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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This book identifies a number of important insights intended to drive the Wichita: Places for People project forward and provide a foundation for future decision making and investment within the Established Central Area.

The Visual Scan identified a large proportion of the ECA's assets located in or near the Central Business District, or Downtown. While the gridded block pattern generally provides good connectivity throughout the ECA, there are many real or perceptual edges that discourage walking or biking into the Downtown area from other neighborhoods. Kellogg Avenue, for instance, is a major edge that runs horizontally through Wichita's ECA, dividing the north portion of the city, containing Downtown and most of the ECA's assets, from the south. There are also a number of vertical edges throughout the ECA, both man-made and natural, including thoroughfares which are difficult to cross by foot, and rivers.

The data analysis has uncovered concentrations of population decline, low household and per capita incomes, and unemployment, generally within the same neighborhoods. Understanding where challenged neighborhoods are located helps focus reinvestment efforts targeted at strengthening public infrastructure, real estate conditions, and social capital. Many of these concentrations are located within the 1940s city boundaries, concentrated in the oldest parts of the ECA and Wichita which have experienced the most disinvestment. In contrast, neighborhoods on the periphery have experienced sustained growth and new development since the mid-century era. In order to increase capacity in struggling neighborhoods, it is important to consider locations of public transportation routes and stops, employment centers, concentrated crime, sidewalks, and bicycle routes.

Some zoning issues have been addressed through the application of overlay districts, containing specific rules to key areas. Most development, however, operates under the city's zoning regulations, affecting the form in which development takes shape, as well as the use of a place. In addition, the existing patterns of blocks and lots can affect the character of the development form in commercial and industrial areas. In general, the block patterns outside the 1940s city boundaries are larger than the traditional city area. In Wichita, height restrictions can be limiting for smaller lots in the older parts of town, since additional height allowances are linked to the physical size of a parcel and its capacity to accommodate additional height. While additional height can be favorable for developers, the regulations steer development to occur on larger lots, which are available outside of the ECA's core. Large lots are not typically recommended for building walkable places. Moving forward, it will be important that the city has enabled regulations which aid in the production of walkable and human-scale places for people, and a strong and supported development community.

In addition to the zoning regulations, current decision-making in Wichita is guided by the Wichita Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, the Wichita Pedestrian Master Plan, the 2017 Development Trends document, and the Wichita Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan Update 2016. These documents collectively inform this planning process, as well as provide information and guidance to the city about the community's values, ongoing trends, and civic goals, challenges, and opportunities.
A “Visual Preference Survey” was conducted to gauge the types of walking environments and buildings that are appropriate in certain contexts. Overall, walking environments with the highest scores had quality pedestrian amenities and plenty of space for people to move freely. The width of the street also played a role in how comfortable people felt, where wider streets received lower scores from survey participants. To facilitate street crossing, respondents preferred environments with additional pedestrian amenities, including signage, raised crosswalks, flashing beacons, or median islands. Most of the proposed building types received positive responses. However, larger proportions of the participants did not prefer the contemporary duplex house or the larger apartment buildings, contributing their low scores to the character and size of the building types. Of the positive responses, small-scale residential building types were mostly identified as appropriate anywhere within a neighborhood. Large-scale residential buildings, such as apartment buildings, and commercial buildings were mostly identified as appropriate in Downtown, at the edges of neighborhoods, or along busy streets. The public participation process also consisted of a Visioning Summit, where citizens of Wichita and the ECA were invited to share their thoughts through individual and group exercises. A mapping exercise uncovered areas that were important to the meeting participants.

This book concludes with a summary of the opportunities and challenges facing the ECA, identifying the status of neighborhoods based on the layers of demographic, socioeconomic, economic, building condition, and market data, as well as field observations.
INTRODUCTION

The Community Profile has been prepared to provide an overview of the information gathered and to provide a better understanding of the current state of Wichita’s Established Central Area, or “ECA”. The information is for reference and is intended to engage the residents and stakeholders in thinking about the current opportunities and challenges within the community as well as a desired future for the Wichita ECA.

The ECA study area boundaries include Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. While many of the existing ECA neighborhoods remain strong, many areas within the ECA may benefit from infill development opportunities.
CHAPTER 1.

ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA PROFILE

To assess the existing conditions of Wichita’s Established Central Area, data has been gathered, analyzed, and is presented throughout Chapter 1. This community profile is arranged in three parts: the Visual Scan, highlighting assets inside the ECA and a Lynchian Analysis of the area; a thorough Data Analysis, covering market conditions, development frameworks, and walkability; and the Document Review, featuring land use policies, recent development trends, as well as information about street network typologies.
There are a number of asset located within the Established Central Area of Wichita, many of which are located in or near Downtown. Although government facilities are available to the south and east of Downtown, most cultural attractions or sports venues are limited only to neighborhoods close to Downtown.
LYNCHIAN ANALYSIS

Kevin Lynch was a planner and writer from Chicago, Illinois, who created an analysis to focus on the physical form of places. He specified five identifiable elements: paths (traveling corridors, streets, trails), edges (boundaries, built or natural, real or perceived), districts (large portions of the study area with a shared identity), nodes (centralized focal points, such as an activated intersection), and landmarks (objects that may enable wayfinding or reference to one’s location in the city).

While not scientific, this analysis allows us to better understand the existing context of Wichita’s Established Central Area, and how a new direction for development can be geared towards enhancing the existing environment.
INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of the following analysis is to create a market-based framework for identifying areas of opportunity within the ECA. Elemental to this framework is an understanding of various development issues. The ECA is a large area (62 acres) that is diverse in many ways—development types, income levels, race, and other factors. Some neighborhoods are very stable and require minimal public investment to support new development. Others face a multitude of challenges that require a more holistic approach consisting of investments in people (community development), investments in jobs and innovation (economic development), and investments in infrastructure and buildings (real estate and public realm development).

The ECA remains an important area within Wichita:
- It makes up 40 percent of the city’s land area,
- It is home to 54 percent of the city’s residents and 56 percent of its households,
- Nearly 70 percent of all jobs in the city are located within its boundaries, and
- 44 percent of all retail sales in the city occur in the ECA.

1940’S CITY

Much of the ECA was also constructed before 1940—the 1940s City represents an area built before the proliferation of the automobile. Many older, traditional neighborhoods were built as walkable communities. In Wichita, suburban-style infill projects and disinvestment have reduced walkability in some portions of the ECA, yet a walkable framework remains.

The criteria used for analyzing the ECA are:
- Demographics: population, households, income, and employment
- Building conditions: vacancies, code violations, and age
- Market indicators: rents, values, and investment trends

Sources: © ESRI Market Profile and Retail Market Place reports (2017), U.S. Census Bureau On-The-Map data
DEMOGRAPHICS

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

A comparison of demographic trends is summarized in Demographic Trend Comparison for the ECA, the area outside of the ECA, but still within the city of Wichita, Wichita, and Sedgwick County. Key observations include:

- The ECA contains most of Wichita’s population and households, yet is projected to grow at a slower rate than the other geographies.
- The median age in the ECA is less than the area outside of the ECA.
- A lower proportion of residents in the ECA have bachelor’s degrees or a higher level of education than in the other geographies.

POPULATION DENSITY

The Population Density map shows that the ECA contains some of the most densely populated areas in the city. The darker areas tend to have a higher concentration of multi-family properties and some of the light areas are employment centers, retail developments, or industrial areas. The ECA has denser development patterns than areas outside of the ECA.
Population Change 2000 - 2017

Projected Population Change 2017 - 2021

**POPULATION CHANGE**

The Population Change maps show areas of historic population loss and gain, as well as projected trends over the next five years based on data provided by ESRI. Population growth and decline was scattered throughout the ECA from 2000 to 2017. Key blocks of growth include Downtown, far northeast portions of the ECA, and scattered neighborhoods in south Wichita. Pockets of losses are generally in the near northeast area, south of Downtown, and near southeast Wichita.

According to population projections provided by ESRI, large portions of the ECA are anticipated to gain population from 2017 to 2022, including much of the 1940s City, the northeast portion of the ECA, and the west portion of the ECA. Concentrated pockets of loss are also projected. Nonetheless, recent growth in the core of the ECA is projected to continue and other areas that historically lost population are projected to begin to gain population. The projections incorporate recent trends in permit activity, U.S. Postal Service delivery data, and other metrics, and generally reflect the long-term impacts of current development activity. That is, there are many developments currently under construction that will add population to some of these areas.
HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

A comparison of household trends is summarized in Household Trend Comparison for the ECA, the area outside of the ECA, but still within the city of Wichita, Wichita, and Sedgwick County. Key observations include:

- The ECA has a significantly lower median household income the other geographies.
- The ECA is expected to gain households during the next five years, although at a slower rate than the other geographies.
- The ECA has a smaller household size than the other geographies.
- There are more renter households in the ECA, which reflects the higher concentration of multifamily properties compared to the other areas.

HOUSING UNIT DENSITY

The Housing Unit Density map shows where more dense neighborhoods are—densely developed neighborhoods are generally spread through the ECA. When compared to the Renter Occupied Housing map, many of the densest neighborhoods also have a high proportion of renter households.
RENTER OCCUPIED HOUSING DENSITY

The pockets of higher density in the ECA indicate concentrations of multi-family housing, which is typically occupied by renters in the Wichita market. There is a small for-sale condominium market, but it is limited because of the relative affordability of the single-family market.

