lack of businesses and employment opportunities exists within the area, also lacking are services that these businesses provide.

To help reverse this situation, the City of Topeka is conducting a retail market study focused primarily on the Eastboro Shopping Center and the immediate surrounding area. It is the intent of this market study to identify potential businesses and services that could thrive within the East Topeka market. New businesses within the area can thus provide both jobs for individuals, and services to the entire community.

A second potential opportunity for new business recruitment is within the proposed Highland Meadows development. Highland Meadows is proposed for the intersection of I-70 and SE Rice Road. While not physically within the East Topeka planning area, this 84 acre development is anticipated to offer a number of retail, office, and service opportunities for area business owners and employees.

**Strategy III. Provide Land in Sufficient Quantities for the Location of Larger Commercial and Industrial Developments in Targeted Locations Within the Area.** The East Topeka area is home to several larger corporations, such as Reeser’s Fine Foods, Payless Shoe Source, and Farmland (recently closed) that provide jobs to area residents. However, the 6th Street and I-70 corridors are poised for significantly more growth as a result of the newly opened Oakland Expressway. In order to accommodate the growth
that is needed by the City of Topeka in general, and East Topeka in particular, it is incumbent upon the City of Topeka and Shawnee County to target that growth in strategic locations that serve both new and expanded businesses, and the surrounding neighborhoods. The City of Topeka must determine and designate ample parcels of land, zone the land accordingly, and ensure the provision of all city services such as sewer and water, in order to lure new businesses to the area.

It must be ensured, however, that this growth be targeted to specific locations. Growth left unchecked and unplanned can result in the decline of residential areas. While new higher paying jobs are a primary objective of this plan, the investment that brings those jobs to the area should be simultaneous with, and parallel to new investment in residential neighborhoods, as well.

The Land Use chapter of this plan delineates several areas targeted for major employment growth. These areas are summarized as follows:

1. Undeveloped area east of SE Golden Avenue, north of Shunga Creek.
2. Intersection of SE 6th Street and Deer Creek Parkway.
3. Triangle formed by SE California Avenue, SE 6th Street, and SE 10th Street.
4. Branner Trafficway from I-70 to Branner Street Bridge.

The dedication of these areas, once zoned appropriately for office, commercial, and industrial uses will provide substantially more land than currently exists within the East Topeka area for new job growth.

Strategy IV. Increase Opportunities for Workforce Training for the Unemployed and the Underemployed. Workforce training is a critical element necessary for the economic revitalization of the East Topeka area. There are several institutions in the City of Topeka that provide some forms of workforce training. However, few of these institutions offer this training within East Topeka.

The skills needed by businesses from their employees varies widely depending on the product or service offered by that business. The tremendous influx of Spanish-speaking residents to the area over the last 10 years has prompted a new need. Clearly, a working knowledge of the English language is foremost among necessary skills. There are several organizations, such as churches and USD 501 that currently offer English language training.

Equally important is the need for adult basic education and literacy programs. Far too many individuals, for a variety of reasons, have not completed high school or obtained a high school diploma. GED classes are available, but funding for these programs is perpetually lacking, and the classes are often inaccessible for many residents. Efforts must be increased.
to reach every individual desiring a high school diploma or GED. It is critical that organizations offering English language and GED training work together to coordinate their efforts and maximize the impact of the services they offer.

Also needed by today's employers are basic computer skills. Word processing has replaced typing as the most basic of skills needed for office employment. Spreadsheets have replaced ledgers. In short, technology is now an ever-changing element in nearly every job available. Employees must be afforded the opportunity to gain and update computer skills in order to compete successfully in the workforce.

As noted earlier, training in these areas does exist within the city of Topeka. Few of these opportunities, however, are available within the East Topeka area, where demand for these services is especially high. To correct this deficiency, those providers of workforce skills training programs should consider providing these services through satellite locations within the East Topeka area. Some service providers that should consider this action are Kaw Area Technical School, private trade schools such as Topeka Technical College and Bryan Career College, USD 501, and Washburn University.

The YWCA and Topeka Youth Project also offer job training and job readiness classes that can be offered in varied locations. Locations to consider for these satellite classes are Eastborough Shopping Center, Rice Community Center, Abbott Community Center, Salvation Army, and local churches.

**Strategy V. Increase the availability of Transportation Services for Individuals that Work Outside the East Topeka area.** While increasing opportunities for entrepreneurship and employment within the East Topeka area is a primary goal of this Plan, it is also recognized that many individuals currently living in East Topeka are employed in jobs outside the area. It is also recognized that more opportunities outside the area will exist in the future than can be generated within the planning area for East Topeka. In order to maximize the ability of individuals to work outside of the East Topeka area, existing transportation services must improved, and more options made available.

Public transportation is currently available in the East Topeka area, but only between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. (See Appendix for current Bus Routes). The only public bus service available during evening hours, Sundays, or holidays is through the Topeka Metropolitan Transit Authority's (TMTA) evening and Sunday reservations service. This service is targeted towards to those who must often work outside normal business hours and is available till 11:30 p.m. A "Lift Bus" picks-up and drops-off curb-to-curb if a reservation is made by 5:00 p.m. the day prior to service. Its cost ($2 one-way) is two and one-half times the cost of normal service making repeated use costly for lower-income citizens.
Many individuals desiring to work but who lack skills are forced to work in jobs that are often outside traditional day-time business hours. Many factory jobs are on rotating shifts that begin or end after 11:30 p.m. Unfortunately, for those individuals that lack independent transportation, their ability to travel to job locations is greatly diminished by the limited hours of operation by public transportation services. This deficiency not only prevents many individuals from entering the workforce, it also prevents the incomes generated by these individuals from reaching East Topeka, thus furthering the economic decline of the area. Transportation deficiencies also limit the workforce available to employers who are located outside the area.

