PLANNING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 10-01

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE REVISED CITY OF OLATHE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, the Governing Body adopted the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Olathe on April 1, 1997, by Ordinance No. 97-48; and

WHEREAS, since 1997 the Planning Commission and Governing Body have periodically updated the Comprehensive Plan through adoption of area and corridor plans and bi-annual reviews; and

WHEREAS, on December 19th, 2006, the Governing Body adopted Resolution No. 06-1185 establishing a Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee consisting of members from the Governing Body, Planning Commission, and the general public to provide direction and guidance on the updating and revising of the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, on June 12, 2007, after a review of the existing Comprehensive Plan, the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee recommended that the City undertake an update and revision to the City’s Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, on November 28, 2007, the City issued a Request for Proposals to solicit consultant assistance in the revision and update of the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, on May 6, 2008, after the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee reviewed eleven responses to the Request for Proposals, the Governing Body selected the consultant firm EDAW / AECOM to assist the City in the Comprehensive Plan update process; and

WHEREAS, on May 6, 2008, the Governing Body reappointed the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee with the task of overseeing the Comprehensive Plan update process; and

WHEREAS, beginning in November 2008, the City undertook an extensive public participation process to gather input on the Comprehensive Plan update, including outreach at public forums and events, stakeholder interviews, visioning workshops, mobile roadshows, open houses, a Comprehensive Plan update website, and face-to-face, phone, and email correspondence; and

WHEREAS, on May 26th, 2010, the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee recommended a complete draft Comprehensive Plan for adoption by the Planning Commission and Governing Body; and

WHEREAS, on June 28, 2010, the Olathe Planning Commission, after giving the required notice, held a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF OLATHE, KANSAS:

SECTION ONE: The Comprehensive Plan, including the parts listed below is
adopted as the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Olathe:

a. Introduction: including including acknowledgements, agencies and
stakeholders consulted, and table of contents

b. Chapter 1. Community: describing the purpose of the Comprehensive
Plan, how the public was involved in its preparation, and how the plan is
used.

c. Chapter 2. Quality of Life: describing the existing quality of life the
community experiences, and how quality of life may change if the
Comprehensive Plan is implemented.

d. Chapter 3. Vision: providing a clear picture of what the community wants
based on community values, and presenting an ambitious vision and
broad planning principles.

e. Chapter 4. Framework: elaborating on the key land use themes
embodied by the Comprehensive Plan and defining the Future Land Use
Plan

f. Chapter 5. Guidance: elaborating on the guiding principles and defining
detailed policies for each principle to ensure this Vision is realized.

g. Chapter 6. Implementation: translating the Vision into a reality by
discussing the process, responsibilities, and strategies necessary for
successful implementation of PlanOlathe.

h. Chapter 7. References: containing reference documents used throughout
the planning process, such as background data and analysis from other
plans, economic analysis and land demand forecasts, and build-out
analysis.

SECTION TWO: The Comprehensive Plan will guide the Planning Commission
and Governing Body when evaluating development applications, rezonings, and other
land use policy decisions. The Comprehensive Plan synthesizes and supercedes the
recommendations of existing area and corridor land use plans that have been previously
adopted as components of the Comprehensive Plan. Design guidelines and overlay
districts associated with existing area and corridor plans will remain in effect and
continue to be applied, but will be reviewed and adapted to function within the framework
of the Comprehensive Plan.

SECTION FOUR: The Comprehensive Plan is intended as a living document
that will continue to evolve and respond to the community’s values and needs over time,
and will undergo at least an annual review to ensure that it is functioning as a useful
policy tool and is being effectively implemented, in accordance with the requirements of Kansas Statute 12-747.

SECTION FIVE: The Comprehensive Plan shall not become effective until approved by the Governing Body in accordance with the requirements of Kansas Statute 12-747.

Jonathan B. Campbell
Chairman, Olathe Planning Commission

ATTEST

David M. Clements
Secretary
ORDINANCE NO. 10-60
AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE CITY OF OLATHE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, the Governing Body adopted the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Olathe on April 1, 1997, by Ordinance No. 97-48; and

WHEREAS, since 1997 the Planning Commission and Governing Body have periodically updated the Comprehensive Plan through adoption of area and corridor plans and bi-annual reviews; and

WHEREAS, on December 19th, 2006, the Governing Body adopted Resolution No. 06-1185 establishing a Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee consisting of members from the Governing Body, Planning Commission, and the general public to provide direction and guidance on the updating and revising of the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, on June 12, 2007, after a review of the existing Comprehensive Plan, the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee recommended that the City undertake an update and revision to the City’s Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, on November 28, 2007, the City issued a Request for Proposals to solicit consultant assistance in the revision and update of the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, on May 6, 2008, after the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee reviewed eleven responses to the Request for Proposals, the Governing Body selected the consultant firm EDAW / AECOM to assist the City in the Comprehensive Plan update process; and

WHEREAS, on May 8, 2008, the Governing Body reappointed the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee with the task of overseeing the Comprehensive Plan update process; and

WHEREAS, beginning in November 2008, the City undertook an extensive public participation process to gather input on the Comprehensive Plan update, including outreach at public forums and events, stakeholder interviews, visioning workshops, mobile roadshows, open houses, a Comprehensive Plan update website, and face-to-face, phone, and email correspondence; and

WHEREAS, on May 28th, 2010, the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee recommended a complete draft Comprehensive Plan for adoption by the Planning Commission and Governing Body; and

WHEREAS, on June 28, 2010, the Olathe Planning Commission, after giving the required notice, held a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan and recommended adoption of the Comprehensive Plan by a vote of 6-0;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF OLATHE, KANSAS:
SECTION ONE: The Comprehensive Plan, including the parts listed below is approved and adopted as the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Olathe:

a. **Introduction**: including acknowledgements, agencies and stakeholders consulted, and table of contents

b. **Chapter 1. Community**: describing the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan, how the public was involved in its preparation, and how the plan is used.

c. **Chapter 2. Quality of Life**: describing the existing quality of life the community experiences, and how quality of life may change if the Comprehensive Plan is implemented.

d. **Chapter 3. Vision**: providing a clear picture of what the community wants based on community values, and presenting an ambitious vision and broad planning principles.

e. **Chapter 4. Framework**: elaborating on the key land use themes embodied by the Comprehensive Plan and defining the Future Land Use Plan

f. **Chapter 5. Guidance**: elaborating on the guiding principles and defining detailed policies for each principle to ensure this Vision is realized.

g. **Chapter 6. Implementation**: translating the Vision into a reality by discussing the process, responsibilities, and strategies necessary for successful implementation of PlanOlathe.

h. **Chapter 7. Reference**: containing reference documents used throughout the planning process, such as background data and analysis from other plans, economic analysis and land demand forecasts, and build-out analysis.

SECTION TWO: The Comprehensive Plan will guide the Planning Commission and Governing Body when evaluating development applications, rezonings, and other land use policy decisions. The Comprehensive Plan synthesizes and supersedes the recommendations of existing area and corridor land use plans that have been previously adopted as components of the Comprehensive Plan. Design guidelines and overlay districts associated with existing area and corridor plans will remain in effect and continue to be applied, but will be reviewed and adapted to function within the framework of the Comprehensive Plan.

SECTION THREE: The Comprehensive Plan is intended as a living document that will continue to evolve and respond to the community's values and needs over time, and will undergo at least an annual review to ensure that it is functioning as a useful policy tool and is being effectively implemented, in accordance with the requirements of Kansas Statute 12-747.
SECTION FOUR: That this Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage and publication as provided by law.

PASSED by the Governing Body this 5th day of October, 2010.

SIGNED by the Mayor this 5th day of October, 2010.

ATTEST:

[Signature]

City Clerk

(Seal)

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

[Signature]

City Attorney
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Purpose

In 1857, Olathe was founded at the strategic location of the Oregon, California and Santa Fe Trails on the westernmost frontier. Named for the Shawnee Indian word “beautiful,” Olathe quickly became the center of commerce and county seat for Johnson County. One hundred and fifty years later, Olathe’s location and character continue to make it desirable for residents and businesses alike. Now, with a population of more than 120,000 residents, Olathe offers all of the cultural advantages of a major metropolitan area with a lifestyle of exceptional quality. Foresight and attributes including great schools, affordable housing, a highly educated workforce, friendly family and business environment, and accepting attitudes have made Olathe one of the most desirable and fastest growing cities in the United States. Today, Olathe is at another strategic crossroads. Fiscal challenges faced by communities across the nation and a volatile market could hinder our progress. We must act with direction and purpose if we are to continue our prosperity and design a future that we all desire.

With an abundant supply of vacant land and existing areas ripe for redevelopment, the Community must make a choice about how to grow. The right choices will ensure the City stays on the cutting edge and enhances its quality of life. A new Comprehensive Plan, PlanOlathe, represents an important milestone in the continuing history of Olathe.
Goals of the Plan

Olathe will continue to grow in population, employment, and land area. How it will grow should be the result of a thoughtful analysis of the choices and consequences. The decisions made on where and how growth occurs and what the growth looks like will affect the long-term quality of life and prosperity of our City.

A great deal of thorough, thoughtful work went into creating the existing Comprehensive Plan, which was originally adopted in 1997. Through this careful planning, Olathe has successfully accomplished several goals outlined in the existing Comprehensive Plan:

- Attract high quality growth, becoming more economically diverse, and achieve a balance of all types of land uses;
- Obtain sufficient revenues to support important community services;
- Obtain an efficient transportation network, excellent educational and recreational facilities, quality shopping and employment opportunities, and a variety of housing options;
- Encourage aesthetically pleasing development and redevelopment throughout the community; and
- Set forth a vision for a future that is progressive, aggressive, and upscale.

Today, Olathe continues its evolution through creation of a new comprehensive plan, known as PlanOlathe.