VACANT HOUSING DENSITY

Areas with higher concentrations of vacant housing tend to be in places that contain more multi-unit and renter-occupied housing types. While some housing vacancy is needed to allow residents to change residencies, concentrated vacancy can point to challenges in neighborhood health.
The Median Household Income and Per Capita Income maps show the geography of household incomes in the ECA. Generally, the ECA contains concentrations of low-income households, particularly within the 1940s City boundary. High income neighborhoods are concentrated in the east/northeast and northwest portions of the ECA.
Several economic metrics were also scanned to gain a better understanding of the ECA. First, job growth within the ECA was compared to growth in Wichita from 2005 to 2015. As shown in Job Growth Comparison, both geographies lost a significant number of jobs during the Great Recession. However, the number of jobs in the City of Wichita rebounded and increased by 15,000, or 8 percent, over the 2005 number. The number of jobs in the ECA decreased slightly over this period. This has implications for buildings and people—increases in vacancies typically impact neighborhood conditions, while a decrease in jobs can limit residents’ access to employment options.

Percent of Total Employment by Industry
EMPLOYMENT CONCENTRATIONS

Concentrations of employment sectors vary from the ECA to Wichita to the U.S. For instance, 15 percent of all jobs in the ECA are in the manufacturing sector, compared to 12 percent in Wichita and 10 percent in the U.S. The healthcare sector provides 14 percent of all jobs in the ECA, equivalent to the U.S. share, but higher than Wichita’s share. This sector is particularly important because it is considered a growth sector nationally, and should continue to provide a variety of jobs in the ECA.

Jobs in the ECA are concentrated in the Central Business District and, around Via Christi St. Francis, Via Christi St. Joseph, and Wesley Medical Center, as well as Wichita State University and the southwest industrial area. Unemployment concentrations have important implications regarding access to employment options. The largest concentration of unemployment is in the near northeast portion of the ECA, with other concentrations scattered throughout. Generally, there are concentrations of unemployment in areas where job density is lower—there is a spatial mismatch. Many of the neighborhoods with high unemployment also have low income—improving connectivity to job centers is an important means to improve the economic conditions of these areas.
Neighborhoods with a high number of code violations tend to also have concentrations of housing vacancy. These issues mirror demographic and socioeconomic challenges. As unemployment, low incomes, and challenging housing conditions are overlapped, potential focus areas begin to emerge.
Real estate market conditions in Wichita, as a whole, are generally stable or improving for all sectors, as indicated in Real Estate Market Indicators. Certain districts within the ECA have undergone significant reinvestment over the past several years, including Downtown, Old Town, and Delano. The ECA’s three medical centers: Wesley, Via Christi St. Francis and Via Christi St. Joseph have undergone significant building projects and a high level of permit activity has occurred in the industrial district in the southwest portion of the ECA. According to building permit data provided by the City of Wichita, nearly $1 billion in permit value for new construction, additions, and remodels occurred from 2012 to January 2018. Not all of the permitted projects are completed. Nearly 2 million square feet of new floor area will be added to the ECA if all permitted projects are completed.
According to building permit data provided by the City of Wichita, nearly $1 billion in permit value for new construction, additions, and remodels occurred from 2012 to January 2018, adding 2 million square feet to the ECA.
Zillow provides rent and home price trend data for various neighborhoods, which enables certain portions of the ECA to be analyzed more closely. The lowest rents and median home values are generally concentrated in the neighborhoods closer in; whereas high rents and values are located in neighborhoods like College Hill, Crown Heights, Indian Hills, located in the eastern and northwestern portions of the ECA.

Rent and home value growth trends are different—some of the inner-ECA neighborhoods show a higher rate of rent and/or home value trends compared to the outer neighborhoods. This is reflective of a degree of reinvestment and improvement in those neighborhoods—some of the most challenged neighborhoods from a demographic, socioeconomic, and condition standpoint show positive signs. Many of these neighborhoods are projected to gain population over the next several years according to ESRI projections.
In each of these cases, the long-term goal is to create an environment where public investments stimulate private investments. Emerging and formative neighborhoods may require significant investments in the public realm, economic incentivization of catalyst projects and investments in people over an extended period to reach self-sufficiency. Maturing neighborhoods are often quite stable and may help support emerging and formative neighborhood through excess taxes.
1.2 DATA ANALYSIS | DEVELOPMENT

ZONING DISTRICT BY LAND USE CATEGORY

The CBD - or Central Business District - zoning district is located in Downtown and surrounded by industrial corridors/districts to the north and south, as well as a mixture of commercial and high-density residential zoning categories. Large portions of the ECA outside of Downtown are dedicated to industrial or low-density residential zoning designations. High-density residential, scattered throughout the study area, and commercial zoning is found along prominent travel corridors and near busy intersections.

ALLOWED BUILDING HEIGHT

Development in the ECA operates mostly under a 35 ft height limit, though various districts allow for greater building heights in some areas. For instance, there is no building height limitations inside the CBD zoning district, and some districts surrounding Wichita’s CBD are generally limited to 60 or 80 ft. There are exceptions which allow heights to increase if the additional height can be set back from the street. While this strategy mitigates a taller building's street presence, it is most applicable within larger parcels that can accommodate an additional building setback.
RESIDENTIAL ZONING HEIGHT
Downtown Wichita is surrounded by residential districts which enable 55’ building heights, with increased height given to property with additional lot-depth. Outside of Downtown and its adjacencies, most of residential Wichita’s ECA is limited to 35’ building heights.

COMMERCIAL ZONING HEIGHT
Outside Downtown, most commercial property is limited to 80’ of height. Lots with enough depth to exceed the 80’ height limit are more likely to be located near the edges of the ECA boundary, where contemporary development patterns typically feature larger lot sizes. Although height limits help mitigate the relationship between the private and public realm, these restrictions are often a limiting factor for potential development. Many overlay districts have been created to achieve desired development environments in Wichita that affect the height restrictions featured on this map.
DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS | EXISTING TYPICAL PATTERN

Pre 1940

Low Density Residential

Average Block Size: 3.39 acres/ 147,668 sq.ft.
Typical Block Length: 575’
Typical Block Width: 275’

High Density Residential

Average Block Size: 6.11 acres/ 266,152 sq.ft.
Typical Block Length: 600’
Typical Block Width: 300’

Post 1940

Low Density Residential

Average Block Size: 7.14 acres/ 311,018 sq.ft.
Typical Block Length: 909’
Typical Block Width: 322’

High Density Residential

Average Block Size: 13.3 acres/ 579,348 sq.ft.
Typical Block Length: 900’
Typical Block Width: 700’
Pre 1940

Commercial/Office District

Average Block Size: 4.6 acres/ 200,376 sq.ft.
Typical Block Length: 590’
Typical Block Width: 300’

Industrial District

Average Block Size: 12 acres/ 522,720 sq.ft.
Typical Block Length: 668’
Typical Block Width: 539’

Post 1940

Average Block Size: 5.5 acres/ 239,580 sq.ft.
Typical Block Length: 600’
Typical Block Width: 280’

Average Block Size: 54 acres/ 2,352,240 sq.ft.
Typical Block Length: 2230’/2662’
Typical Block Width: 615’/2022’
CRIME INCIDENTS

Crime is heavily concentrated in Downtown, expanding north and south of Downtown towards the edges of the ECA. Neighborhoods towards the edges of the ECA experience comparatively low instances of crime per square mile, though many pockets of concentrated crime do exist.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Downtown Wichita has the highest concentration of traffic accidents. Outside of the central core, accidents appear to be more likely to occur at major intersections, or along major thoroughfares, such as Kellogg Avenue.
TRANSIT STOP DENSITY

Downtown holds the highest concentration of bus stops. However, key intersections along many roads suggest prominent transit connections, both north-to-south and east-to-west.

TRANSIT ROUTES

The locations of transit routes can ease the impact of spatial mismatch in the ECA - that is, the mismatch between the location of employment centers and the location of residencies. For Wichita’s non-driving residents, efficient transit routes can offer greater mobility, enabling access to opportunities.
PUBLIC SIDEWALK DENSITY

Public sidewalks are generally concentrated in activity areas near Downtown. Outside the downtown area, active commercial or institutional districts tend to have a higher concentration of public sidewalks, including Delano, Old Town, and higher-education campuses.

BICYCLE ROUTES

There are a number of bikeways in the ECA, all accessible to Downtown. However, the existing bike system is not easily accessible by many neighborhoods. Where a neighborhood is well-connected to the bike system, routes are limited in facilitating most trips.
TRANSIT & EMPLOYMENT

The public transit service provides access to most of the commercial corridors and commercial districts. However, the north-south grid seems lack transit connection especially in the east of ECA area, such as South/North Oliver Street and South/North Woodlawn Street.