Based on input received at meetings for the plan, it is recommended the TMTA survey the East Topeka community to gauge the level of support for regular service in off-hours even if it is for limited or express routes and implement if found to be more cost effective than the reservation system. TMTA should also work on a public information campaign to better market their evening/Sunday services to East Topekans in general. The funding for the reservation system was for 3 years through a Congressional appropriation. It is recommended at a minimum that similar funding be sought to continue the current reservation service.

**Strategy VI. Increase Child Care Services for Single Parents and Dual-Income Households.** In many instances, individuals must make a painful choice between working to support their families, or not working because of a lack of adequate or affordable child care services. For single-parents, this is especially difficult when no other family member or other child care service provider is available that would enable them to leave home to attend a job.

Most day-care services within the City of Topeka are available only during normal day-time hours. However, many individuals and parents are employed in jobs outside these hours. Since child care services offered during evening and night-time hours are more expensive than during daytime hours, often the cost of providing child-care service is greater than the wages earned by the parent. In these situations, it is more cost-effective for the parent simply to accept welfare as an alternative to working, thus enabling the parent to stay home with his/her children, negating the need to pay for the child care services.

Affordable, dependable, and convenient child care services are a crucial element of a successful vibrant economy. While parents are working, there simply must be someone tending to their children. In an environment where a substantial number of working parents possess limited skills or are forced to work non-traditional hours, the lack of day-care services greatly limits the ability of the economy to function at its maximum potential.

Therefore, more child-care service providers in the East Topeka area are encouraged, particularly those that can offer services beyond normal day-
time hours. Those service providers already in the area, such as the Abbott and Rice Community Centers, Parkdale Pre-School, churches, and the Salvation Army, should consider expanding their hours to encompass more evening hours and weekends.
G. Community Building

Community building is an important aspect of neighborhood revitalization because its focus is on making the neighborhood a stronger advocate for itself. Empowering the residents and organizations of a neighborhood with the notion they can foster change that impacts the neighborhood in a positive manner is one of the goals of community building. Some of the principles of community building are:

♦ Build on community strengths
♦ Support families and children
♦ Foster broad community participation
♦ Forge partnerships through collaboration
♦ Value cultural strengths

This chapter of the plan will focus on three aspects of community building: organizing, safety, and youth and education.

I. Organizing

An organized neighborhood can be a strong advocate for itself. A neighborhood that can show it is willing to stand up for itself is a neighborhood that a force for change.

A. Umbrella Organization

♦ Form an umbrella group, built off the plan’s stakeholders group, to work on a regular basis to foster change in the neighborhood. The group would work in the political, public and private systems to champion the plan and make sure everyone is helping to implement it and move East Topeka forward.
♦ Among the things this organization can be responsible for is generating positive press releases for the media to help counter the negative press often linked to the neighborhood. This group could also work to encourage new businesses to locate within the neighborhood.
♦ This group could be known as “ETOPA” – East Topeka Improvement Alliance.
♦ Maintain strong communications between all stakeholders.

B. Collaborate to form partnerships

♦ Building community requires work by all sectors – local residents, community-based organizations, businesses, schools, religious institutions, health and social service agencies – in an atmosphere of trust, cooperation and respect. It will take time and committed work to make this collaboration more than rhetoric.
♦ Groups need to take a serious look at solving service overlap problems so that help can be delivered to the neighborhood in a more efficient manner.
♦ Support training and education to help stakeholders build local organizational capacity to deliver services such as housing and youth programs.
♦ Work with Kansas State University in applying for a Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) grant through HUD to help facilitate technical assistance from faculty and students in relation to housing/homeownership, small business development, youth services, and organizing.

C. Christmas in April
♦ Petition the Christmas in April organization to focus on a part of East Topeka each year to do an all-out housing rehabilitation blitz.
♦ This volunteer effort will demonstrate pride in the neighborhood and will encourage others to take ownership in their neighborhood.

D. History
Using the history of East Topeka as a means to revitalize the neighborhood goes along with the community building principle of building on community strengths. Looking back at the past can identify local landmarks and sites of historic significance. These sites can then be used as focal points within the neighborhood that residents can point to with pride and use to celebrate past accomplishments.
♦ The first step in this process needs to be a survey of the neighborhood to determine what is historically significant. The Kansas State Historical Society provides grants to perform these surveys similar to what the City has done in North Topeka and Collins Park.
♦ The Topeka Cemetery is a historical gem for the neighborhood and Topeka. Promoting the cemetery as a tourist destination with walking tours should be emphasized. Support their nomination as a local landmark and for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

II. Safety
A major goal of this Plan is to: create a safe and clean environment for all those in East Topeka to live, learn, work, and play. A crime problem is a multifaceted problem. There is no magic solution that is going to erase a crime problem. There are things, however, that people can do to reverse the negative cycle and begin to reclaim their neighborhood. Foremost among those is getting people to take ownership in their neighborhood. This will go a long way towards making an area unattractive for criminals.

A. Neighborhood Patrols
♦ The neighborhood should contact Safe Streets to help them set up a neighborhood patrol program.
♦ Stroll Patrols put people out walking the neighborhood. Neighborhood activity by residents discourages criminal activity.
B. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)
- Safe Streets and the Police Department can help the neighborhood determine which property layouts in the neighborhood encourage crime. There are ways to design property and neighborhood layouts to help prevent criminal activity.
- Support adoption of site plan ordinance requiring CPTED principles be enforced for new development.

C. Lighting
- A well-lit area is not attractive to the criminal element. A street lighting plan to increase lighting in the Southwest sub-area is being implemented by the City of Topeka Public Works Department to help in the targeted in-fill housing areas.
- Consider pedestrian lighting along major thoroughfares (e.g., 6th or 10th Streets) that connect to parks and community facilities.