Over a decade ago, Olathe embraced the concepts of quality development. The community is now focusing on becoming one of the top tier communities in the nation. In order to achieve this, PlanOlathe focuses on a number of key items:

- The creation of a community-driven vision;
- Review of existing policies and tools to analyze their effectiveness towards achieving this vision;
- Looking ahead for new opportunities;
- Revisiting the past to identify areas that need improvement;
- Creating a refined future land use plan that identifies the short- and long-term desires of the community;
- Analyzing the economic framework of the City and the region, and establishing an understanding of how these economic forces influence land use decisions; and
Creating an implementation plan that includes both physical and policy recommendations to support the update.

PlanOlathe applies the community’s shared values and goals, establishing planning policies to guide Olathe’s decision-makers.

**Community-Based Process**

City leaders, technical and advisory committees, stakeholders, and the public have given decisive direction:

**Decisions must be based on community values and must continue to enhance the quality of life of the community.**

One of the basic tenets of PlanOlathe is the concept that by working together we can develop new ideas to forge a distinct future. Great communities don’t just happen: they require focus, commitment, and energy. Based on a core set of common values, PlanOlathe proposes achievable solutions that improve our quality of life. There are many reasons to do so – the savings in infrastructure dollars, the revitalization of our downtown and older neighborhoods, expanded job opportunities, and enhancements in our environment. A better future is possible through a common vision, one that engenders support from enough people that progress is feasible.

Since September 2008, the PlanOlathe team has listened to the concerns and visions of approximately 1,500 individuals. Key public involvement activities have included:

**Old Settlers’ Day (September 2008) kicked off PlanOlathe.** Pioneers, parade watchers, and passersby shared their ideas on Olathe’s legacy and hopes for the future.

**www.PlanOlathe.com (October 2008) was launched to share information, communicate events and the process, and provide a central repository for information.** This interactive website provides the ability for the public to comment on key phases of the project and participate in virtual exercise and workshops.

**Stakeholder Interviews (November 2008) where more than 120 community stakeholders shared their interests, areas of concern, and questions about the future of Olathe in a series of small group or one-on-one meetings.** These stakeholder interviews were a great method in which to examine issues regarding a particular niche in the community, be it for a specific neighborhood or group. Stakeholders represented a wide variety of community interests, including neighborhood groups, business owners, architects, real estate professionals, social service providers, the faith community, nonprofit organizations, community groups,
schools, utility districts, and the City of Olathe and Johnson County departments.

**City-wide Visioning Workshops (January 2009) were held to define the vision for Olathe.** The public was notified of this meeting via www.planolate.com, cable TV, local newsletters, flyers, direct emails, and announcements at City Council meetings. At four public meetings throughout the City, attendees were asked to review numerous display boards that describe the potential vision and character, as well opportunities to achieve the vision.

**Mobile Public Visioning Workshops (September 2008 – June 2009) took PlanOlathe to the streets, with in-person presentations to civic and social organizations, neighborhood groups, community groups, homeowner associations school PTO’s, and other groups.** Since September 2008, staff has also presented PlanOlathe at local development, transportation, and housing forums.

**“Think Big” Public Workshops (May 2009): Residents were asked to create and judge those big ideas that can help improve Olathe’s future.** The workshops included hands-on small group exercises where four alternative Community Scenarios were described to represent distinctively different approaches to future growth and development. Each of the scenarios was depicted with maps and accompanying photographs. Armed with markers and pens, citizens were asked to critique the scenarios, offering their words and images directly on trace paper overlays.

**Public Review of the Draft Plan (March 2010): where the question was asked, “Did we get it right?”** Live, televised, and internet-broadcast presentations of the draft plan provided an overview of PlanOlathe’s draft recommendations. Question and answer sessions and public open houses provided an opportunity for the public to explore and learn about the plan, ask questions, and provide critiques and suggestions.

**Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee and Core Working Group (monthly meetings): Throughout it all, City leadership – most notably the Mayor, City Council, and Planning Commission – have taken an active role in directing PlanOlathe.** A Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee (CPAC) served as the steering committee, advising City staff and the consultant team at monthly milestones. A Core Working Group (CWG) representing each City department also conferred with the project team monthly.
As described in the diagram to the left, the project process contained five phases conducted over an eighteen-month period:

**Phase 1: Data Collection.** Phase 1 of PlanOlathe began with interviews of key groups and organizations from the Olathe community. These interviews allowed people to express their hopes and concerns about their hometown. Phase 1 also evaluated the quality of life of the community against other communities.

**Phase 2: Formulate Community Vision.** Phase 2 focused on community visioning and goal setting based on collected information. The community generated opportunities to achieve the vision, and citizen input culminated in a Vision Document (see Chapter 3) that graphically illustrated a desired future.

**Phase 3: Develop Key Principles and Plan Alternatives.** A number of “big choices” were presented to accomplish the community’s desires. Ideas included choices for downtown, new commercial areas, employment centers, greenways, transit and future neighborhoods.

**Phase 4: Evaluate Plan Alternatives and Develop Preferred Plan.** Based on technical data and public input, these ‘big choices’ were tested to see which will continue to elevate the City’s quality of life while being economically reasonable and fiscally sound.

**Phase 5: Draft Plan.** This phase involved drafting a Plan that represented the will of the Community. Part of this Plan included an action plan to ensure the vision is realized.

**How to Use This Plan**

PlanOlathe is designed to be used by anyone interested in the future of Olathe. The Plan establishes a community-based vision, guiding principles, policies and an implementation process. As an adopted City document, decision-makers will refer to PlanOlathe as an advisory guide when evaluating future development proposals.

**Planning Basis and Relationship to Other Plans**

As the City’s official Comprehensive Plan, PlanOlathe addresses elements defined by Kansas State Law, including land use, density, transportation, public infrastructure and facilities, and natural resources (Kansas Statute 12-747). However, the Plan does much more than fulfill statutory requirements. It represents the community vision for how Olathe should grow and develop, today and in the future. The Plan provides the basic guidance for land use decisions, promoting community development in ways that foster prosperity of existing and...
future residents. The recommendations of the Plan begin with the Vision. The Vision sets forth broad principles to guide the future of the City’s development and serves as the foundation for more specific recommendations. Based on these guiding principles, detailed policies and action items outline how the vision can be realized.

PlanOlathe works in conjunction with several other documents. As part of the process to update Olathe’s Comprehensive Plan, an inventory was completed of over 50 existing and in-progress plans and policies adopted since 1986. Documents ranged from land use plans at the sub-area, corridor and neighborhood level; transportation plans; utilities plans; and the overall strategic plan for City services. These adopted plans and policies provided a core level of information that has shaped PlanOlathe.

A major goal in the preparation of PlanOlathe was to simplify land use planning by reducing the number of policy layers associated with area plans, corridor plans, neighborhood plans, and other documents, while preserving the quality analysis and recommendations that are found in those documents. Toward that end, the land use recommendations within previously adopted land use plans have been integrated into PlanOlathe and have helped to shape the principles, policies, and land use designations found in the Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is the document that will guide the Planning Commission and City Council when evaluating development applications, rezonings, and other land use policy decisions. Previously adopted design guidelines and overlay districts associated with existing area and corridor plans will remain in effect and continue to be applied. As PlanOlathe is implemented, design guidelines and overlay districts will be reviewed and adapted to function within the framework of the Comprehensive Plan. Detailed research and analysis within existing area and corridor plans will be retained as supplementary information and an ongoing resource in the appendices of this plan (see Chapter 7 – Reference).

PlanOlathe is intended to work in concert with the City’s various functional master plans, including the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, Transportation Master Plan, service and utility master plans, and the City’s overall strategic plan for City services. Implementation of PlanOlathe will require coordination and alignment between PlanOlathe and these other plans to ensure a common vision and consistent policy recommendations.

PlanOlathe is also connected to regional and local planning efforts. Continued coordination with other regional planning efforts is important, because the scope of many major issues requires regional solutions, and because plans, initiatives, and trends in the wider region ultimately affect those who live and work in Olathe. Regional cooperation includes the development and refinement of regional transportation, infrastructure, schools, housing, economic, open space, and natural resource planning initiatives. Collaboration with Johnson County, adjacent municipalities,
and other jurisdictions is necessary to provide coordinated and sustainable development and resolve land use issues of mutual concern. Only through collaboration can the desired future be achieved for Olathe and the region.

A Living Plan

Over the course of eighteen months, extensive public participation and input have shaped the recommendations of PlanOlathe to create a compelling vision for the future of Olathe. In order for the Plan to be an effective policy tool, and a useful and relevant resource for its users, it must continue to evolve and respond to the community’s values and needs over time. PlanOlathe is a “living plan,” both in how it is used and how it is maintained and updated.

PlanOlathe is intended to be an interactive and user-friendly plan that sets the standard for public usability and accessibility. While graphics, maps, and diagrams in the Plan document help to illustrate the concepts embodied by the Plan, the Plan website, www.planolathe.com, enables the user to fully explore the Plan in a way that is visually interesting and specific to the user’s interest. PlanOlathe is useful in different ways to different groups. Residents may be interested in the location of parks, schools, or community facilities. Business and property owners may be interested in land use recommendations or development policies for their property. Topics such as the fiscal health of the City are a priority for policy makers. Through the Plan website, users of the Plan can explore detailed information on Plan concepts, City services, demographic and development information, or neighborhood activity, all in the context of the vision and recommendations contained in the Plan.

As described in Chapter 3, PlanOlathe is built on stable and enduring community values. As a result, guiding principles and policies in the PlanOlathe are general and timeless in nature and are expected to endure. Still, planning is an ongoing process, and principles and policies must periodically be reassessed, revised, and updated. Annual review of the Comprehensive Plan is required by law (Kansas statute 12-747). This annual review process presents an opportunity to ensure that the Plan is functioning as a useful policy tool and is being effectively implemented. As community priorities evolve and change, more thorough review and updates will be necessary to ensure that PlanOlathe is heading in the right direction.
Organization

The Plan is organized into seven chapters:

- **Chapter 1. Community:** This introductory chapter describes the purpose of PlanOlathe, how the public was involved in its preparation, and how the plan is used.