TRANSIT & POPULATION

The Downtown area has the densest transit routes covered with lower population comparing with other places, especially in the northeast of ECA and high population spots in the southeast.
TRANSPORTATION SERVICE DENSITY & RESIDENTIAL ZONING

Based on the density of transit amenities, transportation service nodes and corridor are identified. Public transit service is focused around Downtown, containing one major service node and corridor in each direction. The level-of-service does not appear to be driven by the location of multi-family residential uses, though higher-density housing may help drive demand for public transit. Many residential areas currently lack concentrated transportation services.

TRANSPORTATION SERVICE DENSITY & COMMERCIAL ZONING

The Downtown area is a commercial district with concentrated transportation service. Other transit nodes and corridors show some commercial use, though there does not appear to be a visual correlation between transit service density and commercial zoning.
1.3 DOCUMENT REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

A number of planning documents are intended to guide long-term improvements in the City of Wichita. An overview of the documents identify the city’s needs and their existing plans.

REVIEW

A. Wichita Community Investments Plan 2015-2035

Plan Vision, Community Values and Guiding Principles

Plan Vision: “building on our rich aviation and entrepreneurial heritage, Wichita-Sedgwick County is a global center of advanced manufacturing and high-tech industry and a premier service, education, health and retail center for South Central Kansas. People feel safe and enjoy affordable housing choice in diverse, vibrant neighborhoods offering unique quality living environments and active, healthy lifestyles with access to arts, culture and recreation.”

7 core community values:
- a. Common-sense approach
- b. Fiscal responsibility
- c. Growth-oriented
- d. Inclusiveness and connectivity
- e. Cultural richness
- f. Vibrant neighborhoods
- g. Quality design

Plan guiding policy principles:
- a. Represent the overarching themes, aspirations and actions for community’s future
- b. Reflect the 2035 plan vision statement and core community values
- c. Guide future land use policies and the plan element goals and strategies
- d. Help set relative priorities at the broadest and highest levels for future investment decisions and funding/expenditure reductions.

Future Land Use Policies

2035 urban growth area map – portrays future growth pattern and extension of city limits for the cities of Sedgwick county.

2035 Wichita future growth concept map – depicts anticipated development patterns and provides a generalized guide to future land use, development and rezoning decisions within the City of Wichita and its 2035 urban growth area. The categories (established central area, new residential, new employment, new residential/employment mix, residential, commercial, industrial...) are aimed to provide a generalized guide to land use based upon functional use classifications.

Locational guidelines – provides a decision-making framework regarding land use changes that comprises of three key elements: development pattern, land use compatibility, and design. Within each of these elements, guidance is provided based on geographic areas:

1. General- applicable throughout the entire plan area
2. Established central area – specific to the downtown core and the mature neighborhoods surrounding it in a roughly 3 miles radius.
3. Outside established central area – specific to the remaining incorporated areas of Wichita outside the ECA, also including Wichita’s 2035 urban growth area.
4. Rural area – specific to the unincorporated areas of Sedgwick county located outside the 2035 urban growth areas.
B. 2017 Development Trends

Wichita Established Central Area

2016 Subdivision Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of Permits</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>432,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Warehouse</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>234,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>135,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; Other Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Residential Building Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Units</th>
<th>Demolitions</th>
<th>New Units Added</th>
<th>Percent of Net Units Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Including 33 units
- One family, 42 units
- Two family, 286 units
- Five or more

2016 Other Building Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Industrial, Warehouse</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Office &amp; Other Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Permits</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Footage</td>
<td>432,479</td>
<td>234,007</td>
<td>135,412</td>
<td>58,276</td>
<td>4,784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Wichita Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan Update 2016

Plan Purpose:

- identifies the need over the next 20 years for approximately $750 million of capital renovations and new parks, recreation and open space facilities that would fully preserve existing resources and meet current and future community needs.

- identifies maintenance gaps and recreation service needs that would increase operations costs related to parks and recreation by approximately $4 million annually.

- proposes a number of ways to close the funding gap.

Wichita's Park Land

Wichita has 138 public park sites of varied size containing over 5,000 acres of park land that provide opportunities for playing, exercising, socializing, and recreating outdoors, as well as participating in sports and appreciating nature. Different types of parks serve different functions and offer different recreation opportunities.

Summary by classification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
<th>Acres of Parkland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>369.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>532.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>661.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Parks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>490.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Plazas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>712.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Parks/Pathways</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Areas/Wichita</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1178.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Sites</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1015.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Parks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5,006.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pedestrian experience is significantly influenced by the design of the built environment. Factors such as the organization and connectivity of the street network, presence or lack of pedestrian facilities, and organization of land uses all play a role in walkability. Within the City of Wichita’s Established Central Area, the built environment can generally be categorized into three development patterns (referred to here as neighborhood typologies) that are related to the time period in which neighborhoods were developed.

The neighborhood typologies within the Established Central Area (ECA) are categorized as:
- Downtown Grid (1870-1909)
- Residential Grid (1910-1944)
- Grid and Curvilinear (1945-1980+)

Each of the neighborhood typologies has unique challenges and opportunities. This section provides a brief overview of the three City of Wichita neighborhood typologies located within the ECA and the most common challenges for pedestrians in these areas.
DOWNTOWN STREET GRID (1870-1909)
Characteristics: Downtown Wichita was built between 1870 and 1909 with the older sections of town built along the Arkansas River. The street grid is mostly intact with long, rectangular blocks approximately 650 feet by 350 feet. There are several major barriers to pedestrian circulation in this area including an elevated freeway, a rail corridor, and the river. The streets are generally multi-lane and one-way. The land use is predominantly commercial with large buildings and surface parking lots. There are sidewalks on both sides of the streets and building frontages are mostly adjacent to the sidewalk. Most intersections are signalized and building entrances are mostly accessible from the sidewalk. Pedestrian volumes tend to be higher here than in other parts of the city due to the concentration of services within short walking distances. From the sidewalk there also is access to on-street parking and transit.

Example Neighborhoods: Downtown

DOWNTOWN GRID NEIGHBORHOOD TYPOLOGY
SPECIFIC CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Excess capacity:
Many Downtown streets are wide and have more lanes than needed to accommodate traffic volumes. Wide streets increase a pedestrian’s exposure to traffic when crossing the street and encourages higher vehicle speeds.

Transit accommodations:
There is higher transit use Downtown compared to other areas. This requires accommodations for transit resources (e.g., bus shelters, benches) within the sidewalk zone and a need to provide facilities that allow pedestrians to safely cross the street.

One-way streets:
Many Downtown streets are one-way with more than one travel lane, creating a multiple threat hazard for pedestrians attempting to cross. On roads with multiple lanes in the same direction, a multiple threat hazard occurs when one car stops for a pedestrian and a car in the adjoining lane does not. The driver in the adjacent lane may not be able to see the pedestrian around the first stopped vehicle.

Long blocks:
On the long side of blocks in Downtown, pedestrians wanting to access businesses and services on the opposite side of the street are more likely to make a mid-block crossing instead of walking out of their way to cross at a signalized intersection.

Life on the streets:
With wide sidewalks and a high intensity of use, entertainment and restaurants, Downtown is a great location for placemaking related improvements such as public art, benches, and street trees.
RESIDENTIAL STREET GRID (1910 – 1944)
Neighborhoods built between 1910 and 1944 fall into this typology. These neighborhoods are typically 1 to 3.5 miles from the city center. The street grid is intact, with blocks approximately 600 feet by 300 feet. The long side of the block is north south and typically includes a sidewalk with a buffer to the motor vehicle travel lanes. The land uses are predominantly single family residences with some schools, churches and small businesses. Commercial areas are typically located at arterial street intersections. On-street parking is available and used.
Example Neighborhoods: Delano, South Central, Midtown

RESIDENTIAL STREET GRID TYPOLOGY SPECIFIC CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Visibility at intersections:
Streets in these areas are generally narrow, and on-street parking and street trees are present close to the intersections.

Cut-through traffic on roads one block away from arterial streets:
When there is congestion on arterial streets, some motorists will choose to cut through the neighborhoods, often using the residential street one block off of the arterial. These streets often see higher motor vehicle volumes and speeds than other residential streets during the peak hours.

One-way streets:
Some of the arterial streets in these areas are one-way with more than one travel lane, which creates a multiple threat hazard for pedestrians attempting to cross. On roads with multiple lanes in the same direction, a multiple threat hazard occurs when one car stops for a pedestrian and a car in the adjoining lane does not. The driver in the adjoining lane may not be able to see the pedestrian around the first stopped vehicle.

Crossings on arterial streets between neighborhoods, schools, or shopping areas:
There are shopping areas, services and adjacent neighborhoods within walking distance of homes in these areas. However, a lack of crossing opportunities across arterial streets make them less accessible. Many arterial street intersections are not improved for pedestrians, making them challenging to cross. Walking or ADA access into commercial areas is often not provided, requiring pedestrians to pass through parking lots where sidewalks or dedicated pedestrian space are not provided from the street to the entrance to the store.
GRID AND CURVILINEAR STREETS (1945 – 1980+)

Characteristics: In these neighborhoods built between 1945 and 1980+, the street grid meets longer curvilinear blocks. These areas are typically 3.5 to 5 miles from the city center. The land use is predominately single family homes. Along residential streets there are few sidewalks, and those that are present are narrow. On-street parking is available but sparsely used because most of the homes have driveways. Residential street intersections are generally stop controlled or uncontrolled. In order to access most businesses on foot, a busy arterial street must be crossed or accessed. Arterial streets in these neighborhoods generally have sidewalks with some gaps in the network.