D. Neighbor to Neighbor
The "broken windows" theory explains that little things such as a broken window or a unkempt porch at one property can leach out to other properties as people begin to feel that no one cares about what's going on. The problem will continue to grow block by block, street by street, until it reaches the point where the whole neighborhood is suffering from decline.
- Volunteer "neighbor to neighbor" programs can address smaller housing maintenance issues – painting, porches, gutters, etc. – that prolong life of existing housing stock and prevent the "broken window" cycle.

E. Enhanced Police Presence
The neighborhood should encourage the Topeka Police Department to establish a "satellite precinct" in East Topeka. It would be a place where the police officers working in the neighborhood could do their paperwork and make phone calls. More importantly, people (good and bad) in the neighborhood would know where the ongoing police presence is.
- The City occasionally acquires dilapidated housing in East Topeka. A new program could be created by which the City would rehab an old house which then would be used to accommodate a satellite precinct. The house would continue to be used as a precinct until that time another house is acquired by the City. Once that new house is rehabilitated, the police precinct will move into it. The previous house will then be used as an affordable home for a new homeowner. The effect of this program would be that the police precinct would move to different streets in the neighborhood and dilapidated homes will be rehabilitated into viable single family homes. There may be a need to
amend the zoning code and access grant programs in order for this program to work.

♦ Perhaps a local resident, or non-profit serving the neighborhood has a home they would like to donate to the City for this purpose.
♦ Eastboro Shopping Center also has vacant space available that could be used as a police precinct.

III. Youth and Education

Youth are critical for the ongoing revitalization of the neighborhood. As these children grow up and are faced with choices about where to live, they are going to be more inclined to stay in the neighborhood if they had good experiences growing up in a place that provided a positive environment. If East Topeka is “kid friendly”, it will have the two-fold benefit of attracting/retaining families in the short-term and becoming assets to the community in the long-term. Scott Magnet School must work to be seen as successful both inside and outside its walls with the community.

Adult education is also an issue in East Topeka. There is a large immigrant Hispanic population in the neighborhood that would benefit from programs that provide them language training and other types of educational assistance. Some actions include:

♦ Support after-school programs at Scott Magnet School through the 21st Century Program.
♦ Support expanded capacity of the Abbott Community Center to offer mentoring, tutoring, and recreational support of youth in the neighborhood.
♦ Encourage youth to help with neighborhood clean-ups.
♦ Continue adult tutoring and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs at Scott Magnet School.
♦ Develop a mural or art project within the community utilizes the talents of youth.
Implementation
VI. IMPLEMENTATION

"So long as you are headed in the right way and don’t stand still, it doesn’t make much difference where you begin to push first"  
Frederick Law Olmstead, Jr., A City Planning Program (1913)

The purpose of this section is to provide a summarized “framework for action” that outlines how the community’s vision for East Topeka can be realized over the next 10-15 years. This section should be used by all stakeholders to guide their decision-making in determining prioritization and responsibility of actions recommended in the Plan.

A. Target Areas

Many of the actions fall into several strategic geographic target areas. By combining several major actions within a concentrated area of a neighborhood, a greater cumulative impact can be realized than if they were dispersed throughout the larger planning area. The actions detailed below represent “major” actions for each area.

This targeted-comprehensive approach will be highly visible, leverage more private investment, build momentum, protect public investments, and accelerate the revitalization of the specific area. In this manner, it is intended that multiple target areas can be simultaneously being worked on in various stages of completion. Once the first area is “finished”, the majority of the public investment can then be shifted to the second area, then the third, etc. The housing costs below represent subsidies from City Consolidated Plan funding (CDBG/HOME) and are intended to leverage private dollars. They do not represent total development costs. Costs for infrastructure and parks reflect City-bonded capital costs from sources typically found within the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), unless otherwise indicated.

Infrastructure = includes repaired/new sidewalks, curbs, alleys, pavement, etc.
Infill housing = acquisition, demolition (if needed), construction, sale to homeowner
Rehab minor = grants to property owners up to $10,000
Rehab major = acquisition, gut rehab, re-sale to homeowner; similar subsidy as infill

#1 Chandler Field Area  
(SE sub-area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Fill Housing (10th to 12th, Branner to Lafayette) (30-40 units including Habitat)</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME/CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab Minor (10th to 12th, Branner to Lafayette)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab Major (10th to 12th, Branner to Lafayette)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill/Rehab (remainder of Area 1) (10-15 units including Habitat)</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>CDBG/CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Topeka Jr. High (elderly)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Tax credits/202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Park</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Field conversion to Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CIP/CDBG/501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott Center Expansion</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bidwell Creek Nature Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streets and Circulation</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure (10th to 11th, Bronner to Lafayette)</td>
<td>414,000</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure (11th to 12th, Bronner to Lafayette)</td>
<td>385,000</td>
<td>CDBG/CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure (remainder of Area 1)</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>CDBG/CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Street (I-70 to 10th)</td>
<td>870,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Infill housing property should be acquired by the City and RFP'd to potential CBDOs. Minor rehab should follow in-fill housing using representatives of the NIA to promote it. Because of the various options for location of an expanded Abbott Center, a physical site plan for Jackson Park and Chandler Field should be prepared by the Parks Dept. prior to implementing any parks projects. This should show the spatial relationships between the activities and users envisioned for this area. Indiana Street should be improved in conjunction with conversion of Chandler Field for parking and pedestrian access.