- **Chapter 2. Quality of Life:** This chapter describes the existing quality of life the community experiences, and how quality may change if PlanOlathe is implemented. The relationship between quality of life and factors such as cost of living, economic sustainability, and the fiscal constraints of the City is also explored.

- **Chapter 3. Vision:** This chapter provides a clear picture of what the community wants based on community values, and presents an ambitious vision and broad planning principles.

- **Chapter 4. Framework:** This chapter elaborates on the key land use themes embodied by PlanOlathe and defines the Future Land Use Plan. The specific characteristics of the neighborhoods, centers, corridors, and greenways identified in the Future Land Use Plan are also outlined here.

- **Chapter 5. Guidance:** This chapter elaborates on the guiding principles and defines detailed policies for each principle to ensure this Vision is realized.

- **Chapter 6. Implementation:** This chapter translates the Vision into a reality by discussing the process, responsibilities, and strategies necessary for successful implementation of PlanOlathe.

- **Chapter 7. Reference:** This chapter contains reference documents used throughout the planning process, such as background data and analysis from other plans, the build-out analysis, economic analysis, and land demand forecasts.
**Chapter 2. Quality of Life**

**Introduction**

Olathe citizens have indicated that a high quality of life is one of the most important considerations in future planning, as well as one of Olathe’s greatest existing assets. In addition to the traditional factors that draw people to communities, such as jobs and housing, community leaders recognize quality of life as increasingly important. This is evident in local community planning efforts across the country, as well as in national surveys like *Money* magazine’s Best Places to Live annual rankings and the Best Places Almanac, where Olathe has received high marks. The concept is that people relocate and settle in places that are appealing on various levels, providing a balance of economic stability, recreation opportunities, healthy surroundings, cultural experiences, and educational foundation. Communities like Olathe that offer such high-level amenities are better able to forge the social, civic, and cultural bonds that allow a community to prosper and flourish over time.

This Chapter describes how quality of life is defined and how Olathe performs relative to the primary elements of the Comprehensive Plan (PlanOlathe), beginning with a description of the issues identified through the public involvement process. Each section summarizes the key quality of life findings, including city-wide inventories and analyses, housing assessment and market analysis. The Chapter also includes an analysis of the relationship between quality of life, cost of living, economic sustainability and the fiscal challenges of the City.
WHAT IS QUALITY OF LIFE?

Quality of life factors are highly interwoven. Where you see communities with exceptional educational opportunities, you are likely to find lower crime risks and a higher sense of well-being. This can attract cultural diversity; pride in the community, and in turn, economic growth. Striving for high quality of life standards promotes a balanced, prosperous community.

Quality of life permeates all dimensions of the community. It measures how well people move around, where they live, their access to parks and recreation, the quality of their schools, and the safety of their neighborhoods, to name a few. Essentially, the measure accounts for anything that affects an individual’s ability to lead a balanced, healthy, prosperous life.

High quality of life is often about providing options for people, so that the community meets the needs of a broad range of individuals. For example, a completely car-centric city might be very unappealing to a person that is committed to walking, biking, or busing to work. Therefore, balancing a high functioning road system with multi-modal options makes for a high quality of life standard for transportation.

Some quality of life factors do not need to provide options, but simply strive for a high standard. These include clean water and air, abundant open space and natural areas, low crime risk, and outstanding schools. Achieving these standards benefits each and every member of the community and can continuously be improved upon.

Specifically, what does high quality of life mean to those who live in Olathe?

Comments received at numerous public events revealed that residents identify Olathe as a place that:

• Promotes economic opportunity.
• Places strong emphasis on education.
• Welcomes newcomers.
• Provides quality public services and development.
• Respects the area’s cultural history.
• Values health, safety, and well-being of all citizens.
Quality of Life and Economic Competitiveness

Quality of life has a broad meaning in economic development terms. It refers to the livability of an area as defined by numerous community characteristics and indicators such as public safety, quality of educational and employment opportunities, entertainment and cultural amenities, as well as environmental quality and access to open space, parks, and recreation opportunities. While the value of quality of life is not typically quantified, high quality of life correlates with positive economic growth.

Metropolitan areas in the U.S. are transitioning from heavy industry and manufacturing toward more knowledge-based industries and industries whose profits are not tied to their locations. These industries rely less on access to raw materials, heavy infrastructure, and energy supplies, and more on a skilled workforce. As a result, attracting a skilled and talented workforce is key to economic development for knowledge-based industries. A City’s success in economic development, especially in high-tech, research and development, and other mobile industries, is therefore tied to its ability to attract and retain highly educated professional employees and entrepreneurs. As other sectors of the economy become more dependent on technology and knowledge, attracting and retaining these skilled and talented employees will become increasingly important.

Knowledge workers often have more flexibility than others in choosing where to live, and quality of life is often a major factor in their decisions. As a result, businesses sometimes need to seek out high-amenity locations to satisfy their labor force requirements. High quality of life can also lead to lower employee turnover and absenteeism, better loyalty, higher productivity, and lower health care costs.

Parks, Open Space, and Recreation

PlanOlathe proposes a network of greenways, parks, and multi-use paths (bicycle and pedestrian). These types of natural and open space amenities have been shown to have positive impacts on real property values and public health. Land that is preserved for open space, either for recreational use, habitat conservation, or natural resource protection, has a tangible value that is hard to measure. One of the primary benefits of open space and conservation lands is increased quality of life. While the value of quality of life is not often quantified, quality of life has a direct link to economic development and community vitality that can be measured in other ways.

It has been well established that proximity to open lands and conservation areas enhances property values. Although less research has been conducted on community-wide benefits as a result of open space purchases, recent studies found a positive correlation.
Expanding open space and recreation opportunities and integrating bicycle paths as transportation options will also improve the health of Olatheans. Approximately two-thirds of American adults are overweight or obese. Children who commute to school by cycling or walking gain two to three fewer pounds per year than children who go to school using motorized transportation. The larger development pattern of a community also affects public health. People who live in mixed use neighborhoods with a variety of transportation options have lower body mass than those who live in exclusively residential neighborhoods.

**Future Transit Opportunities**

Plan Olathe anticipates future transit service, consisting of a potential regional rail connection to other areas of the metro area, and expanded local transit service, potentially a bus rapid transit (BRT) system. Broadly, the economic benefits of transit improvements consist of increased mobility and labor force access; reduced congestion; travel time savings; reduced fossil fuel consumption; and improved quality of life flowing from these other benefits.

Depending on the destinations and frequency of service, fixed rail transit has been demonstrated to have direct positive real estate development impacts. With more frequent service to more attractive destinations (e.g., major employment centers and shopping and entertainment districts) the development impacts are greater. The development impacts of rail transit generally occur within reasonable walking distance, $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ mile, of a transit station. Numerous studies have quantified the real estate impacts of transit, including higher rents and faster leasing for office and commercial development, and higher property values for all development in closer proximity to transit stations.

There are economic benefits associated with bus-rapid-transit as well. The increased mobility and equity in transportation choice are economic benefits that will be realized from any transit system improvements. In addition, transit can provide potential travel time savings, reduced congestion, and reduced carbon emissions compared to single occupancy vehicles.

**Downtown Vibrancy**

The experience of numerous downtowns and central city locations around the country has shown that a few well-targeted catalyst projects, public-private development projects, and infrastructure investments can trigger a cascading effect of additional redevelopment activity. Over time these initial investments are repaid with an overall increase in property values, economic activity, and the associated tax revenues.

Having a vibrant commercial area with a mix of diverse businesses, restaurants, and services is also important to the skilled workforce that
is crucial to economic growth. Busy professionals enjoy having a mix of services and retail opportunities close to their place of work, as a time saver and as a lifestyle amenity.

Residential property values have been shown to be related to the quality of a commercial corridor, where homes closer to high quality commercial corridors command higher prices than those near low quality corridors. “High quality” corridors were generally areas with low vacancies and a walkable pedestrian environment. Low quality commercial corridors were generally more automobile oriented, with wide cross-section streets, few if any pedestrian or bicycle access amenities, and higher vacancies. Studies have also found that investments in neighborhood greening, such as streetscaping and tree planting, pocket parks, and median plantings resulted in sizeable gains in comparable home values. Homes located in community improvement districts (CIDs) were found to be worth more than homes not in a community improvement district (CID).

Cost of Living

A reasonable cost of living is among the factors important for a community’s quality of life. Where cost of living is too high, it can negate the benefits of quality jobs and wages, and limit access to other necessities and amenities. The challenge for Olathe is to continue to improve quality of life while maintaining a reasonable cost of living. Cost of living includes housing, transportation, utilities, food, health, and other miscellaneous expenses.

By encouraging higher residential densities around employment and activity centers, identifying local commercial services in walkable proximity to neighborhoods, promoting a variety of transit options including a robust trail system that links residential and employment areas, the policies of PlanOlathe can reduce commute times, reliance on automobiles, and overall transportation costs. An enhanced parks and greenways system linked with a bike and pedestrian trail network provides recreational opportunities and environmental benefits that can improve resident health.

While there is evidence that access to quality of life amenities can increase residential property values, policies in PlanOlathe promote a variety of lot sizes, home sizes, styles, and price points to provide options for Olatheans of all income levels. Olathe is a very affordable community today, with an attractive combination of a high median income coupled with housing costs that are at or below the national average. With careful planning, Olathe can continue to enhance quality of life while remaining an affordable place to live.
**Measuring and Managing Quality of Life**

To effectively assess a community’s quality of life, planners and policymakers rely on indicators for specific elements. Initially, the process of identifying indicators that are relevant to a particular place enables planners and policymakers to gain a holistic perspective on what defines their community. Secondly, as these indicators are refined, the issues that are most important to the community emerge. Lastly, indicators allow policymakers to measure and, therefore, manage their community’s quality of life.