Example Neighborhoods: Southwest Neighborhood, Benjamin Hills, Matlock Heights, Fabrique

GRID AND CURVILINEAR STREETS TYPOLOGY

SPECIFIC CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Safe walking routes to schools and parks:
The intact street grid makes it possible for students to walk to school. However, streets without sidewalks and unimproved street crossings are barriers to safe walking and bicycling for children. Skewed intersections are more common in these areas when roads do not meet at right angles, which can lengthen street crossing time and increase vehicle turning speeds (due to the reduced radius of the turn).

Crossings on arterial streets between neighborhoods, schools, or shopping areas:
There are shopping areas, services, and adjacent neighborhoods within walking distance of homes in these areas. However, a lack of pedestrian access across arterial streets make them inaccessible. Arterial street intersections are often not improved with crosswalks or signals for pedestrians, making them challenging to cross. Walking or ADA access into commercial areas is often not provided requiring pedestrians to pass through parking lots where sidewalks or dedicated pedestrian space are not provided from the street to the entrance to the store.

Sidewalks:
Many of the streets are missing sidewalks on one or both sides of the street.

Residential street intersection control:
At low volume residential street intersections motor vehicle drivers may not always comply with stop controlled intersections or obey rules of the road at uncontrolled locations (yielding) because they rarely encounter cross traffic at those locations. At intersections without control, traffic calming measures can help to slow speeds and improve compliance.
Public participation is a vital part of the planning process. Contributions from the community help steer the conversation and shape the overall vision.

Involvement of citizens, stakeholders, staff, and public officials makes the difference between successful planning and successful implementation. It is essential to provide the right information, in the right hands, at the right time so that citizens and stakeholders can make effective decisions.

The participation approach is rooted in the belief that public involvement must be intentionally educational to provide all involved a sufficient level of understanding to evaluate and promote appropriate ideas for change. We have provided a variety of methods in which those interested can engage in the process to provide meaningful input, including the Visual Preference Survey, the Visioning Summit public meeting, and creation of the project website.
The visual preference survey was conducted during the month of March in 2018. It was accessible through the project website, and was widely circulated, receiving more than 300 participants over the course of one month. The survey primarily focused on walkability and building types. To understand walkability preferences, respondents were asked to rank the comfortability of use of various sidewalk, street, and crosswalk conditions -- 1 being very uncomfortable and 5 being very comfortable. The rankings presenting in this chapter represent the average of several hundred people. In order to assess building types, participants were shown a range of residential and commercial structures and asked to identify whether or not the building type of appropriate. For those that answered "No", respondents were asked to choose one or more attributes relating to the building that made it unappealing for the ECA. For those that answered "Yes", respondents were asked to choose one or more location criteria to gauge where specific building types are most suitable in the ECA.
### HOW DO YOU FEEL WALKING ALONG A STREET ON A SIDEWALK WITHOUT A BUFFER?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Uncomfortable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**2.7 /5**

### HOW DO YOU FEEL WALKING ALONG A STREET ON A SIDEWALK WITH STREET CAFES?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Uncomfortable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**4.7 /5**
HOW DO YOU FEEL WALKING ALONG A STREET ON A SIDEWALK WITH STREET TREES AND LANDSCAPING?

4.6 /5

HOW DO YOU FEEL WALKING ALONG A STREET ON A SIDEWALK WITH PARKED CARS?

3.8 /5
HOW DO YOU FEEL WALKING ALONG A STREET ON A SIDEWALK WITH STREET FURNITURE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Uncomfortable</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 /5

HOW DO YOU FEEL WALKING ALONG A STREET ON A PATH WITH A BUFFER?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Uncomfortable</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 /5
HOW DO YOU FEEL WALKING ALONG A MEDIUM WIDTH STREET IN WICHITA?

2.8 /5

HOW DO YOU FEEL WALKING ALONG AN WIDE STREET IN WICHITA?

3.4 /5
HOW DO YOU FEEL WALKING ALONG A NARROW STREET IN WICHITA?

3.9 /5

HOW DO YOU FEEL WALKING ON A SHARED STREET IN OLD TOWN?

3.6 /5
### How do you feel crossing a street with a long, well-marked crosswalk?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 /5

### How do you feel crossing a street with a crosswalk and curb extensions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 /5
### HOW DO YOU FEEL CROSSING A STREET WITH A CROSSWALK, MEDIAN ISLAND, AND ADVANCE YIELD BARS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfort Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 /5

### HOW DO YOU FEEL CROSSING A STREET WITH A MIDBLOCK PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL AND BRICK CROSSWALK?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfort Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 /5
HOW DO YOU FEEL CROSSING A STREET WITH A CROSSWALK AND OVERHEAD FLASHING BEACONS?

Very Uncomfortable 1 2 3 4 Very Comfortable

Neutral

3.9 /5

HOW DO YOU FEEL CROSSING A STREET WITH A CROSSWALK AND A MEDIAN ISLAND?

Very Uncomfortable 1 2 3 4 Very Comfortable

Neutral

3.8 /5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Uncomfortable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How do you feel crossing a street with a raised crosswalk?

3.7 /5
IS THIS HOUSING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

86% Yes  14% No

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

- Within the Downtown.  60
- Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic.  54
- Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park.  72
- At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors.  77
- Anywhere within a neighborhood.  151

Number of Respondents

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

- The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking.  16
- The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk.  22
- The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc.  24
- The size of the building (height and width).  14

Number of Respondents
IS THIS HOUSING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

90% Yes 10% No

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the Downtown.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park.</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anywhere within a neighborhood.</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The size of the building (height and width).</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IS THIS HOUSING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

- Yes: 93%
- No: 7%

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

- Within the Downtown: 67
- Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic: 70
- Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park: 88
- At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors: 82
- Anywhere within a neighborhood: 149

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

- The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking: 8
- The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk: 6
- The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc: 11
- The size of the building (height and width): 17
IS THIS HOUSING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

41% Yes  
59% No

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

- Within the Downtown: 14
- Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic: 13
- Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park: 38
- At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors: 33
- Anywhere within a neighborhood: 136

Number of Respondents

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

- The size of the building (height and width): 23
- The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc.: 88
- The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk: 28
- The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking: 31

Number of Respondents
IS THIS HOUSING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

- **Yes**: 90%
- **No**: 10%

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

- **Within the Downtown**: 71
- **Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic**: 73
- **Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park**: 69
- **At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors**: 99
- **Anywhere within a neighborhood**: 114

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

- **The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking**: 12
- **The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk**: 7
- **The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc.**: 19
- **The size of the building (height and width)**: 11
IS THIS HOUSING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

88% Yes 12% No

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

- Within the Downtown: 123 respondents
- Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic: 105 respondents
- Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park: 69 respondents
- At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors: 93 respondents
- Anywhere within a neighborhood: 61 respondents

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

- The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking: 13 respondents
- The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk: 9 respondents
- The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc.: 17 respondents
- The size of the building (height and width): 20 respondents
IS THIS HOUSING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

- Yes: 21%
- No: 79%

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

- Within the Downtown: 117
- Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic: 102
- Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park: 63
- At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors: 88
- Anywhere within a neighborhood: 44

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

- The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking: 20
- The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk: 16
- The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc.: 28
- The size of the building (height and width): 46

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
IS THIS HOUSING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

- Yes: 71%
- No: 29%

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

- Within the Downtown: 129
- Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic: 78
- Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park: 53
- At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors: 51
- Anywhere within a neighborhood: 35

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

- The character of the street — width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking: 20
- The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk: 17
- The character of the building — design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc.: 26
- The size of the building (height and width): 69
IS THIS BUILDING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the Downtown</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic.</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors.</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anywhere within a neighborhood.</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character of the building – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking.</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The size of the building (height and width).</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IS THIS BUILDING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

- Yes: 84%
- No: 16%

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

- Within the Downtown: 64
- Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic: 125
- Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park: 44
- At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors: 121
- Anywhere within a neighborhood: 51

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

- The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking: 13
- The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk: 21
- The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc: 31
- The size of the building (height and width): 11
IS THIS BUILDING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE 
ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE 
BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

Number of Respondents

Within the Downtown. 153
Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic. 130
Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park. 71
At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors. 106
Anywhere within a neighborhood. 58

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT 
IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

Number of Respondents

The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking. 3
The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk. 2
The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc. 2
The size of the building (height and width). 4
IS THIS BUILDING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

- Yes: 87%
- No: 13%

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

Within the Downtown: 147
Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic: 129
Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park: 46
At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors: 75
Anywhere within a neighborhood: 29

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking: 10
The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk: 9
The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc.: 21
The size of the building (height and width): 23
IS THIS BUILDING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

- Yes: 80%
- No: 20%

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

- Within the Downtown: 156
- Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic: 99
- Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park: 33
- At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors: 50
- Anywhere within a neighborhood: 24

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

- The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking: 17
- The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk: 9
- The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc: 25
- The size of the building (height and width): 37
IS THIS BUILDING TYPE APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA?