---

**#2 Scott Magnet School Area**
(NW and NE sub-areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME/CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>CDBG/CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Infill housing property should be acquired by the City and RFP'd to potential CBDOs. Minor rehab should follow in-fill housing using representatives of the NIA to promote it. Infill housing at Scott Gateway Park should follow California/6th Street intersection project. Acquire buildings as they become vacant.

---

**#3 Eastboro Area**
(NE sub-area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>TEA-21/CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Absent a major rehab buyer, vacant Bentwood buildings should be incrementally acquired and demolished with goal of advancing a new housing construction project (possible 202 elderly?). Minor rehab should follow using representatives of the NIA to promote it.
### #4 Sixth Street Corridor
(all sub-areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Area I</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab Minor/Major</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Area II</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab Minor/Major</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streets and Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Street: Golden to California</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Merging of 6th/10th (e.g., roundabout)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landscaped medians/Left-turn lanes/Ped lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Street: California to Chandler</td>
<td>522,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landscaped medians/Left-turn lanes/Ped lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Land acquisition of potential housing redevelopment should occur prior to major infrastructure work to clear blighted properties and limit cost of acquisition. New housing or mixed-use development may occur at any time.

### #5 Freedom Valley Park Area
(SW sub-area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Fill Housing (6 units - mixed income or market rate)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME/Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Topeka Fishing Lake</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Valley Park Playground/Green</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streets and Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure (Illinois Street Extension)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Infrastructure must be in place before infill housing can take place. Lake improvements should also occur after infrastructure.

### #6 Ripley Park Area
(NW sub-area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment for In-Fill Housing (Area 6 - Shunga Trail View; 40-60 units)</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab Minor/Major (4th to 2nd, Line to Chandler)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberlee Apartments Rehab or Redevelopment</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunga Trail Extension to Ripley Park</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley Park Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streets and Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Route Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>CIP/Oper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure (Infill Housing for Area 6)</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Infill housing property should be acquired by the City and RFP'd to potential CBDOs or developers. Infrastructure should be in place prior to new housing being built. Minor rehab should follow in-fill housing using representatives of the NIA to promote it.
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#7 Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Rehab Paradise Plaza Apartments</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>CDBG/HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California: 6th to I-70</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Creek Trafficway: I-70 to 21st</td>
<td>2,640,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE sub-area infrastructure (Area 3)</td>
<td>5,200,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE sub-area infrastructure (Area 4)</td>
<td>4,700,000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is not so critical to determine the sequencing of actions when there is such a vast need in East Topeka, some actions are advisable before others and require more thought. In the case of safety-related projects, those can be occurring at any point in the plan’s implementation and will naturally have more of a priority. Infrastructure projects should be sequenced to coincide with support of a particular economic development project and may be move up or back depending on the timing. In terms of housing development, it is advisable to have the City acquire sites for new housing prior to the installation of new sidewalk and street improvements. This will discourage speculation by land owners, lower costs to the City or other developers for acquisition, and ensure that the City’s investment in infrastructure is capitalized on.

B. Key Action Priorities

The community was surveyed at a February 9, 2002 meeting to determine their priorities for implementing specific strategies and actions of this plan. The actions below are organized based on the rankings received at that meeting (179 votes) as well as the stakeholder meetings held since March 2001. They are not necessarily inclusive of all potential actions, but a checklist of some of the more major actions that should be undertaken.

Level A Actions (Address these before others)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Plan as part of Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert Chandler Field to Neighborhood Park and Recreation Space</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Shunga Trail and Deer Creek</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Use East Topeka Jr. High</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development-Attract New Employers to Area</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Lake at Freedom Valley Park</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastboro Shopping Center Improvements</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill Housing Target Areas: Chandler Field, Scott Magnet, 6th Street, etc.</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downzone From Heavy Commercial (C4) to Mixed Use (X1) on 6th Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downzone From Two-Family Residential (M1) to Single-Family Residential (R2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella Organization (ETOPIA)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Level B Actions (Secondary, but still can be worked on)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Activities</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve California to 3-Lanes between I-70 and 6th Street</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka Cemetery Preservation</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better/More Variety of Retail Services in Neighborhood</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Park Improvements (Ripley, Eastborough, Jackson)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Bus Service Times</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation: &quot;Christmas in April&quot; or Other Volunteer Effort</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Programs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill Housing With Design Guidelines</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make 6th Street/10th Street Merge Safer</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Patrols</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Sidewalks and Curbs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Level C Actions (Hold off until more of A and B get accomplished)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gateway Park&quot; to Scott Magnet School (Lamar/California/6th)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Street Beautification (Landscaped Medians, Pedestrian Lighting, Blight Removal, Left-Turn Lanes, etc.)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Paving</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education/ESL</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Housing</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Abbott Community Center</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Loans for Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite Police Station</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill Housing Target Area: Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Rate Housing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic/Truck Calming</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix
Future Neighborhood Park

Antonette Walker

10th Avenue

Chandler Avenue

Indiana Avenue
Help Your Community

Lend a helping hand to make our community a whole lot better.

By Graciela Munoz
Things won't change without helping hands...

By: Amanda Oegen
Help community and lip make it better.

By: Amanda
East Topeka Infrastructure Improvements Cost Estimates, to Accommodate In-Fill Housing

Area 1-A, Bounded by Interstate Highway 70, Branner Trafficway, SE 10th St, SE Chandler St.