While some quality of life indicators are highly subjective, setting standards is essential to the assessment process. Measuring indicators initially provides an inventory of the community’s current status, such as park acreage, the student-teacher ratio, and the accessibility of transit and frequently-used services. This inventory provides a baseline from which to grow.

Planners and policymakers also must understand the context of their community by comparing it to other similar communities that possess desirable characteristics. Measuring indicators provides this ability. For instance, the quality of life assessment might indicate that a community has far fewer parks than other desirable communities of similar size and demographics. Or, the assessment could indicate that the educational foundation in the community is much stronger than the national average. Community comparisons identify gaps and strengths in a place’s overall quality of life.

Perhaps most importantly, setting standards and measuring quality of life indicators enables policymakers and planners to set goals for their community. Where weaknesses are identified, they can use comparable community standards for something to strive toward. Where strengths are identified, they can make budgetary adjustments to maintain that quality, but reprioritize investments in other areas. Clearly, quality of life assessments can have profound effects on the planning and management of a community.
QUALITY OF LIFE IN OLA THE

Direction Finder Survey Results

The perspective of Olathe residents on their quality of life has been measured on a regular basis through the Direction Finder Survey. The Direction Finder Survey is an annual survey of Olathe citizens to assess the effectiveness of City services and measure citizens' overall satisfaction with Olathe as a place to live, work, and raise children.

When the Direction Finder Survey was initially conducted in 2000, Olathe rated at or below average in nearly every category when compared to the overall Kansas City metropolitan area. The 2009 survey showed Olathe at or near the top in nearly every major category covering City services. In addition, Olathe’s satisfaction ratings significantly exceeded national averages.

In general, residents reported improved perceptions of the community across a wide range of indicators during the last survey. Most notably, residents felt that the overall quality of life in Olathe has continued to improve over the past several years. Olathe residents also reported a large degree of satisfaction with the City and City services, as compared to the U.S. at large. As it relates to overall quality of life, Olathe received very high marks as a place to live, work, and raise children. Olathe has continued to see significant improvements in overall citizen satisfaction when compared to the metropolitan area. Since the survey began, overall citizen satisfaction increased from a baseline of 100 to 126, while the same overall satisfaction index for the metropolitan area decreased from the 100 baseline to a score of 93.

The 2009 survey results showed that Olathe is considered a metropolitan leader in overall quality of city services; of the eight major categories surveyed under city services, Olathe ranked at or near the top in all categories. Those were: police, fire, and ambulance services; water and sewer utilities and stormwater runoff; parks and recreation; street and building maintenance; code enforcement; overall quality of customer service; and the effectiveness of city communication. In 2009, Olathe saw satisfaction improvements in the vast majority of categories. Traffic improvements have been the clear citizen priority since the survey began, and the City Council has invested tens of millions of dollars to meet that demand. The satisfaction increase is largely attributed to the completion of the 127th Street overpass project, elevation of the railroad crossing at Santa Fe Street east of Downtown, and the College Boulevard roadway widening and bridge construction. There is strong agreement among city residents (54%) that Flow of Traffic/Congestion Management should be a top priority for the City. This is followed by Maintenance of City Streets/Buildings/Facilities (47%).
Quality of Life Elements

In September 2008, the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee (CPAC) identified several elements they felt were important for overall quality of life to residents of Olathe and that should be addressed in PlanOlathe. These elements are: Housing and Neighborhoods; Parks, Recreation and the Environment; Public Safety; Mobility; Economy; Social, Leisure and Culture; and Education. Specific indicators were then selected for each of the elements in order to gauge how the City of Olathe compares to other communities, as well as nationally, in the provision of quality of life attributes.

One goal of this Chapter is to provide a baseline measurement of Olathe’s quality of life today, and then project resident’s future quality of life into the future based on the proposed land use and development pattern depicted in PlanOlathe. Each of these quality of life elements begins with an introduction, followed by several existing indicators that help to measure its current condition, and then a projection of community performance into the future based on measurable data and/or adopted policies. The indicators are developed from measurable, defensible available data. Where possible, data was obtained from National, State or local sources. In some cases quantitative measures are not available, so the best possible qualitative measures are provided that help us get a snapshot of future conditions.
Housing and Neighborhoods – Challenges and Opportunities

Housing and neighborhoods are a key component to community livability. Indicators such as median home price and proximity to urban services inform people relocating to an area of what they can expect from a community in terms of affordability and desire to maintain a “livable” community as it grows.

The authenticity of a newly developed community is directly related to how well it reflects the social, cultural and economic diversity of the larger region. Housing affordability contributes directly to diversity and, over time, enhances the sense of place. A community can be considered successful if its housing inventory offers a range of options and costs that is proportional to the makeup of its residents and employees and their ability to pay for housing. A successful range of housing choices will include ample options on the lower end as well as the upper end of housing prices. The beneficiaries are not only community residents, but also employers that are able to draw from a greater variety of potential employees.

Specific indicators in this section include:

• Median Home Price
• Proximity to Urban Services
• Standard for Key Areas or Level of Quality Development
• Range of Housing Inventory

Today

The City of Olathe has a very affordable housing stock, compared to both other communities and to the national average. While the median home price in Olathe, at approximately $192,600, is similar to national median home price of $192,400, Olathe’s median income of approximately $75,600 is considerably higher than the national median of $52,200. Several surveyed communities with similar growth and demographic characteristics have median home prices that are more than double that of Olathe. At 1.6 jobs per household, the job/housing balance in Olathe is close to the national average of 1.7. Overall, this is still slightly better than most compared communities. Olathe’s lower median home prices, coupled with higher than average incomes, provides for greater levels of discretionary income that can enhance citizen’s quality of life. Olathe also scores just above average in proximity to urban services with a score of 6 out of 10. The proximity of urban services score is based upon the distribution of grocery store-anchored shopping centers and their distance to housing. The national average is 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Home Value and Income Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing challenges facing Olathe are many. How will new residential neighborhoods be designed as more accessible and inclusive? How can frequently used services, like a grocery store, be sited within a reasonable distance from housing? How will the community maintain housing affordability while promoting high quality architecture and design?

These challenges relate to increasing density, diversifying the housing product mix, providing the full range of housing price points and closer proximity to services.

Under the proposed Future Land Use Plan, Olathe will provide a greater opportunity for a range of housing types, including single-family homes, townhomes, condominiums, accessory dwelling units, and apartments, which will allow for a range of housing affordability, style, and size.

Distances to commercial centers have been measured as part of the Quality of Life analysis. One of the most important measurements is based on the ability of pedestrians to access these activity areas. The primary pedestrian commute that was measured has a radius of 1,320 feet (1/4 mile) and roughly equates to a five-minute walk. As a point of reference, the typical block in Olathe is about 500 feet in length. A second measurement includes the dimension of the one-half mile (10 minute) walk. Walking distances tend to lengthen up to 10 minutes when the destination is work, school or a transit stop as long as the pedestrian experience is safe and appealing. Once walking distances exceed 10 minutes, the temptation to drive a car usually wins out.

As the following table indicates, the number of residents within close proximity to commercial centers will increase as new centers are constructed and higher densities are focused around employment and activity centers. It’s noteworthy that centers will allow more than 2/3 of Olathe’s ultimate population to live within ½ mile of a center, which will likely result in a higher probability to walk or use a bicycle for these trips.

More robust principles and policies have been incorporated into the plan that protect or enhance neighborhoods through better design quality. Design policies focus primarily on design components that help create vibrant, safe and integrated neighborhoods: great parks and public spaces, provision of a variety of housing types, and transportation elements that support walkability. No specific policies are included that address building style and materials, since these elements can materially increase housing costs. Improved design is called for in both newly developing neighborhoods as well as existing areas where buildings need rehabilitation and there is the potential for infill and redevelopment to occur.
Parks, Recreation and the Environment—Challenges and Opportunities

This section examines parkland available to residents, as well as natural resource protection ordinances and green initiatives instituted by the local government. While people relocate and settle in places that are appealing for a variety of reasons, the provision of high quality parks and recreation programs, and protection of the natural environment are often important factors.

Communal areas, like parks and recreation facilities, provide places for people to gather, help to connect communities, and have an influence on other factors such as crime and health. Parks and recreational facilities offer places for children and adults to exercise and participate in team activities. The ability to participate in such activities can have a positive impact on the overall health of a community’s residents. Issues such as childhood obesity and heart disease can be mitigated through exercise that might take place at parks and recreation facilities.

Open space and natural resources areas provide resource conservation, wildlife, and recreational benefits, as well as relief from urban development. Like parks, natural resources increase property values and provide educational opportunities, in addition to providing a number of “free” ecosystem services like flood storage, moderation of climate, and air purification. They also provide communities with green infrastructure that naturally manage stormwater, reduce flooding risk, and improve water quality.

Green infrastructure can be thought of as a system of interconnected open spaces of various types that help to preserve ecosystems while also benefiting surrounding human populations. In order to encourage thriving natural and human communities, green infrastructure planning treats open spaces as a necessary and beneficial aspect of urban and suburban environments. By incorporating green space networks into our communities, we improve our own quality of life as well as the health of the natural world.