- Yes: 92%
- No: 8%

IF YES, WHERE WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA IS THE BUILDING SHOWN APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the Downtown.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along wider, busier streets that have more automobile traffic.</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to or across the street from open space or a park.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the edges of a neighborhood, along major street corridors.</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anywhere within a neighborhood.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF NO, WHAT MAKES THIS BUILDING NOT APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA OF WICHITA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The character of the street – width of street, street trees and planting, on-street parking.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship of the building to the street / sidewalk.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The character of the building – design details, windows/doors, building materials, etc.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The size of the building (height and width).</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Visioning Summit focused the public’s attention on the current state of the ECA, the future desires for the community, the challenges of achieving the future and where areas of need are within the ECA. Over 80 people participated in the event and summary of their feedback is presented here. A full recap of their comments can be found in the appendix.

Headline Reporter 2018
When asked to provide a hypothetical news headline describing the current state of Wichita, Wichitans gave the following responses:

**Top Headlines**

#7 For Car-Loving People but No Where to Park

We’re #8!

Delano Gets New Baseball Stadium

Wichita Makes the Leap to Save Itself

Great Restaurants and Food Deserts!

Why Doesn’t the Bus Take Me Where I Want to Go?

Empty Lots = Newest Neighborhood Dump

City Focuses on Infill

Anyone Can Build – Lets Repurpose!

Fabrique Neighborhood Struggles with Our Green Space

Headline Reporter 2040
When asked to provide a hypothetical news headline describing the 2040 state of Wichita, Wichitans gave the following responses:

**Top Headlines**

City Awarded Cleanest in America

Gordon Ramsey Elected Governor of Kansas

Private Property Rights Don’t Exist

Fabrique – From Drainage Ditch to Multi-Use Park

Wichita Receives National Award for Broadway Revitalization

Century II Remodeled (Inside) For the Arts and Expo Hall Is Enlarged

Who Drives? Wichita Is Now One of Most Mobile Communities with Most of The Populations Public and Shared Transportation

Wichita Wins National Award for Being Cleanest City – Recycling Up Due to New Trash and Recycling Receptacles

Essential Services and Families

Ungutting Wichita – Amenities Move to Center

Q-Line Replaced with Hyper Loop

Wichita, KS as a cultural hub for art and innovation

Wichita wins back bragging rights for best entrepreneurial city
Change Agent - Barriers to Change

When asked to provide barriers to change, Wichitans gave the following responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging, empowering and enticing the public to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do we change crime without spending money?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimism, Fear of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Action and Coordination for Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of growth and tunnel vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of education about good urban design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greed drives development and funding – neighborhoods get the shaft!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of trash and utilities/services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code violations and unethical landlords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMBYism and zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment plans are disregarded when completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of strong leadership and vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No agreements or consensus on priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Importance

Participants in the first public workshop were asked to identify specific areas in Wichita that are significant to them. The map illustrates the feedback of over 60 participants. Heavier shades of blue indicate locations identified by multiple people. The darker the color, the more people identified the area as significant.
CHAPTER 3.

ESTABLISHED CENTRAL AREA VISION

The information presented is intended to provide a foundation of information from which future decisions can be made. Those future decisions should all make progress towards the implementation of the vision for the ECA. The vision should provide the aspirational direction for the community to strive for in defining its future. The vision statement provided here is a result of the information reviewed and analyzed, the community conversations to date and the identification of opportunities and challenges within the ECA, supported by the previously mentioned elements.

How can you contribute to making the vision a reality?
3.1 OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

POTENTIAL FRAMEWORKS

Understanding demographic, economic, and market trends within the ECA is important. However, given the scale of the area, it is equally critical to establish a framework that will enable the city to focus future investments in a manner that reflects the goals of this plan.

Neighborhood Investments Framework summarizes one approach to understanding how investment occurs in different districts. The ECA contains neighborhoods that represent all three frameworks. For instance, stable areas in the outer northeast and northwest portions are primarily free-market driven. That is, the private market responds to public investments in basic infrastructure like roads, sidewalks, and parks. No further incentivization is required.

Other neighborhoods, like those adjacent to Downtown, might require incentivization in addition to infrastructure investment to spur new development.

Finally, more challenged neighborhoods require a long-term approach combining basic infrastructure investments, economic incentives, and investments in people, or the social infrastructure, to promote lasting change.

A more detailed framework classifies neighborhoods based on their position in a development cycle, as summarized in Evolution of Revitalizing Neighborhoods.
These classifications are applied to the many neighborhoods in the ECA in the Neighborhood Cycle Classification Map based upon the layers of demographic, socioeconomic, economic, building condition, and market data, as well as field observations. Finally, the neighborhood classifications will provide a piece of information to understand the level of intervention is needed to promote long-term development sustainability within the ECA.

The long-term goal is to create an environment where public investments stimulate and support private investments. Generally, emerging and formative neighborhoods may require significant investments in the public realm, economic incentivization of catalyst projects and investments in people over an extended period to reach self-sufficiency. While flourishing and maturing neighborhoods are contributors to the rest of the city as the tax base in these neighborhoods helps to support other neighborhoods, and require less assistance.
Based on analysis of places and the Lynchian analysis several neighborhoods are identified, places further defined by their development patterns and development characteristics - scale, form, use, etc. Districts and nodes throughout the ECA provide resources and opportunities, as the identified corridors establish the physical connections for which accessibility can be enhanced. The development patterns of the ECA present opportunities and challenges to the redevelopment of the area. The next step is to address how change can best be implemented in pursuit of the vision.
The Established Central Area is a Place for People - a place that provides for the movement of people - on foot, on bike and through transit - in balance with automobiles.

The creation of a connected, accessible community including strong neighborhoods, vibrant active centers and community destinations will demonstrate our commitment to development and public improvements that put people first. The reimagining of our urban areas will advance our economy and revitalize our community.
To implement the Vision defined for the ECA, strategies and targets have been identified. The intent of the strategies is to help guide the community in their actions to create walkable places within Wichita. Providing guidance for future development, public improvements and investments will assist residents, business owners, city staff and city leaders to make decisions that improve the community for an economically sustainable, connected, people-centered future. The targets are intended to provide implementation action for the community to strive for as the vision is implemented throughout the ECA. While the target may provide specific numbers for things like housing units or commercial space, the intent is not necessarily to hit the target, but to make sure that the community is aiming for those things that will improve the community.

STRATEGIES

1. Create walkable destinations that support the various neighborhood environments in the ECA.

2. Improve the connectivity within the ECA for all modes, with special attention to pedestrians and cyclists, between neighborhoods and commercial services.

3. Improve the economic feasibility of commercial / service uses and the markets necessary to support them.

4. Create tools and target incentives to cause infill and redevelopment to occur in desired areas.

5. Provide a diversity of housing options to attract new residents and allow existing residents to remain in the ECA.

6. Encourage infill and redevelopment that is contextual to the environment in which it is occurring.

TARGETS

1. Within one year, amend the zoning ordinance to allow walkable development patterns and environments for people to be built.

2. Improve 25 miles of road annually with enhancements for pedestrians, cyclists and transit users.

3. Improve 20 miles of sidewalks that better connect existing neighborhoods to future commercial / mixed-use destinations.

4. Begin repositioning 2 commercial centers, per year, to create walkable destinations for adjacent neighborhoods.

5. Create 350 new (net) housing units within the ECA, annually. Provide a mix of predominately market rate units, with some subsidized units and a mixture of types including 2/3 multifamily units comprised of row houses, small-scale walk-ups and flats, and 1/3 single family infill and redevelopment.

6. Concentrate a critical mass of businesses within a desired commercial center to create a destination and provide goods and services to the community.
   - Reposition 100,000 square feet of retail development to a walkable development pattern, through out the ECA within commercial centers, initially targeting areas where existing patterns support this change.
   - Reposition or create 50,000 square feet of commercial office (or mixed-use), within the commercial centers, that supports the creation and growth of small businesses, including start-ups.