Estimates were made for proposed improvements to permit in-fill housing, to provide paved streets, storm sewers, sidewalks, sanitary sewers and water lines to those rights of way within the boundaries of this area. The objective is to provide standard urban services and infrastructure to the entire area without improvements to the existing standard infrastructure, or improvements to service level maintenance. Existing pavements and sidewalks are not scheduled for replacement unless badly deteriorated and beyond a reasonable cost to repair or maintain. These situations are noted as deteriorated, remove and replace. Additionally, approximately 10% of the curb and gutter in the area is badly deteriorated or missing and is listed as a separate item. Surface maintenance of existing pavements is not included as an improvement, nor is addition of ADA compliant sidewalk ramps to existing sidewalks. The storm sewer systems on existing paved streets are considered as adequate for this estimate as well as are the existing sanitary sewer systems. Sanitary sewers and water line extensions are estimated only for those areas that will require service addition. Upgrades to the existing sanitary sewer and water distribution systems are provided through maintenance of these systems and Red-Water Correction Improvements and are not included as improvements here.

Sanitary Sewer:
Overton Street, from Washington Street to 350' west $22,750

Water Lines for this area are considered adequate $0

Pavement - 27' back of curb to back of curb, concrete curb and gutter, 8'' asphalitic concrete pavement, storm sewer and sidewalks:
Brady Street, from 12th Street to 100' south of 13th Street $90,160
13th Street, from Brady Street to Washington Street $58,800
Branner Street, from 14th Street to Vine Street $69,776
Vine Street, from Branner Street to Chandler Street $72,520
Chandler Street from Vine Street to 14th Street $109,620

Remove and Replace Deteriorated Pavement - 27' back of curb to back of curb, concrete curb and gutter, 8'' asphalitic concrete pavement, storm sewer and sidewalks:
14th Street, Washington Street to Chandler Street $245,680

Rehabilitate Pavement - Remove and replace curb and gutter, mill and Overlay pavement, remove and replace sidewalks:
13th Street, from Washington Street to Chandler Street $76,500
Remove and Replace Curb and Gutter, ± 1700' $34,000

Construct Sidewalk:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East and West sides of Washington Street, from Branner Trafficway to North line of Interstate Highway 70</td>
<td>$40,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East side of Hancock Street, from 10th Street to 11th Street</td>
<td>$8,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East side of Chandler Street, from 10th Street to 14th Street</td>
<td>$24,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North side of 11th Street, from Washington Street to Hancock Street</td>
<td>$3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North side of Wood Street, from Chandler Street to west, 300'</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North side of 11th Street, 500 feet in block from Branner Street to Chandler Street</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North side of Overton Street, from Branner Trafficway to Chandler Street</td>
<td>$20,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South side of Overton Street, Branner Trafficway to Washington Street</td>
<td>$5850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and South sides of 12th Street, form Chandler through cul de sac east of Branner Trafficway</td>
<td>$47,205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction** $942,061

**10% Contingencies** $94,206

**Total Construction** $1,036,267

**Engineering Fees @ 6.19%** $64,145

**Project Service Fees @ 8%** $82,901

**Right of Way Acquisition (easements to be donated at no cost)** $0

**Contingency Amount @ 3%** $31,088

**Interim Interest @ 6%** $72,864

**Project Total** $1,287,265
East Topeka Infrastructure Improvements Cost Estimates, to Accommodate In-Fill Housing

Area 1-B, Bounded by Interstate Highway 70, SE Chandler St., SE 10th St., Topeka Cemetery and Biddle Creek Storm Water Detention Area

Estimates were made for proposed improvements to permit in-fill housing, to provide paved streets, storm sewers, sidewalks, sanitary sewers and water lines to those rights of way within the boundaries of this area. The objective is to provide standard urban services and infrastructure to the entire area without improvements to the existing standard infrastructure, or improvements to service level maintenance. Existing pavements and sidewalks are not scheduled for replacement unless badly deteriorated and beyond a reasonable cost to repair or maintain. These situations are noted as deteriorated, remove and replace. Additionally, approximately 5% of the curb and gutter in the area is badly deteriorated or missing and is listed as a separate item. Surface maintenance of existing pavements is not included as an improvement, nor is addition of ADA compliant sidewalk ramps to existing sidewalks. The storm sewer systems on existing paved streets are considered as adequate for this estimate as well as are the existing sanitary sewer systems. Sanitary sewers and water line extensions are estimated only for those areas that will require service addition. Upgrades to the existing sanitary sewer and water distribution systems are provided through maintenance of these systems and Red-Water Correction Improvements and are not included as improvements here.

Sanitary Sewers for this area are considered adequate $0

Water Lines for this area are considered adequate $0

Pavement - 41' back of curb to back of curb, concrete curb and gutter, 8"
Reinforced concrete pavement, storm sewer and sidewalks:
Indiana Avenue, from 10th Street to Interstate Highway 70 bridge $869,400

Pavement - 27' back of curb to back of curb, concrete curb and gutter, 8"
asphaltic concrete pavement, storm sewer and sidewalks:
11th Street, from Indiana Avenue to Lime Street $25,480
12th Street, from Lime Street to Lawrence Street $54,880
11th Street, from Locust Street to Lafayette Street $54,880
Lafayette Street, from 10th Street to 150 feet south of 11th Street $166,600
14th Street from Lake Street to Indiana Avenue $39,200

Construct Curb and Gutter:
North side of 13th Street, from Illinois Street to Locust Street $10,800