A healthy environment provides a strong foundation for a community’s quality of life. Having clean air, water bodies, and drinking water allows residents to fully enjoy the other amenities a place has to offer. Green initiatives are also becoming increasing important quality of life factors to existing and future residents. More and more often, people want to live in a community that respects the environment and shows this through leadership of green initiatives at the local level, where they can actively participate. Green initiatives in a community can include things such as recycling programs, climate protection programs for local businesses, and energy savings solution for residents and businesses alike, just to name a few.
Specific indicators in this section include:

- Municipal Parkland
- Existing and Future Open Space per 1,000 Residents
- Natural Resources Protection Ordinances
- Green Initiatives

Continually, communities that are ranked as best places to live by such publications as Money Magazine list the provision of parks as a top priority. As such, communities desiring to provide, or improve quality of life, look to provide additional parks and recreation amenities.
Today

The City of Olathe provides a very high level of service in the provision of parkland. There are approximately 1900 acres of parkland in the City of Olathe, or 15.33 acres per 1,000 people. While no national average is available for this indicator, previously adopted National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) guidelines recommended that communities provide up to 8 acres of parkland per 1,000 people between neighborhood, community, and district parks. Combining other open space in addition to parks, such as subdivision common areas and semi-private outdoor recreation areas. Olathe provides approximately 2,700 acres of total open space today, or 21.80 acres per 1,000 people. The City of Olathe is doing an excellent job in the provision of parkland for its residents, and can continue to do so by ensuring that policy mechanisms for parkland and open space remain in place as future development occurs.

There is no national average for the provision of natural resource protection ordinances or green initiatives. On a scale of 1 to 5, Olathe scores low with a 1 on natural resource protection ordinances, and a 2 on design guidelines. Olathe’s standards, by and large, match federal requirements for floodplain and wetland protection and suggested best management practices for water quality. High ranking communities in this category utilize provisions or programs such as:

- local regulations protecting wetlands, natural habitat and natural landscape features, all that surpass federal standards;
- solar protection siting standards for new subdivisions;
- a dedicated sales tax for acquisition of natural open space lands that have unique geologic features, natural habitat or native species, and prime farmland;
- override of private covenants that prohibit energy saving devices, e.g., solar panels and clotheslines; and
- a wind power option for electricity customers and an energy saving program with financial incentives.

Like most of the surveyed communities, Olathe has already instituted an excellent curbside recycling program. Olathe continues to make progress in establishing natural resource protection ordinances and green initiatives, but there is more that can be done. Increasingly, both existing and future residents desire to live in a community that places emphasis on protecting the natural resources and environment around them. This can be achieved through the establishment of natural resource protection ordinances and other green initiatives for the local community.
In the Future

PlanOlathe provides a balanced system of open space composed of environmentally sensitive areas, natural areas, wildlife corridors, habitat areas, trails and greenways using a variety of conservation methods that meet both the needs of the citizens and the City’s resource protection goals. Lands with conservation values (see Greenways) have been identified on the Future Land Use Map as conservation priorities as development occurs.

Expansion of Olathe’s greenway system is one of the major elements of PlanOlathe. The Plan calls for preservation and reclamation of streamway corridors for natural ecosystems, trails, to improve air quality and wildlife habitat, and to provide a contrast and amenity to urban development. This comprehensive interconnected greenways system will include pedestrian and bikeway paths that provide links and regional connections between residential and employment areas, commercial centers, recreational and open space areas and educational facilities.

By the time the community matures to its ultimate size, 38 acres of open space will be provided per 1,000 residents. This generous amount of preserved open land will make up approximately 24.4% of the community’s land area.

Recently, Olathe adopted a parks and recreation master plan with specific acreage standards for developed parkland. With the projected population growth, new community and neighborhood parks will be needed to meet these standards. Olathe continues to acquire and improve parkland to meet the community’s needs. A number of major parks and natural areas have already been acquired and protected in Olathe’s Future Growth Area through City, County, and State efforts. Immediate priorities for the parks and recreation system include the need for programmable indoor space.

To achieve cleaner air, better water quality, conserve energy, recycle solid materials, and encourage resource efficient (“green building”) design and construction, clear policy has been set through the Plan. Specific policies have been included in the Plan that support green initiatives including recycling programs, conservation and cluster development, green building practices, and energy savings solutions for resident and businesses.
Public Safety—Challenges and Opportunities

Feeling safe and secure within our homes, communities and cities is a basic human desire. It is a key determinant in the perception of the quality of life of a community. As communities grow, the needs for safe social and physical environments where people are able to participate fully in their communities without fear of incident becomes an increasing challenge.

Crime affects all members of a community. If crime rates increase, a community’s overall sense of security and perception of safety will diminish. High levels of crime lower property values, discourage commercial investment, reduce competition, erode employment opportunities, shrink customer bases and ultimately can depress a city’s economy. Therefore, perceived safety and actual crime rates are crucial components in the overall welfare of a community.

Specific indicators in this section include:

- Personal Crime Incidents
- Property Crime Incidents

Today

Crime statistics assessing current conditions have been gathered through Benchmark City Survey, Direction Finders Survey and three national crime data bases to help provide a general snapshot of community safety. For consistency Olathe uses the same definitions and standards established by the Kansas Incident Based Reporting System (KiBRS) and the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system and the agreed up parameters established by Benchmark City for the reporting of all crime data.

Overall, Olathe maintains a high degree of public safety. When compared to other Benchmark Cities violent Part I crime incidents are lower at 2.6 per 1,000 people, as compared to an average of 3.0 per 1,000 people. As for Part I property crimes, Olathe scores rather low in comparison to the average of the other surveyed communities in Benchmark City. Olathe reports 22.0 property crimes per 1,000 people, while the survey average is higher at 33.7 per 1,000 people.

Citizen’s responses to the 2008 Direction Finder survey revealed a high level of satisfaction with various aspects of public safety in Olathe. Approximately 92% of residents are satisfied with the local fire, police, and ambulances services. Olathe residents feel generally safe in their community; 97% say they feel safe in their neighborhoods during the day, and 86% feel safe in their neighborhoods during the night.
None of these results can be taken for granted as it takes little upward movement in crime trends, rates or response times to influence the public perception of safety. Public Safety is the responsibility of all branches of government. It will take constant attention to details, analysis of crime trends and services provided, along with interaction and feedback from citizens to ensure the common goals of preventing, reducing and solving crime is met. Thus fulfilling the public’s expectation for a strong sense of security and safety.

In the Future

Crime statistics can help provide some quantifiable measure regarding police performance in the future; however, they are only one portion of the overall story. Principles and policies are contained within PlanOlathe that support the community’s commitment to maintain an adequate level of police protection, and promote community design principles that maximize public safety.
Mobility – Challenges and Opportunities

The primary mode of transportation in Olathe is by automobile. The community is served by a variety of interstate highways, state highways, and city streets; all of which form the surface transportation network that allows personal mobility throughout the city and beyond. Surface transportation plays a role for every resident and visitor in the area, whether that is personal mobility or the provision of goods to sustain life. Every activity we undertake involves movement and in a geographically diverse area much of that is through use of a vehicle. However not everyone has the ability, or the desire, to drive a vehicle. Thus other attributes of a community related to transportation have become increasingly important, such as a community’s walkability and the availability and access to public transit.

Several freight rail lines also pass through the Olathe region. The presence of these lines and their proximity to the local road network also plays a very important role in the circulation and movement of traffic in and around the city.

Public transit is a “life-line” service to people who have no other viable means of travel. This includes elderly who may be limited due to age in driving as well as persons with disabilities who may not be able to physically operate automobiles. It can also apply to people who are unable to afford private means of travel. Public transit can also be vital to the overall transportation network in that it can help alleviate traffic congestion or parking needs in high-density areas. Related to transit, is the ability of people to walk throughout their community. A walkable community is seen by many as being a livable, healthy community.

Specific indicators in this section include:

- Median Commute Time
- Transit Access
- Walkability
- % of Population Carpooling, Walking, Using Public Transit, or Other Means

Today

Olathe has a median commute time of 23.7 minutes, lower than the national average of 25.1 minutes. This figure also compares favorably to other communities that are similar to Olathe.

Transit access has been measured based upon the extent and layout of the existing transit system. In terms of transit access, the City of Olathe ranks alongside the national average. However, a survey of similar communities suggests that there is more that can be done in this area.
Another important indicator is that of a community’s walkability. The degree of walkability was analyzed for each of the surveyed communities through a web-based program called “Walk Score”. Walk Score uses a system to assign algorithms to housing and destinations. Based on this data, Olathe and its neighbors score near the national average with a score of 2 out of 5. The most walkable communities surveyed rank a 5 out of 5.

Related to walkability is the percentage of the population that utilizes means other than driving with a single occupant. This includes walking, carpooling, public transit, or other means, such as bicycling. 12.9% of the population of Olathe uses other means, which is somewhat lower than the national average of 17%.

In general, Olathe has some room to improve on its provision of alternative means of transportation. This would include providing more access to public transit, as well as providing incentives for residents to use alternative means of transportation. This may include improving future neighborhood design to encourage walking safely and providing additional off-street trails.

**In the Future**

The Plan includes measures to maximize existing street investments. The capacity, efficiency, and safety of arterial roads will be enhanced by controlling the number and spacing of signalized intersections and consolidating driveway access. Investments will be made in roadway design that will accommodate transit features, bicycle facilities and pedestrian access. Improved traffic signal timing will help to reduce congestion and improve air quality.

PlanOlathe calls for walkable neighborhoods and districts built to include transit, and a variety of non-motorized options. The Plan addresses Olathe’s dispersed land use pattern that has tended to limit the choice to walk, bike or use transit. This new, more compact, land use pattern includes a greater mix of land uses that make transit and multi-modal transportation more viable.

Transit service quality has been measured based on the proximity of transit routes to housing. As with the indicating measurements for neighborhood quality, the key measurement is the distance from residences based on pedestrian activity.

The negative impacts of freight rail on community mobility will be addressed through improved coordination between the rail and transportation systems. Railroad quiet zones will continue to be investigated.
Economic Sustainability – Challenges and Opportunities

Olathe’s economy is sustainable to the degree that its mix of activities minimizes the use of natural resources while maximizing the economic well-being and quality of life of its residents.