7. Use 85% of incentives and public investments to support redevelopment and improvements within the ECA to create walkable environments and destinations.
APPENDIX A: COMMUNITY INPUT

The information contained in this appendix represents all the comments received from the public in attendance at the Visioning Summit, the first public meeting for the Places for People Planning Process.
When asked to provide a hypothetical news headline describing the current state of Wichita, Wichitans gave the following responses:

**Top Headlines**

- #7 For Car-Loving People but No Where to Park
- We’re #8!
- Delano Gets New Baseball Stadium
- Wichita Makes the Leap to Save Itself
- Great Restaurants and Food Deserts!
- Why Doesn’t the Bus Take Me Where I Want to Go?
- Empty Lots = Newest Neighborhood Dump
- City Focuses on Infill
- Anyone Can Build – Lets Repurpose!
- Fabrique Neighborhood Struggles with Our Green Space

**News Headlines**

- Abandoned House Attracts Homeless Squatters
- Wrong Way, One Way
- Who Owns the Alleys?
- Multicultural Neighborhoods Grow
- Old Neighborhoods Ignored – Pockets of Newer Neighborhoods Are Focused On
- Neglected Neighborhoods Dying – Focus Is on Commercial Districts
- 3rd Street Canal Cleaned Up!
- Crosswalks Installed – Amazing!
- Illegal Dumping and Trash Overwhelm Wichita’s Central Neighborhoods and Parks, As Very Little Trash Service Is Provided
- Fast Traffic and Inattentive Drivers Finally Forced to Stop for People Crossing Streets Now That A Few Crosswalks Have Lights
- Wichita Bus Service Continues to Be Only Slightly Faster Than Just Walking, Though More Expensive, Can’t Keep Pace with Riding Your Bike
- 21st Street Zoning! Wichita Sets Neighborhoods in Uncomfortable Proximity to Special Interest Industrial Zoning
- Illegal Dumping in Parks, Empty Lots, And Alleyways
2010 Midtown Plan Languishes

Homeless Man Found Dead in Midtown Motel – Drugs Identified in Room

Low-Income Rentals and Bad Landlords

The Homeless – Need Help, Not to Be Moved, Out of Sight Out of Mind Is Not the Way Our City Should Be

Empty Buildings

More Crime and Shootings in Central and South Wichita

Development Continues Along Arkansas River and Douglas Avenue

Commerce Arts District Continues to Grow and Thrive

Resources Devoted Largely to Downtown Area

Northeast Ignored, Treated Like Ugly Stepchild

West side Seems to Lose Restaurants While More Go to East side

Citizens Ready to Meet Future

Residents Accept Responsibility for Community

Council of Elders Lead the Community

Sedgwick County Park Used Well

The Zoo Is Out West

Aesthetic of Historic Neighborhood in Jeopardy

The Floodway Is Not Maintained

West Side Is Protected by The Floodway

SW Wichita – On Its Deathbed! No New Development to Follow

East side V West side? Hell, What Happened to The North and South Sides?!

Wichita Takes A Bold Step Forward

Wichita Drivers Learn to Share the Streets

SW Wichita On Its Deathbed – No New Developments

New Leaf Revitalizes Twin Lakes Area

Infill Strip Center Ignites Neighbor’s Concerns

Wichita Closes At 8

East side Discovers A West Side Was There All Along

Exciting New Developments Happening Everywhere!

Community Working Together to Produce More Walkable Living Spaces

Move Traffic

Join The 1980s With Recycling Program!

Private Developer Nabs Funding for Infrastructure Development

District 6 Opposes Cell Tower in River Corridor
Need Decent Sidewalks, Bike Trails and Running Trails

Buses Too Empty – Need Smaller Transit Vans for Efficiency and Adjustable Routes

Douglas Design District Sets Trends and Leads Way to Cultural Shift in Wichita

Douglas Design District – Tired of Waiting, Ready for Reinvestment in Cultural Core

Wichita – A Donut with A Candy Center

Helping Modest Housing Stay Healthy and Purposeful

No Parking Available!

Lots of Beer Joints

Too Many Churches and Schools for Parking Available

Living on Top of Commercial Buildings

Congested Traffic Conditions

Wonderful Sidewalks, Great for Meeting Neighbors

Living Urban in Kansas

College Hill Connected to It All

College Hill – Your Change to Live “Rockwell”

Polls Show Riverfront A Hidden Gem

Residents Are Eager to See Neighborhoods Thrive

Not Enough Green Space to Encourage People to Spend More Time Downtown. More Outside Space Would Encourage More Families to Spend More Time

Vibrant Pockets Lend Themselves to Helping People (Douglas, Delano)

Downtown Rebounding Now, But Faces Gaps – Can’t Fill Gaps Before Losing Steam

Local Established Developers Own Large Amounts of Underdeveloped Land in Central Area; Challenged to Invest or Divest to Others Who Will

Wichita Starts to Make The Great Leap Forward” To Save Itself

Traffic Control – Be Ready to Stop A Lot!

Delano - Great Small-Town Feel in Center of Town

Douglas Street Have 4-Wheel Drive Road in Some Spots

Residents Are Eager to See Neighborhoods Thrive

Investors Wonder If City Is Willing to Change Its Policies

Neighbors Have Change but Not in My Backyard

Residents Afraid to Use Downtown Wichita Over Fears That It May Change

People Are Afraid to Invest to Change Downtown Wichita, But Don’t Use It

Library (Current) – Expanded for An Aquarium
Downtown Rebound – But Will It Catch Up to Itself?

Jobs Come to Central Northeast Wichita

Old Boys and Girls Club Holds Innovative Campus

Transit Bus Adds Additional Hours

Several Unpaved Roads Have Been Surfaced

Walkability Begins to Materialize Along Douglas Corridor

Pockets and Neighborhoods Beginning to Connect

Continued Development Down Douglas Design District Brings New Business

Real Mixed-Use Comes to Wichita

Water Walk Scrapped! City Decides to Start Over…

Existing Rules Punish People Upgrading Their Properties in the ECA

Youth Will Save Downtown Wichita

Downtown Poised for Growth. Leaders Strive to Connect Major Assets Along the River to Delano, Downtown, Old Town, And Douglas Design District

Downtown Launches Bike Share Program with Some Success – New Targets for Speeding Traffic

Wichita Continues to Cut Funding for Quality of Life Offerings – Parks and Recreation Department Receives Yet Another Cut, Asked to Do More with Less

Wichita Parking Lots Take Up More Area Than Buildings

Downtown Wichita Slowly Improving Walkability and Livability

Kellogg Avenue Divides North and South Sides of City

Wichita Lacks the Funds to Move Forward

Neighbors Dump Development

Multi-Family Development Spreading Like Fire

Time to Turn Wichita Inside Out

Many Wichitans Excited and Hopeful for River-walk District

Downtown Is Revitalizing, But Nearby Neighbors Aren’t All Doing So Well

Too Much Parking?

Man Has to Walk Dog in Traffic Lane from Oliver To Edgemoor Due to No Sidewalks!

Our Area Has A Great Sedgwick County Park

We Have West Urban for Kids to Enjoy Playing Ball

The Zoo Is A Great Addition to Our Area

Children Recreate “Frogger” Heading to School North Of 9th Street

Development Concentrated Downtown

City Needs More Parks
At-Risk Populations Being Ignored

Bicycles Create Traffic Problems, Private Property Rights Infringed, Public Transportation Not Necessary

Wind Resistant Trash Cans, Please!

Bicycle Lanes Create Problems

Wichita Is Updating the Roads and Sidewalks in Downtown and Old Town, But When Will They Put in Receptacles Updated to Take Trash and Recycling?

Can Old Town Create A Dog Park for Residents Living Downtown?

When Will Downtown Get A Grocery Store?

Wichita Police Kill Resident Over Prank Call…

Plastic Grocery Bags and Take Out Styrofoam Containers Choke Sewers as Trash Overruns the Canal Route

Closing City Swimming Pools Top Priority Due to Lack of Profitability as Residents Drown Because They Do Not Know How to Swim

Long Overdue Work Started in Central Area

Wichita Hosts NCAA

Traffic Along 1st And 2nd Street Issues – Walking and Cycling Conflicting with Traffic

Iconic Century II Saved for The Arts

City Upgrade and Transport Plan Up for Public Comments

City Planners Hires Outside Consulting Firm to Help Make Wichita a Modern City

Are We Helping Entrepreneurs Enough?

Do Kids Have A Place to Create in Their Space?

Central Northeast City Corridor Has Had A Problem Attracting and Retaining Business Due to The Perception of High Crime Rate

There’s A Lack of Food and Social Amenities in The Northeast Communities

Ineffective, Overpriced, SLOW Transit!

Outreach Workers Giving General Public Information

21st Street East Of I-35 Rezoned “General Commercial”

Wichita State University Opens Innovation Campus

Disorganized and Not Well Planned for Public Transportation or Pedestrians

East Riverbank to Be Developed into Park for Everyone

Metro Transit – Lack of Adequate Buses, Routes, Etc….
Headline Reporter 2040

When asked to provide a hypothetical news headline describing the 2040 state of Wichita, Wichitans gave the following responses:

**Top Headlines**

- City Awarded Cleanest in America!
- Gordon Ramsey Elected Governor of Kansas
- Private Property Rights Don’t Exist
- Fabrique – From Drainage Ditch to Multi-Use Park
- Wichita Receives National Award for Broadway Revitalization
- Century II Remodeled (Inside) For the Arts and Expo Hall Is Enlarged
- Who Drives? Wichita Is Now One of Most Mobile Communities with Most of The Populations Public and Shared Transportation
- Wichita Wins National Award for Being Cleanest City – Recycling Up Due to New Trash and Recycling Receptacles
- Essential Services and Families
- Ungutting Wichita – Amenities Move to Center
- Q-Line Replaced with Hyper Loop
- Wichita, KS as a cultural hub for art and innovation
- Wichita wins back bragging rights for best entrepreneurial city

Who Drives? Wichita Citywide Public Transportation, Walk and Bike Trails Makes Wichita Ranked in The Top 5 Mobile Cities in The Us


Wichita Competes for Tech Solutions

Historic Neighborhoods Thrive with New Purpose. Wichita City Council Has Preserved Historical Buildings for Repurposing

Wichita Ranked Highest in The Nation with Quality, Clean Green Belts and Parks

Community Blight Reversed Through Investment and Services

Unified Trash Service for Every Citizen Reduces the Number of Trash Trucks on Wichita Streets and Ends Illegal Dumping

Wichitans Now Predominately Walk or Bike or Use Public Transit for Trips Under 5 Miles from Home

Wichita City Council Has Not Approved the Destruction of a Landmark or Architecturally Significant Building In 22 Years!