Remove and Replace Curb and Gutter, ± 900' $18,000

Construct Sidewalk:
North side of 14th Street, from Chandler Street to Lake Street $40,500
East and West sides of Lake Street, from 14th Street to dead end 250' south $7,500
South side of 10th Street, from Lime Street to Topeka Cemetery $21,000
North and South sides of 11th Street, from Lime Street to Locust Street $18,000
North and South sides of 12th Street, from Indiana Avenue to Lime Street $3,900
North side of 12th Street, from Lawrence Street to Locust Street $4,500
North and South sides of 13th Street, from Indiana Avenue to Locust Street $22,950
South side of 14th Street, from Illinois Avenue to Locust Street $6,300
East side of Illinois Avenue, from 14th Street to dead end 220' south $3,300
East and West sides of Lime Street, from 10th Street to 13th Street $53,100
+ 400' on West side of 1000 block of Lawrence Street $6,000
East side of Lawrence Street, from 10th Street to 11th Street $9,450
+ 200' on East side of 1100 block of Lawrence Street $3,000
+ 400' on West side of 1000 block of Locust Street $6,000
East side of Locust Street, from 10th Street to 11th Street $9,450
+ 300' on East side of 1100 block of Locust Street $4,500
East and West sides of Locust Street, from 12th Street to 13th Street $17,100
East side of Locust Street, from 13th Street to 14th Street $6,300

Construct Sidewalk/Retaining Wall:
South side of 12th Street, from Lawrence Street to Locust Street $15,000
East and West sides of Lawrence Street, from 12th Street to 13th Street $57,000
Construction $1,554,010
10% Contingencies $155,401
Total Construction $1,709,411

Engineering Fees @ 6.04% $103,248
Project Service Fees @ 8% $136,753
Right of Way Acquisition (easements and right of way to be donated at no cost) $0
Contingency Amount @ 3% $51,282
Interim Interest @ 6% $120,042
Project Total $2,120,736
East Topeka Infrastructure Improvements Cost Estimates, to Accommodate In-Fill Housing

Area 3, Bounded by SE 10th Street, Golden Avenue, SE 6th Avenue, Deer Creek Trafficway

Estimates were made for proposed improvements to permit in-fill housing, to provide paved streets, storm sewers, sidewalks, sanitary sewers and water lines to those rights of way within the boundaries of this area. The objective is to provide standard urban services and infrastructure to the entire area without improvements to the existing standard infrastructure, or improvements to service level maintenance. Existing pavements and sidewalks are not scheduled for replacement unless badly deteriorated and beyond a reasonable cost to repair or maintain. These situations are noted as deteriorated, remove and replace. Surface maintenance of existing pavements is not included as an improvement, nor is addition of ADA compliant sidewalk ramps to existing sidewalks. The storm sewer systems on existing paved streets are considered as adequate for this estimate as well as are the existing sanitary sewer systems. Sanitary sewers and water line extensions are estimated only for those areas that will require service addition. Upgrades to the existing sanitary sewer and water distribution systems are provided through maintenance of these systems and Red-Water Correction Improvements and are not included as improvements here.

NOTE: Most of the streets in this area are of inadequate right of way for a standard residential street with sidewalks classification, Additional donations of 10' of right of way will be required on both sides of all North to South streets except Highland Avenue, Golden Avenue and Deer Creek Trafficway. Additional right of way donations of 10' will be required on both sides of all East to West streets, from Carnahan Avenue to the alley west of Gilmore Street, and additional right of way donations of 5' will be required on both sides of all East to West streets, from the alley east of Highland Avenue to Golden Avenue. Right of way is adequate on SE 6th Avenue and SE 10th Street. DONATIONS WILL BE CONSIDERED AS AT NO COST TO THE CITY.

Sanitary Sewers for this area are considered adequate

Water Lines for this area are considered adequate

Pavement - 27' back of curb to back of curb, concrete curb and gutter, 8" asphaltic concrete pavement, storm sewer and sidewalks:

Highland Avenue, from 6th Avenue to 10th Street $531,480
Gilmore Avenue, from 6th Avenue to 10th Street $531,480
Wear Avenue, from 6th Avenue to 10th Street $531,480
Sherman Avenue, from 6th Avenue to 10th Street $531,480
Carnahan Avenue, from 6th Avenue to 10th Street $531,480
7th Street, from Golden Avenue to Carnahan Avenue $372,860
8th Street, from Golden Avenue to Deer Creek Avenue $424,360
9th Street, from Golden Avenue to Carnahan Avenue $372,860
Construct Sidewalk:
North side of 10th Street, from Golden Avenue to Deer Creek Trafficway $35,600
East side of Golden Avenue, from 6th Avenue to 10th Street $49,000
Construction $3,827,480
10% Contingencies $382,748
Total Construction $4,210,228

Engineering Fees @ 5.48% $230,720
Project Service Fees @ 8% $336,818
Right of Way Acquisition (easements and right of way
to be donated at no cost) $0
Contingency Amount @ 3% $126,307
Interim Interest @ 6% $294,219
Project Total $5,197,880
East Topeka Infrastructure Improvements Cost Estimates, to Accommodate In-Fill Housing

Area 4, Boundary described as: beginning at SE 6th Avenue and Tefft Avenue; west on SE 6th Avenue; north on SE, Golden Avenue; east on SE 2nd Street; south on SE Woodland Avenue; east on SE 3rd Street; south on SE Tefft Street to SE 6th Avenue.

Estimates were made for proposed improvements to permit in-fill housing, to provide paved streets, storm sewers, sidewalks, sanitary sewers and water lines to those rights of way within the boundaries of this area. The objective is to provide standard urban services and infrastructure to the entire area without improvements to the existing standard infrastructure, or improvements to service level maintenance. Existing pavements and sidewalks are not scheduled for replacement unless badly deteriorated and beyond a reasonable cost to repair or maintain. These situations are noted as deteriorated, remove and replace. Surface maintenance of existing pavements is not included as an improvement, nor is addition of ADA compliant sidewalk ramps to existing sidewalks. The storm sewer systems on existing paved streets are considered as adequate for this estimate as well as are the existing sanitary sewer systems. Sanitary sewers and water line extensions are estimated only for those areas that will require service addition. Upgrades to the existing sanitary sewer and water distribution systems are provided through maintenance of these systems and Red-Water Correction Improvements and are not included as improvements here.