Economic sustainability requires a broad view of the interactions among economic, environmental and social systems with the goal of recapturing and recycling activity within the community. The successful attraction, incubation and retention of economic activities that interact with each other both functionally and geographically are the keys to a sustainable economy. This interaction requires that those activities be located near each other, and all economic activities must have access to both their employment bases and their ultimate markets. Given these needs, economic sustainability dictates a mix of land uses, with sufficient housing (prices of housing units as well number and types) to accommodate the work force.

To support the ability of the City of Olathe to continue to provide public services of the types and at the levels desired by City residents, economic development must also be sensitive to the revenue needs of the community. While some of these revenue-generating uses (like retail and lodging) are fiscally beneficial, their wage scales may not support their employees’ local housing costs. This is just one example of the need to balance the various policies of PlanOlathe. Thus, the community will be challenged to resolve competing priorities as it pursues sustainable economic development within the framework established by the Comprehensive Plan.

Sustainable development requires that the City of Olathe maintain fiscal solvency by collecting revenues in amounts great enough to cover the costs of providing public services to its residents and businesses.

Today

Both Johnson County and Olathe are well positioned in the Kansas City regional economy. Both areas have diversified service-oriented economies that have experienced growth above that of the regional and national economies. Olathe, in particular, has experienced a surge in its employment. Johnson County has a high concentration of “white collar” industries, including Administrative, Professional and Technical, Finance and Insurance, Real Estate, and Educational Services. These are typically well paying jobs that draw an educated workforce and affluent demographic.

The economic growth in Olathe and Johnson County has translated into high population growth. While Johnson County is growing at nearly
double the rate of the region, Olathe’s population grew three times faster than the region. This high growth has also been captured in residential construction.

Olathe and neighboring Overland Park captured 60 percent of the demand for residential construction in Johnson County. Olathe consistently captures 30 percent of total county residential construction, and issued an average of 1,200 new residential building permits per year from 2000 to 2008. Overland Park also issues approximately 1,230 permits per year, but builds considerably more attached and multifamily housing than Olathe. In Olathe, single-family homes comprise 76 percent of annual construction, on average. In Overland Park, attached and multifamily housing is 46 percent of new construction while single-family detached housing is 54 percent. Households in both Olathe and Johnson County are considerably more affluent and well-educated with median incomes and educational attainment levels well above those of the Kansas City Metropolitan Area. Olathe has a younger population with a median age below that of the Kansas City area.

Olathe is capturing the majority of its resident’s expenditures and is not experiencing major sales leakage to surrounding areas. The City of Olathe has continued to reinvest retail sales tax revenues in infrastructure, facilities and other quality of life improvements desired by the community.

While it appears that Olathe has an adequate supply of retail space to serve its demand and attract an inflow of retail sales in traditional store categories, there is a significant over supply of retail/general commercial space. Much of this vacant or outdated retail space is located along Olathe’s older arterial roads, such as Santa Fe, Old Highway 56, and South Harrison Street, as well as Downtown Olathe. The City’s regional mall has transitioned from its primary anchor tenants to a mix of second tier and off brand tenants. There are also some newer shopping centers that are not well positioned for retail capture given their size and location.

In the Future

PlanOlathe proposes a number of “Big Ideas” aimed at improving the quality of development in Olathe and to improve the community’s overall quality of life and attractiveness. From an economic perspective, all of these proposed policies and investments would help Olathe continue to compete for economic and residential growth in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

The Plan designates extensive areas for employment development along key corridors such as K-10/College Boulevard and K-7, and the K-7/I-35 area. These areas are strategically located along major regional access roadways and are ideal for high visibility corporate sites. It is an
important strategic decision to ensure sufficient land capacity in these locations in order to be competitive for regional employment growth.

Considering the areas of underperforming, obsolete, and vacant retail, PlanOlathe provides greater direction on the scale and type of retail uses sought for certain locations. Retail placement ensures that locations for new regional retail projects (e.g. a lifestyle center or “town center” project, or power centers) are reserved in the path of growth, surrounded by a large enough trade area (housing), or located such that they could capture sales leakage to adjacent communities, and that neighborhood or community centers are sized and located such that they can be market supported.

New policies suggest more aggressive commercial redevelopment strategies and additional public investment to direct retail and commercial growth to existing commercial centers, including Downtown. Demographics analysis has shown that Olathe can support approximately 125,000 square feet of new retail development alone within Downtown over the next 25 years.

PlanOlathe proposes extensive new areas of greenways, parks, and multi-use paths (bicycle and pedestrian). These types of natural and open space amenities have been shown to have positive impacts on real property values and public health. Land that is protected from development, for recreational use, habitat conservation, or natural resource protection such as water, has a tangible value that is hard to measure. One of the primary benefits of open space and conservation lands is increased quality of life. While the value of quality of life is not often quantified, quality of life has a direct link to economic development and community vitality that can be measured in other ways.

The Plan anticipates future transit service, consisting of a potential regional rail connection to other areas of the metro area, and expanded local transit service, potentially a bus rapid transit (BRT) system. Broadly, the economic benefits of transit improvements consist of increased mobility and labor force access; reduced congestion; travel time savings; air quality improvements; reduced fossil fuel consumption; reduced carbon and other tailpipe emissions; and improved quality of life flowing from these other benefits. Depending on the destinations and frequency of service, fixed rail transit has been demonstrated to have direct positive real estate development impacts. With more frequent service to more attractive destinations (e.g., major employment centers and shopping and entertainment districts) the development impacts are greater. The development impacts of rail transit generally occur within reasonable walking distance, ¼ to ½ mile, of a transit station.
SOCIAL, LEISURE AND CULTURE – CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

This section examines the emphasis placed on culture, arts and downtown vibrancy in the community. While this is a broad category, some base level of access to cultural opportunities of varying degrees is highly important to many people.

Strong and thriving cultural and arts can have a positive impact in a community. They can act as a catalyst for economic development, promote educational awareness of heritage, and encourage historic preservation. They can also inspire others to act in creative and entrepreneurial ways.

Regarding the arts, culture and heritage attractions, residents and tourists are frequently interested in the same things: an accessible experience that is both fun and rewarding. Maintaining a large number of organizations and programs indicates a vibrant community capable of accommodating a variety of interests and talents. These organizations and programs provide opportunities for a diversity of individuals to create, learn, and work together around a common interest. Related to this is the provision of public spaces that can both accommodate arts and cultural events, as well as contribute to a vibrant and economically sustainable downtown core.

Specific indicators in this section include:

- Libraries and Museums in the Vicinity
- Historic Preservation and NRHP Designations
- Arts Funding
- Number of Major Civic Gathering Places
- Downtown Vibrancy

Today

The proximity of Olathe to Kansas City provides it with a high concentration of libraries and museums. There are approximately 48 libraries (15 miles) and museums (30 miles) available to residents of Olathe. This is similar, albeit slightly lower, than the other Kansas City area communities in this comparison. Olathe provides approximately $0.80 per person of state funds on the arts. This is a little lower than the national average of $1.00 per person, but similar to that of other Kansas City area communities. With respect to the provision of major programmed civic gathering spaces in the community (not including parks), Olathe provides two: the R.R. Osborne Plaza at City Hall and the Johnson County public square. This is above the average of one per surveyed community. Several similar communities do not provide
any major civic gathering areas; however, the most vibrant downtowns provide several major civic gathering spaces.

In general this element suggests that Olathe is a little behind other communities in its provision of social, leisure, and cultural places. Its proximity to Kansas City tempers this somewhat, however the community itself could do more to provide civic gathering spaces and improve upon the vibrancy of its downtown.

**In the Future**

PlanOlathe promotes opportunities for artistic and cultural expression. A stronger arts program will integrate art into the public realm and into peoples’ daily experiences. Provision of public art will enhance beauty, provide visual interest, and be a source of community pride. It can also contribute to cultural expression and raises awareness of diversity in the community.

Along with the visual and performing arts, preservation and recognition of historical resources will also help give residents a stronger sense of place. Historic resource protection, recognition of sites, and educational programs will be the focus of preservation efforts in the future. A range of incentives will be provided to encourage the preservation of historic resources.

Since Downtown provides the cultural heart of the community, sustaining and re-energizing the Downtown and its surrounding neighborhoods is a dominant theme within PlanOlathe (see Districts in Chapter 4). Implementation of the Plan will help transform Downtown Olathe into a vibrant multi-functional district which builds on existing neighborhood and business strengths. One of the key recommendations call for additional community gathering spaces that can support celebrations and events, such as a farmer’s market pavilion and civic square.
EDUCATION – CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Local public schools play a significant role in the quality of life, character, and civic involvement of a community. A school district’s main mission is to educate the children of a local community. Schools strive to develop a passion for learning, as well as to create a safe and encouraging environment for students to further develop skills required for learning. Schools provide vital tools, guidance, and inspiration for children, thus providing them the ability to shape their futures. Each school district is asked to provide both a basic level of education as well as meet all special needs of the student body.

Schools play a vital role in civic involvement, and include participation from students, teachers, administrative staff, parents, and volunteers, many of which reside within the local community.

Schools are often the first item of discussion when homebuyers are examining new areas. Property values also are typically affected by the quality of the local school district. Local school districts that perform well attract parents seeking high quality public schools, and typically increase home prices and assessed values.

Specific indicators in this section include:

- Student-Teacher Ratio
- Graduation Rates
- % of Students Above/Below the State Average for Math and Reading
- Per Pupil Spending
- School Quality

Today

Olathe has a very favorable student to teacher ratio of 1:15. This is lower than the national average of 1:17, and considerably lower than the surveyed community with the highest ratio. Olathe also has a favorable graduation rate of 94.2%. This is significantly higher than the national average of 85% and the state average of 75%. Olathe students have scored well above the state average on achievement tests, including a reading proficiency score of 92.5% in 2009 [national adequate yearly progress (AYP) target 76.7] and math proficiency score of 92.2% (AYP target of 70.5). The average ACT score for 2009 was 23.3, higher than both the state and national averages.