Riverside Awarded National Historic Landmark Designation

Heart Transplant Causes Developer to Embrace Neighborhood’s Values – Money Is No Longer Primary Motivator

Arts Funding Exceeds All Projections
Headline Reporter 2040 (Continued)

Walk, Ride, And Bike Guides City Planning

Wichita Reborn

No Automobiles in Wichita!

Wichita – Cosmopolitan Mecca

Downtown Wichita Is 10x Bigger Than It Used to Be!

Affordable Housing Will Be Available

Historic Landmark Torn Down for Parking!

Investments Are Made Across the Whole City

Public Schools’ Reputations Are Boosted

Crime and Poverty Are Reduced

Walking Trails Connect Neighborhoods

Northeast Residents Proud of Community

We Did It!

Tiny House Takes Over

Broadway Street Given Award for Best Walkability

Neighborhoods Are Safe with No Empty Houses

Aquarium Downtown Is Thriving

Dog Parks!

Wichita Awarded Safest City to Raise A Family

Southwest Wichita Lives! It’s A Miracle! Revitalized and Bounding Back with Her Best Years to Come.

Passenger Rail Service Makes Triumphant Return!

From 7 To Heaven!

Livability Efforts Exceed City Growth Expectations

Air Quality Penalties Inspire Transit Improvements

Downtown Population Triples!

Wichita: Cultural Hub for Art and Innovation

Community Supported: Where Small Businesses Thrive

Healthy Options Abound

Everything Happened and People Still Complaining

Wichita – Now A National Cultural Art Hub

Self-Driving Uber Eliminates Need for City Bus

Hoverboard Accidents – 20-Year Old Sidewalks Need Repair

Drones Deliver Fresh Food but Only To 1%ers Outside The ECA

City Partial Investor in Best Electrical Car Manufacturer

Buses Finally Work for All Wichitans!
Wichita Sets Trends and Leads Way to Cultural Shift Across Midwest Communities

Suburban Sprawl in Rear view Mirror as Downtown Growth and Innovative Development Is on The Rise

Still Deciding What to Do with Century II?

ECA Buys New Bus

Cars Gridlocked Over Night

Police Patrol on Roller Skates

No Need for Cars in Town

Bike Garages on Each Corner

Sidewalks Continue for Entire City Block

Century II, The Spaceship We Can’t Let Go

Another Generation Unsurprised by City’s Lack of Progress

How Wichita Came Back from The Brink to Become One of America’s Hottest Towns to Live In

How Millennials Took Over Wichita And Made It Work for Them

Peace, Love and Groovyness In The ECA

ECA Are We Done Yet

A City Unleashed

A New Day in Wichita – Honey, Have You Seen the Car?

Wichita Engages California Agency To Develop Plan For CII

Once Forgotten, Central Northeast Wichita Is Now A Booming Job Mecca

McAdam’s Park Celebrates 20 Years of Revitalization of Rec Center and Pool

No Changes Made in City Since 2018

Neighborhood Connectivity Complete

Trader Joe’s Opens Downtown

Downtown Is Busing at The Seams… No Vacancy!!

Mass Transit Has Commute Time of Cars

New High Rises Planned for Downtown

Mixed-Use Continues to Thrive In ECA

Wichitans Can Access Anywhere in The City Via Public Transportation in Less Than 20 Minutes! Driving Takes 45 Minutes in Snarled Traffic

Downtown Trader Joe’s Opens

Young Professionals Prefer the Inner-City to The Suburban Fringes

City/Business Move Marking to Multi-Use Buildings with Parking, Office, Residential, Retail

Wichita Old Town Districts Exceeds Expectations and Sets Precedent

Measure Twice, Dig Once!
Families Return to ECA Due to Improved Livability (Schools, Amenities, Etc.)

Wichita Reaches 5% Population Growth

Convention Center Bridges River and Visitors Flow In!

Wichita Maximizes Use of Cleaned Up River

Improvements Complete – But Was It Enough?

Should Have Done It Right the First Time

What to Do with Century III?

Repurposing Obsolete Freeways and Parking Lots into Green Space

My Mother the Car: Remembering When Wichita Was One of The USA's Best Car Cities

Wichita’s Bike/Walk Tanking Soars After City and Community Reinvest in Infrastructure and Neighborhoods

Wichita’s Performing Arts Center Still A Prime Example of Innovation and Creativity

City Spreads the Wealth: Oldest Neighborhoods Reborn

Homeless Population = 0; Wichita Population = 500,000

Investments Are Made Across the City

Walkable Wichita With Trees, Buses, Bicycles

Koch – WSU – Cargill – Sole Survivors!

Downtown Dog Park Is Given Two Paws Up!

Downtown Grocery Store Expanding Its Service

Recycled Material Building Product Facility Expands Nationwide!

Industrial Hemp and Medical Cannabis Become Top Tax Revenue Producer State-Wide with Main Industry Leaders Based in Wichita

City Development Efforts Are A Model for Nation

Passenger Rail Returns to City

We Turned Old into New… Look at Us Now!

City Transformed – No Empty Buildings

Our “No Empty Buildings” Ban Worked!

Our Heritage Preserved – A Look Back

Riverside Neighborhood Registered on National Register of Historic Places After Years of Encroachment by Unwanted Development, Our City’s Core Has Some Safeguards

Industrial Development Blocked from River Corridor

Big and Little Arkansas Rivers Slated for Environmental Clean Up

Walking and Bicycle Paths – Streets Safer as Families Can Now Safely Bike and Walk Anywhere in Town

City Trash Collection with Recycling – Those Who Recycle Pay Less Than Those Who Don’t
Change Agent - Barriers to Change

When asked to provide barriers to change, Wichitans gave the following responses:

**Top Comments**

- Encouraging, empowering and enticing the public to participate
- How do we change crime without spending money?
- Pessimism, Fear of Change
- Lack of Action and Coordination for Initiatives
- Resistance to change
- Perspective
- Fear of growth and tunnel vision
- Lack of education about good urban design
- Greed drives development and funding – neighborhoods get the shaft!
- Consolidation of trash and utilities/services
- Code violations and unethical landlords
- NIMBYism and zoning
- Redevelopment plans are disregarded when completed
- Lack of strong leadership and vision
- No agreements or consensus on priorities

Money – what and how do we get the money that will make changes

City council – what is better for group isn't best for fall, need for consensus-building

Wheel and hub VS grid and dealing with buildings downtown

Local leaders (unelected) and developers who oppose change Because they oppose increased sales or property taxes and they want to build something new

Some city people (developers and people with money and influence) want current library torn down and expand parking

Some people want shops along east riverbank and the developer would like to benefit financially from this. The land that is on the east of the river must be retained by the city for the benefit of its citizens for park and recreation.

Lack of respect from MAPD – most can't see that development must be balanced with green space, parks, aesthetic amenities.

Our comprehensive water plan seems focused on Cheney Lake, conservation and distribution rather than river clean up.

Code enforcement chokes new owners who are revamping and upgrading houses

City development is overwhelmingly oriented towards new construction and growth at the fringe by large developers
Change Agent - Barriers to Change (Continued)

Pioneer home-buyers need support and mentoring

Funds are for city expansion services at the expense of supporting the core area

Some city codes are barriers for core revitalization

Redevelopment Plans are disregarded

Funds for city expansion services and core area suffers

City planning and redevelopment plans are disregarded

Codes should be worked on to build more livable houses and community and allow infill to older neighborhoods

Failure to anticipate our population growing older and housing stock doesn’t allow for aging out of home

Lack of money

No green space

Not enough resources or funding for the at-risk community

Housing codes are not followed, and blight can occur

NIMBY-ism and zoning

Preconceived perceptions of good/bad areas

Inability to include citizens in initial planning – decision makers, planning and positive change in the community

Failure to maintain existing infrastructure

Tendency to go for big projects rather than several small investments

Willingness to change – loss of power and control

Public engagement and apathy

Inaccurate information

Lack of public engagement

Perception – how we see ourselves

Reputation – the image we’ve created of ourselves, for ourselves outside of Wichita

Identity – clarifying who we are as a city

Overcome Kansas negativity and inferiority complex. Focus on building positives, not negatives

Inspire younger generations to take leadership

Lack of coordination among groups, government and organizations working on same initiatives

Support/demand for public transportation

Viewpoint that art and culture is a luxury rather than a necessity for a city’s growth

Food deserts

Sidewalks

Private opinions, politics, and complaining

There is a lack of community involvement by the police and a lack of police presence in general
Change Agent - Barriers to Change (Continued)

Not enough people acting on their support

Innovations – politicians resistant to innovative thinking and changes

Grassroots movements – businesses that don’t respond to citizen needs

Fear of change

Nostalgia

Frozen taxes – not supportive of progress, additional amenities or maintenance of existing infrastructure

Earthquakes damaging homes and buildings

Corrupt politicians and leaders

Changing attitudes

Congested streets

Homeless

Comprehensive plan, need one

Continued stigma that there is nothing to do in Wichita

Crumbling infrastructure hinders development (water!)