NOTE: Some of the streets in this area are of inadequate right of way for a standard residential street with sidewalks classification. Additional donations of right of way will be required on portions of the East side of Golden Avenue and on portions of the West side of Alkire Avenue. DONATIONS WILL BE CONSIDERED AS AT NO COST TO THE CITY. In addition, this estimate envisions opening High Street and Carnahan Street to SE 6th Avenue. In those areas where there is no dedicated right of way for either street, right of way must be acquired AT COST TO THE CITY.

Sanitary Sewers for this area are considered adequate  $0

Water Lines:  
High Street, South end of existing right of way, south over new right of way, to SE 6th Ave; SE Alkire Ave, SE 5th St, to SE 6th St;  
Carnahan Street, SE 3rd St to SE 6th Ave; 2nd St Terr, SE Alkire St to Woodland Ave.  $122,000

Pavement - 27' back of curb to back of curb, concrete curb and gutter, 8" asphaltic concrete pavement, storm sewer and sidewalks:  
SE High Street, from SE 2nd St, to SE 6th Ave  $519,400  
SE Alkire Street, from SE 2nd St, to SE 6th Ave  $519,400  
SE Woodland Ave, from SE 3rd St, to SE 6th Ave  $368,480  
SE Carnahan St, from SE 3rd St, to SE 6th Ave  $368,480  
SE Tefft St, from SE 3rd St, to SE 5th St  $250,880  
West half of SE Woodland Ave, from Se 2nd St, to SE 3rd St  $136,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE 2\textsuperscript{nd} St, from SE Woodland Ave, to cul de sac between SE Golden Ave and SE High St</td>
<td>$273,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 2\textsuperscript{nd} St Terr, from SE Golden Ave, to SE Alkire St</td>
<td>$135,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 2\textsuperscript{nd} St Terr, from SE Alkire St, to SE Woodland Ave</td>
<td>$135,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 3\textsuperscript{rd} St, from Alkire St, to SE Woodland Ave to north</td>
<td>$135,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South half of SE 3\textsuperscript{rd} St, from SE Woodland Ave, to SE Tefft St</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 4\textsuperscript{th} St, from SE High St, to SE Alkire St</td>
<td>$76,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 5\textsuperscript{th} St, from SE Golden Ave, to SE Alkire St</td>
<td>$135,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct curb and gutter:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East side of Golden Avenue, from SE 6\textsuperscript{th} Ave, to SE 4\textsuperscript{th} St</td>
<td>$33,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct Sidewalk:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and South sides of SE 4\textsuperscript{th} St, from SE Golden Ave, to SE High St</td>
<td>$9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East side of Golden Avenue, from 6\textsuperscript{th} Avenue to 4\textsuperscript{th} Street</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$3,361,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Contingencies</td>
<td>$336,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction</td>
<td>$3,698,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees @ 5.59%</td>
<td>$206,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Service Fees @ 8%</td>
<td>$295,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Acquisition (see note above)</td>
<td>$166,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Amount @ 3%</td>
<td>$110,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Interest @ 6%</td>
<td>$268,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,747,187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Topeka Infrastructure Improvements Cost Estimates, to Accommodate In-Fill Housing

Area 6, Bounded by SE 6th Avenue; an alley between SE Leland Street and SE Liberty Street; Shunganunga Creek; an alley between SE Davies Street and SE Burr Street

Estimates were made for proposed improvements to permit in-fill housing, to provide paved streets, storm sewers, sidewalks, sanitary sewers and water lines to those rights of way within the boundaries of this area. The objective is to provide standard urban services and infrastructure to the entire area without improvements to the existing standard infrastructure, or improvements to service level maintenance. Existing pavements and sidewalks are not scheduled for replacement unless badly deteriorated and beyond a reasonable cost to repair or maintain. These situations are noted as deteriorated, remove and replace. Surface maintenance of existing pavements is not included as an improvement, except to Davies Street between 4th Street and Shunganunga Creek, nor is addition of ADA compliant sidewalk ramps to existing sidewalks. The storm sewer systems on existing paved streets are considered as adequate for this estimate as well as are the existing sanitary sewer systems. Sanitary sewers and water line extensions are estimated only for those areas that will require service addition. Upgrades to the existing sanitary sewer and water distribution systems are provided through maintenance of these systems and Red-Water Correction Improvements and are not included as improvements here.

NOTE 1: California Avenue from SE 6th Avenue to SE 5th Street is excepted from this estimate for improvement purposes. A separate estimate has been prepared for this improvement, including probable right of way acquisition and relocation costs.

NOTE 2: Approximately 10% of the curb and gutter on existing paved streets is badly deteriorated and in need of replacement. A line item is shown for this.

Sanitary Sewers and Water Lines for this area are considered adequate. $0

Pavement - 27' back of curb to back of curb, concrete curb and gutter, 8" asphaltic concrete pavement, storm sewer and sidewalks:
SE California Avenue, from SE 4th Street, to an intersection with SE Liberty Street $98,880
SE Swygart Avenue, from SE 4th Street, to Shunganunga Creek $90,640
SE Market Street, from SE 4th Street, to Shunganunga Creek $72,100
SE Market Street, from SE 6th Street, to SE 4th Street $278,100
SE 5th Street, form SE Liberty Street, to SE California Avenue $72,100
SE 5th Street, from SE California Avenue, to SE Market Street $164,800
SE Gabler Street, from SE Market Street, to SE Davies Street $47,380

Overlay Existing Concrete Pavement:
SE Davies Street, from SE 4th Street, to Shunganunga Creek $3,360