Per pupil spending in Olathe is $5,843 and very consistent with that of other communities. However, it is significantly less than the national average of $8,701.
Residents of Olathe have enjoyed Johnson County’s focus on academic excellence. Educated residents, both children and adults, create a solid foundation for community growth, safe and prosperous cities, and diverse creativity. Increasingly, job creation is shifting to the high technology and service industries that demand more highly skilled and creative workers. Lifelong learning opportunities are important to maintaining productivity and competitiveness of individuals and communities in the global marketplace. Of counties in the United States with populations above 250,000, Johnson County ranks first in percent of adults with at least a high school education, sixth in percent with at least a bachelor’s degree, and 16th in percent with a graduate or professional degree. Nearly 96% of Johnson County residents 25 years or older have earned at least a high school diploma, 51% have a bachelor’s degree, and 17% have earned a graduate or professional degree.

In general, it can be said that Olathe has a high quality school system with high graduation rates and a low student to teacher ratio. The Olathe School District was recently listed as one of the top 25 places to live and go to school by Relocate America, and has received the Standard and Poor’s top district efficiency award. Overall, education in Olathe remains a strong quality of life attribute.

**In the Future**

Principles and polices found in PlanOlathe underline the need for a high performing school system that will help make the community more competitive in the regional economy. The anticipated future land use pattern integrates educational facilities into the community by strategically locating schools relative to housing, rapid transit routes, and civic amenities. PlanOlathe calls for strong partnerships between the school district and other public and private entities through shared-use or joint facilities, so that educational services can be provided as efficiently as possible.
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CHAPTER 3.

Vision

A COMMON VISION

The purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to identify and articulate citizen's values and goals and help the community achieve its desired future.

It is clear that the Plan must help the City to foster an enhanced quality of life for Olathe’s residents; ensure the City responds effectively to citizens’ social, economic, environmental, and development concerns; and achieve rational and logical patterns of growth.

The vision for Olathe may mean something different for different people. For its ambitious leaders, it has been simple: to create a plan that represents the community's collective will to create a top tier American City. For all, it has been to create a welcoming community that continues to improve its quality of life.

City leaders, steering committee, stakeholders, and the public have given clear, early direction: decisions must be geared toward improving the quality of life of those who live in Olathe. Our exceptional quality of life is clearly our most important asset. Our great schools, family and business-friendly environment, and beautiful surroundings strengthen our City’s competitiveness. This is evident in local community planning efforts across the country, as well as in national surveys like Money Magazine’s Best Places to Live annual rankings and the Best Places Almanac (Money Magazine 2008 and Savageau 2000). The concept is that people relocate and settle in places that are appealing on various levels, providing a balance of economic stability, recreational opportunities, healthy surroundings, cultural experiences, and educational foundation. It is understood that communities that offer such amenities are better able to forge the social, civic, and cultural bonds that allow a community to prosper and flourish over time.

Quality of life factors are highly interwoven. Where we see communities with exceptional educational opportunities, we are also likely to find lower crime risks and a higher sense of well-being. This can attract cultural diversity, pride in the community, and, in turn, economic growth. Striving for high quality of life standards promotes a balanced, prosperous community.
Quality of life can be measured by how well people move around, where they live, their access to parks and recreation, the quality of their schools, the safety of their neighborhoods, access to quality jobs, and access to services and amenities. Essentially, the measure accounts for anything that affects an individual’s ability to lead a balanced, healthy, prosperous life.

To that end, our collective vision statement could be phrased as follows:

**Improve the quality of life in Olathe by:**

- Promoting economic opportunity.
- Placing strong emphasis on education.
- Welcoming newcomers and diversity.
- Providing high-quality public services.
- Supporting sustainable land development.
- Valuing the area’s cultural history and sense of community.
- Ensuring the health, safety & well-being of all citizens.
- Balancing the needs of today’s citizens without compromising the needs of future citizens.
This will require that Olathe remain:

- **Fluid** – Embracing a balanced sense of change. Olathe is not static, but ever-adapting and flexible while also retaining the values and traditions that contribute to a healthy community and environment.
- **Inclusive** – Actively promoting a safe, fair, and cohesive local culture.
- **Environmentally sensitive** – Protecting natural resources and systems.
- **Well-planned** – Featuring a quality built environment and valued natural areas.
- **Well-connected** – Enabling efficient transportation and communication linking people to jobs, schools, health and other services.
- **Economical** – With a thriving and diverse local economy.
- **Well-served** – With public, private, community and voluntary services that are appropriate to people’s needs and accessible to all.

A Vision and Guiding Principles for each plan component have arisen from direction given by the public, stakeholders, steering committee, planning team, and throughout City policy documents.

Based on comments received, the vision has been outlined by defining guiding principles, community benefits, and implementation opportunities. Each of these is described in the following pages.
Promote high quality community growth that will advance Olathe as a vibrant, progressive city, yet preserve positive qualities of a small town.

Guiding Principles

• Plan Olathe, the City’s Comprehensive Plan, will be the guiding document within the Olathe Growth Area.

• Collaborate with other jurisdictions to provide coordinated and sustainable development of the community and to resolve land use issues of mutual concern.

• Promote adequate residential densities to support existing and future commercial centers.

• Encourage mixed-use development, especially in the downtown area, to support commercial uses, promote walkability, and provide for a variety of housing options.

• Develop commercial centers of an appropriate size and scale, and within the right locations, to ensure economic sustainability and shape community form.

• Discourage “leap-frog” or sprawling land use patterns by encouraging growth in serviceable areas. Promote the infill of vacant parcels and reinvestment in buildable areas.

• Encourage design standards that successfully enhance quality of life in a manner that is economically viable and sustainable for the City and the private sector.

• Achieve a balanced mix of residential and non-residential development throughout Olathe.

Benefits

• Minimizes sprawl by encouraging growth in serviceable areas, and promoting mixed uses, higher densities, and infill in developed areas

• Preserves intact green space throughout the City.

• Improves connectivity between neighborhoods and retail/service areas.

• Defines the edges of the community.

• Ensures adequate density for the efficient delivery of urban services and viable commercial areas.
Community Commercial Area Integrated with Employment and Housing

Open Space/Trail Connection

Visitor Center

Mixed-Use Office & Multi-family Housing

Regional Shopping Center

Park & Ride
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**Economic Sustainability**

* Maintain fiscal health by being a competitive economic force.*

**Guiding Principles**

- Utilize Olathe’s strengths, including a highly educated population, affordability, recreation opportunities, business and family-friendly environment, and other quality of life amenities as a tool to attract quality jobs and position Olathe as a regional economic leader.

- Achieve a balanced mix of commercial and residential development to promote fiscal sustainability and ensure that tax revenues are sufficient to support public services provided to the citizens of Olathe.

- Strengthen and revitalize existing commercial centers.

- Develop distinct employment districts to ensure Olathe’s strong and diversified economy.

**Benefits**

- Promotes long-term economic stability.

- Increases self-sufficiency.

- Diversifies the economy.

- Strengthens existing commercial areas.

- Ensures long-term fiscal health.

- Allows City to continue providing quality services.

- Increases local opportunities for quality employment.
Reinventing our commercial areas will be an equal priority as creating new, walkable, commercial centers.

The following illustrations depict one of many possible redevelopment scenarios for antiquated commercial buildings.
Original Town is recognized as the foundation of a well-balanced, thriving community.

Guiding Principles

- Continue to support efforts to improve and expand the Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods by locating additional uses and amenities in this area, including entertainment, restaurants, transportation hubs, high density housing, and other compatible uses in a manner that is harmonious with the historic character of Downtown.
- Promote policies and financial incentives that assist Downtown redevelopment efforts.
- Encourage and implement innovative techniques designed to spur Original Town revitalization activities.

Benefits

- Strengthens Downtown and Original Town as the symbolic heart of the community.
- Minimizes sprawl by creatively reusing land in the center of the City, where public facilities and services exist.
A revitalized Downtown Olathe could include:

- Mixed-use office, retail, and residential
- New government offices
- Additional and enhanced community facilities, such as a new library and community center
- Rehabilitated Mill Creek Center
- Public Town Square Plaza
- Farmers’ market pavilion
- Developed Mill Creek Trail
- Improved pedestrian connections and walkability
- On-street parking with enhanced street crossings
- Completion of Downtown streetscape improvement projects
- Pedestrian and vehicular wayfinding
- Internal, structured parking facilities
- Historic Signage

Downtown Olathe
Create residential communities that allow residents to live, work, and play in their neighborhoods, and foster a sense of community.

Guiding Principles

• Maintain the character and identity of existing residential neighborhoods.

• Support housing development and redevelopment that includes a variety of housing types and opportunities to enable a wide range of economic levels, age groups, and lifestyles to live within a community.

• Promote high quality residential design.

• Promote housing strategies to ensure an adequate supply of homes at all price ranges.

• Encourage housing densities and styles that will support vibrant retail and transit centers.

• Reduce physical and social barriers between neighborhoods, while at the same time preserving and nurturing unique neighborhood identities.

Benefits

• Neighborhood stability is maintained or enhanced.

• Residents experience an increase in neighborhood livability.

• An adequate supply of housing options is provided.
Neighborhoods with Full Range of Services and Uses

- Front Porches & Native, Adaptive or Drought-Tolerant Landscaping
- Neighborhood Park Surrounded by Neighborhood-Serving Commercial
- Minimal Building Setbacks
- Landscaped Tree Lawns & Detached Sidewalks
- Narrow Street Width
- Curb Extensions & Pedestrian Crosswalks at Corners
- On-street Parking
- Live/Work Housing Units
  - On-street Parking
Parks, Trails & Recreation

Provide a variety of high-quality parks, trails, and recreational facilities.

Guiding Principles
• Provide and maintain a diverse, high-quality, safe and affordable system of parks, trails and recreational facilities that provides for all ages and abilities.
• Provide a system of interconnected trails that connects to neighborhoods, services and adjacent regional trails.