Wichitans love their cars (parking)

The city does not maintain its existing infrastructure instead treating the built environment as a disposable one and done

Unwillingness to listen

Not enough variety of services, retail, etc. in neighborhoods, such as the new apartments downtown

Risk averse and comfortable

Lack of diversity

10 families in Wichita control 95% of the city’s wealth

Private money

Kansas City, lack of cooperation, competition in community endeavors

Willingness for Wichita leadership to take risks

Lack of talent, talent retention

You don’t have to have it all worked out before your start

You go first…

City unwilling to take risks

Exporting of your people

Need resources

Fear of change

Lack of youthful environment

Fear of central NE development

End special assessments

Bring things up to code
### Change Agent - Barriers to Change (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown Rebound – But Will It Catch Up to Itself?</th>
<th>Downtown Wichita Slowly Improving Walkability and Livability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Come to Central Northeast Wichita</td>
<td>Kellogg Avenue Divides North and South Sides of City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Boys and Girls Club Holds Innovative Campus</td>
<td>Wichita Lacks the Funds to Move Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Bus Adds Additional Hours</td>
<td>Neighbors Dump Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Unpaved Roads Have Been Surfaced</td>
<td>Multi-Family Development Spreading Like Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkability Begins to Materialize Along Douglas Corridor</td>
<td>Time to Turn Wichita Inside Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pockets and Neighborhoods Beginning to Connect</td>
<td>Many Wichitans Excited and hopeful for Riverwalk District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Development Down Douglas Design District Brings New Business</td>
<td>Downtown Is Revitalizing, But Nearby Neighbors Aren’t All Doing So Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Mixed-Use Comes to Wichita</td>
<td>Too Much Parking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Walk Scrapped! City Decides to Start Over…</td>
<td>Man Has to Walk Dog in Traffic Lane from Oliver To Edgemoor Due to No Sidewalks!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Rules Punish People Upgrading Their Properties in the ECA</td>
<td>Our Area Has A Great Sedgwick County Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Will Save Downtown Wichita</td>
<td>We Have West Urban for Kids to Enjoy Playing Ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Poised for Growth. Leaders Strive to Connect Major Assets Along the River to Delano, Downtown, Old Town, And Douglas Design District</td>
<td>The Zoo Is A Great Addition to Our Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Launches Bike Share Program with Some Success – New Targets for Speeding Traffic</td>
<td>Children Recreate “Frogger” Heading to School North Of 9th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita Continues to Cut Funding for Quality of Life Offerings – Parks and Recreation Department Receives Yet Another Cut, Asked to Do More with Less</td>
<td>Empty Lots = Newest Neighborhood Dump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita Parking Lots Take Up More Area Than Buildings</td>
<td>Development Concentrated Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Needs More Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moving beyond aircraft

Building and zoning codes not adjusting with need for infill

Misconception of ECA safety issues

Zoning and code requirements hamper infill development

Special assessments – we must wean ourselves off them if we wish to see developers invest somewhere other than the fringes

Infrastructure costs in the future are daunting

Failure of water walk plan

Developer green

Funding

Getting people on the same page – work together in collaboration

Lack of engagement and education about needs

Everyone likes to drive too much

Zoning laws prevent walking

People think government is “them”, but really it is “us”

If normal people don’t serve, normal people aren’t served

Pessimism

Lack of inter-generational equity

Willingness to change by community

Competing priorities

Lack of public engagement

Code violations

Landlord issues

Conflicting priorities

Working with the city to change the mindset of the people to include proper trash disposal and recycling – build, educate, involve

The city working with group that focuses on making the change

Finding the people and resources to make the change

1% billionaires refuse to be fairly taxed… Koch brothers!

Making city council meetings in the evening 1 day a month

Empty and forgotten businesses and manufacturing facilities

Perception – lack of vision for all citizens

Lack of imagination

Failure to maintain existing infrastructure

Lack of resources

Center Northeast – Image of high crime
Change Agent - Barriers to Change (Continued)

No anchor stores in neighborhoods

A mindset of trash and build new

What is best for everyone rather than the rich few making and controlling the purse strings

Lack of ideas – helping entrepreneurs build a business

Diversification of resources and allocating funds

Lack of consolidation in the public works department

Need to balance the need to bring in businesses and jobs with the need to protect neighborhoods

Consolidating trash services Because of multiple services – not troubleshooting the issues

The perception that only poor people use public transit

City of Wichita is not interested in acting as an agent for increasing the quality of life for its citizens by enforcing sanitation charges
Areas of Opportunity

When asked to provide areas of opportunity, Wichitans gave the following responses:

1st/2nd Streets chronic issues with one-ways and wrong way drivers. Can we fix by adding do not enter signs?

Uptown area has chronic issues with polluted alleys

I-35 and Central is distressed, high crime, slumlords, abandoned properties

3rd street canal is not clean but can be a great corridor pedestrian promenade and gateway downtown

Increased civic pride has come into Wichita over the last 5-6 years which must be harnessed to bring people back into the city

Individuals are rehabbing and developing in the downtown corridor and east on their own, a tipping point for increasing value can be reached

Inclusion!!! All of us need a voice

Clean the chemicals out of the river as well as cleaning along the banks. That includes the big ditch and 3rd Street Canal

The Little Arkansas River, North Riverside and Riverside Neighborhoods need your help keeping light industrial development out of the river corridor. We don’t want a cell tower at 707 W 13th.

We don’t want the MAPC to disregard the residents needs in favor of developers.

Protect and enhance river corridor

Protect historical areas and properties

Old structures must be removed

Pioneer home buyers

Code enforcement pressure on developers

A Price Woodard Neighborhood – city has been receptive and hope to see that continue

Need to address safety issues

Look at all ages as if equal value to the city

Permeable concrete for all parking lots and sidewalks – return water to water table and eliminates petrochemicals running off from asphalt

Build up high-tech in city for everyone

Transition plane building to other types of transportation – i.e. Electric cars, buses, etc.

Public transportation

Walkable/bikeable, pedestrian-friendly core with more retail and less parking lots

Stable neighborhoods need to be kept up
Areas of Opportunity (Continued)

The area at Douglas and Hydraulic is a huge opportunity area. Even small developments in this area could make an enormous impact on both the commercial and residential in the area.

Fill in development gaps less empty lots. Force invest or divest!

Coworking space!

More micro-apartments downtown

Be willing to take risks

Job growth in central northeast Wichita

There are no real amenities in NE Wichita – grocery stores

Art/Culture in all of Wichita

Limit liquor store permits, limit predatory lending companies

Encouraging public participation

Continue the momentum

Capitalizing on resurgence of Wichita pride

Delano – baseball stadium redevelopment

Intrust Bank Arena neighborhoods

Attracting young people

Delano

River

South Side

River development is cool. Do it!

Dynamic equilibrium – recognize that change is inevitable; whether it is good or bad is up to us

The river

The Central Core

Transit

Save College Hill Pool

A Price Woodard Neighborhood

The parks that have lakes

Buildings – repurposing them to help make changes

Downtown

Public swimming pools should not be required to make a PROFIT

The music community is energetic and creative

Century II is beautiful

21st and Amidon

23rd and Amidon

29th Street
Areas of Importance

Participants in the first public workshop were asked to identify specific areas in Wichita that are significant to them. The map illustrates the feedback of over 60 participants. Heavier shades of blue indicate locations identified by multiple people. The darker the color, the more people identified the area as significant.
Location of Home and Work

Participants in the first public workshop were asked to identify specific areas in Wichita that they reside or work in. The map illustrates the feedback of over 60 participants.
**Most Important Issues**

When asked to provide areas of opportunity, Wichitans gave the following responses:

- Building preservation
- Community addressing what is important, not city government – trash, transportation
- Trash service, civic engagement, barriers
- Sanitation and transportation
- Trash issues and transportation
- Inclusion of citizenry in planning
- Helping the poor
- Make financial sense, making investments that don’t immediately return but improves the city
- Just discussing the issues was important
- Recycling
- Protecting homes
- Forward progress
- Barriers to overcome
- City needs to take risks and quit asking questions
- Urban infill

---

**Urban design**

- The plan to make Wichita’s future a desirable place to live
- Keeping our young people here
- Concept of connecting these areas
- NIMBY, idea of connecting community
- Repurposing
- Citizen empowerment
Additional Questions/Comments

Would have liked discussion about Century II and the area from Douglas to Kellogg

Was more interested in what you folks were looking at

Is this really in purview of “How the city looks”

Plan to move forward – what is it?

What are the outcomes that could come out of this?

Will industrial hemp and medical cannabis be legal?

How to overcome polarization within our community

Problems identified, but not “discussed”

Downtown Wichita is developing more and more residential lofts and options for people to live. I would like to see a park with a flat grassy field / venue outlined with trees where people could congregate... Perhaps have farm and art markets / vendors / food trucks etc... Be able to use the area. The turf would have to be irrigated in order to maintain a good grassy surface or have artificial turf installed (like a football field higher up front cost but lower maintenance in the long run.)