Remove and Replace Curb and Gutter (10% estimated of entire area, existing paved streets) $34,000
Construct Sidewalk:
East and West sides of SE Liberty Street, from SE 6th Street, to SE 3rd Street: $41,850
East side of SE Lamar Street, from SE 6th Street, to SE California Street: $6,900
East and West sides of SE Swygart Street, from SE 6th Street, to SE 5th Street: $18,300
East and West sides of Davies Street, from SE 6th Street, to Shunganunga Creek: $48,600
North and South sides of SE 3rd Street, from SE Leland Street, to SE Liberty Street: $11,520
North and South sides of SE 4th Street, from SE Leland Street, to SE Liberty Street: $8,400
North side of SE 4th Street, from SE Swygart Street, to SE Market Street: $5,100
North and South sides of SE 4th Street, from SE Market Street, to SE Burr Street: $13,800
North and South sides of SE 5th Street, from SE Market Street, to SE Burr Street: $13,800
SE Gabler Street, from SE Davies Street, to SE Burr Street: $9,300
SE 6th Avenue, from SE California Avenue, to SE Market Street: $14,400

Construction: $1,039,530
10% Contingencies: $103,953
Total Construction: $1,143,483

Engineering Fees @ 6.19%: $64,347
Project Service Fees @ 8%: $83,162
Contingency Amount @ 3%: $31,186
Interim Interest @ 6%: $79,331
Project Total: $1,401,509
East Topeka Infrastructure Improvements Cost Estimates, to Accommodate In-Fill Housing

Area 2 Bounded by Shunganunga Creek, an alley between SE Chandler St and SE Branner St., SE 4th St., an alley between SE Lime St and SE Lawrence St

Estimates were made for proposed improvements to permit in-fill housing, to provide paved streets, storm sewers, sidewalks, sanitary sewers and water lines to those rights of way within the boundaries of this area. The objective is to provide standard urban services and infrastructure to the entire area without improvements to the existing standard infrastructure, or improvements to service level maintenance. Existing pavements and sidewalks are not scheduled for replacement unless badly deteriorated and beyond a reasonable cost to repair or maintain. These situations are noted as deteriorated, remove and replace. Surface maintenance of existing pavements is not included as an improvement, nor is addition of ADA compliant sidewalk ramps to existing sidewalks. The storm sewer systems on existing paved streets are considered as adequate for this estimate as well as are the existing sanitary sewer systems. Sanitary sewers and water line extensions are estimated only for those areas that will require service addition. Upgrades to the existing sanitary sewer systems are provided through maintenance of these systems and are not included as improvements here.

Sanitary Sewers for this area are considered adequate $0

Water Lines/Replace Mains:
Chandler, Lake and Lime Streets, from 4th Street to 5th Street; 5th Street, from Lime Street to alley west $63,000

Pavement - 27' back of curb to back of curb, concrete curb and gutter, 8" asphaltic concrete pavement, storm sewer and sidewalks:
5th Street, from Chandler Street to alley west $31,360
5th Street, from Chandler Street to Lake Street $58,880

Remove and Replace Curb and Gutter:
South side of 4th Street, from alley west of Chandler Street to Lime Street $19,000
West and East sides of Chandler Street, from 4th Street to Shunganunga Creek $22,400
West and East sides of Lake Street, from 4th Street to 5th Street $18,400
West and East sides of Lime Street, from 4th Street to 5th Street $18,400
North side of 5th Street, Lake Street to Lime Street $6,000

Construct Sidewalk:
South side of 4th Street, from alley west of Chandler Street to Lime Street $13,000
North and South side of 5th Street, from Lake Street to Lime Street $7,950
North side of 5th Street, from Lime Street, 90' east $1,350
West and East sides of Chandler Street, from 4th Street to 5th Street $13,800
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West and East sides of Chandler Street, from 5th Street to Shunganunga Creek</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West and East sides of Lake Street, from 4th Street to 5th Street</td>
<td>$13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West and East sides of Lime Street, from 4th Street to 5th Street</td>
<td>$13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$303,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Contingencies</td>
<td>$30,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction</td>
<td>$333,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees @ 7.50%</td>
<td>$25,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Service Fees @ 8%</td>
<td>$26,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Acquisition (easements and right of way to be donated at no cost)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Amount @ 3%</td>
<td>$10,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Interest @ 6%</td>
<td>$23,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>$419,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND USE(Parcels %)</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family Residential</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/Utility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total(Parcels)</td>
<td>(612)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Property Size</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family sq. ft.</td>
<td>6,887</td>
<td>6,761</td>
<td>12,727</td>
<td>15,746</td>
<td>9,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family sq. ft.</td>
<td>13,326</td>
<td>9,451</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,250</td>
<td>9,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family sq. ft.</td>
<td>29,958</td>
<td>8,083</td>
<td>69,583</td>
<td>168,109</td>
<td>84,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land sq. ft.</td>
<td>7,193</td>
<td>8,041</td>
<td>50,205</td>
<td>18,345</td>
<td>15,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings(Units)</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>2,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Conditions(by property)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Deficiencies</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Deficiencies</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Deficiencies</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Density (units/acre)</th>
<th>7.7</th>
<th>1.9</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (units/acre)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family (units/acre)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family (units/acre)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Tenure (%)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied Units</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Units</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Units</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraised Property Values (2000)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$12,078</td>
<td>$15,371</td>
<td>$19,350</td>
<td>$22,143</td>
<td>$91,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family</td>
<td>$23,025</td>
<td>$16,946</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,185</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>$90,392</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$186,026</td>
<td>$549,312</td>
<td>$2,082,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraised Property Values (2000)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family</td>
<td>$38,800</td>
<td>$55,400</td>
<td>$77,590</td>
<td>$91,500</td>
<td>$91,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>$42,700</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$469,000</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>$2,082,000</td>
<td>$2,082,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>