Benefits
• Enhances personal health.
• Improves air quality.
• Increases opportunities for social interaction.
• Controls stormwater runoff and improves water quality.
• Increases property values.
• Stabilizes neighborhoods.
• Aids economic revitalization.
• Preserves stream and utility corridors and environmentally sensitive areas.
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Greenways Linking Community Destinations

Unique Architectural Elements, Shelters, Lighting & Furnishings

Connections to Schools, Retail, Housing, Parks & Employment

Natural Drainage with Low-maintenance Vegetation

Soft Surface Jogging Path

Divided Concrete Path for Biking, Skating & Walking
Environmental Sustainability & Resources

Protect ecological systems and reduce inefficient use of resources.

Guiding Principles

• Protect and preserve significant natural ecological systems.
• Encourage innovation in green building practices.
• Minimize the disposal of solid waste to preserve landfill space.
• Manage stormwater runoff and conveyance systems to protect the water quality of Olathe’s streams and lakes and protect property from flood damage.

Benefits

• Increases energy efficiency.
• Promotes water conservation.
• Promotes waste minimization.
• Promotes use of resource-efficient materials.
• Aids pollution prevention.
• Conserves natural resources.
• Improves indoor and outdoor air quality.
• Reduces outdoor light pollution.
• Reduces greenhouse gas emissions.
**MOBILITY**

*Establish and maintain a balanced multi-modal transportation system that provides effective, efficient, and safe mobility for residents.*

**Guiding Principles**

- Provide an efficient, safe, and cost effective roadway network that will meet the City’s mobility needs in a manner compatible with fiscal and environmental constraints.
- Purposefully integrate transportation and land use decisions to be mutually supportive.
- Provide a transportation system that integrates multiple modes of travel.

**Benefits**

- Transportation choices reduce the number of vehicle trips, overall miles traveled, and traffic congestion.
- Improves public health.
- Reduces air pollution.
- Provides travel options for residents and visitors.
Cultural Resources & Landmarks

Preserve Olathe’s historic sites and buildings, and foster a culturally vibrant and diverse community.

Guiding Principles

• Promote opportunities for artistic and cultural expression. Support cultural amenities as a contributor to economic health and as a reflection of the importance of the arts and our heritage.
• Support historic preservation efforts throughout the city.
• Ensure that urban design standards and guidelines will promote community identity, sustainability, and civic pride.

Benefits

• Educates the public about the community’s rich history since cultural resources most clearly reflect the community’s evolution, history, and diversity.
• Adjacent property owners and the community benefit economically from the unique cultural amenities.
COMMUNITY SERVICES & FACILITIES

Provide coordinated, high quality community services and facilities.

Guiding Principles

• In order to protect and use past investments in capital improvements, new development and redevelopment will be located in areas where adequate public services presently exist or are planned to be provided.
• Growth will pay the fair share of associated costs for facilities and services and to mitigate negative impacts.
• Promote the health and safety of the community.

Benefits

• Uses infrastructure and resources efficiently.
• Decreases infrastructure costs.
• Provides each child the opportunity for high quality education.
• Increases public security.
• Encourages the retention of first-rate police and fire personnel.
• Protects the natural environment.
Utility Services

Provide efficient and sustainable utility services.

Guiding Principles

- Provide adequate water, sewer and related utility services to meet the demand of existing and future residents and commercial and industrial growth through a combination of developer-funded infrastructure improvements for new growth and capital investments by the City in major treatment and transmission facilities.
- Collaborate with adjacent cities, special service districts, various Federal, State, and County agencies, and appropriate service providers to provide coordinated and sustainable development of the community.

Benefits

- Uses infrastructure and natural resources efficiently.
- Decreases infrastructure costs.
- Protects public health.
This chapter illustrates the core concepts of the Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map sets forth the planned development pattern of the City and provides the geographic framework for the City’s land use policies. The Future Land Use Map incorporates the Vision and Big Ideas that have been developed and refined by the community in the creation of PlanOlathe.

The Purpose of the Future Land Use Map

The map is intended to serve as a general guide for future land use decisions. It is not a zoning map. Many of the boundaries on the map are generalized for illustrative purposes, and may vary when applied to specific parcels and developments. Because it is difficult to predict market and other conditions for multiple decades, it is anticipated that the actual development of the community may differ in some respects from the illustrative vision found in the Future Land Use Map. However, the core Framework Elements should be followed.

The Future Land Use Map is used along with the Plan’s written policies to help guide future decision making. It is also used to develop geographically-based projections for the future growth of the City, which in turn will be used to plan for roads, transit, parks, utilities and community facilities.

The Plan’s Framework

Olathe is making strides to grow and develop in a healthy, efficient, and sustainable manner. PlanOlathe’s future land use framework is an important tool to achieve the community’s Vision, preserve and promote community character, and fulfill citizens’ desires to elevate Olathe to one of the top quality of life cities in the nation.

As illustrated in the Future Land Use Map, Olathe is poised to continue to be a strong economic force within the region. Innovation, technology, education, medical, office, science, distribution, industrial and downtown areas will provide an expansion of the job base, and enable Olathe to enhance its role as an employment center for the region. Districts with a distinct character and focus of activity will help to build upon existing economic success and emerging strengths. With a whole greater than the parts, these districts will leverage existing activity to promote new similar and complementary uses, attract new businesses, and create opportunities for spinoffs and partnerships (see Districts).
A series of self-sustaining commercial centers at a variety of scales and intensities spread throughout the community will provide an alternative to commercial strips and retail development on every corner. These centers will range from a place to buy a cup of coffee to a place to work in new multi-story commercial and office developments (see Centers). Located within walking distance of these new centers will be a varied mix of housing, ranging from traditional single family units to new lofts (see Neighborhoods).

There is potential for Olathe’s greenway and park system to be unmatched in the region. Larger primary greenways will become locations for new and enhanced regional parks, lakes, recreational areas and trail hubs. Smaller secondary greenways will include trails that connect Olathe’s parks with its centers, employment districts and neighborhoods (see Greenways).

As the plan is implemented, transportation options will not focus solely on the automobile. Instead, the Plan promotes mobility that encompasses a range of possibilities to move from one place to another. In the Future Land Use Map, corridors will define the areas where transportation and land uses are linked. Land uses and densities are located to support transit within or near these corridors. New transit options will share these corridors with the car (see Corridors), connecting to adjacent regional systems. Options will include more efficient modes of transit such as high frequency bus, bus rapid transit (BRT) and light rail. Bicycle and pedestrian paths will use on-street facilities and an off-street trail network to link residents to employment and activity centers.

The Future Land Use Plan and its Framework Elements are based on the idea that measures such as integration of public transit; protection of the environment; balance of jobs and housing; and design of complete communities can actually reinforce a community’s social fabric and long-term economic vitality. Four major Framework Elements work together to achieve the vision of PlanOlathe: Centers, Corridors, Neighborhoods and Greenways. Overlying the Framework Elements are Districts. These Districts will play a unique role in achieving Olathe’s future, by creating distinct places where transportation, employment and residential uses are strategically focused. The Future Land Use Framework Elements and Districts are further explained in this chapter.
Centers

Centers provide places for residents to shop, work and gather. For Olathe, a hierarchy of centers focuses commercial activity, reinforces the transit network and promotes the development of distinct neighborhoods and Districts within the community. Centers are served by a highly connected street network, transit connections and greenways, and are reinforced by locating a large portion of residents within walking distance of each. Centers are also spaced with consideration to trade area and population served.

Neighborhood Commercial Centers

Neighborhood Commercial Centers are an intrinsic part of neighborhoods that help provide needed services, recreation opportunities, and community gathering spaces. Typically between 50,000-200,000 square feet in size, these centers offer an array of goods and services geared toward the convenience needs of immediately surrounding residents that are within a five-minute drive or a five to ten-minute walk. These Centers are sometimes anchored by a small grocery store, specialty market or pharmacy. Other supporting uses fit the size, scale and intensity of the neighborhood setting and may include small offices, restaurants, hair salons, dry cleaning, video stores, or other convenience-oriented retail and services. Some type of civic use is often present, such as a neighborhood park, plaza, square or green. By providing a focal point for local activity, a Neighborhood Commercial Center helps define the neighborhood as a specific place. Because Neighborhood Commercial Centers are smaller in scale and typically located near residential neighborhoods, they are particularly suited to a pedestrian friendly design and character.

Community Commercial Centers

Community Commercial Centers frequently have a similar mix of tenants as Neighborhood Commercial Centers, but are larger in size. Typically, these Centers are 250,000 to 350,000 square feet in floor area and often include a full-service supermarket as an anchor tenant. Since the Community Commercial Center draws from multiple neighborhoods, they may also include larger-scale tenants, including building hardware, apparel, booksellers, larger restaurants and sporting goods. These centers tend to be more pedestrian-scale than regional centers, and are typically located along transit or intersections of prominent streets. Adjacent uses would include denser residential uses and mixed-use buildings that serve as a transition to adjoining residential neighborhoods. Where possible, on-street parking should supplement surface parking to maximize land available for commercial and residential uses. Multi-story buildings are also encouraged.
Regional Commercial Centers

The Future Land Use Plan outlines one large Regional Commercial Center. These Centers provide for commercial development offering a diversity of retail, service, entertainment, office, finance and related business uses to serve the needs of community residents and the larger region. Total building floor areas typically exceed 900,000 square feet and can be as much as 2 million square feet. Uses are generally less dependent on adjacent commercial uses for spin-off business. These Centers are intended to be the City’s most intensive commercial areas with establishments that have a large customer draw. Consequently, they are situated with access to highways or major thoroughfares. The existing 119th Street Regional Commercial Center will continue to provide the location for larger format retail stores that require proximity to major highways and cannot be supported in the mixed use format of the Urban Center/Downtown. However, this Center does provide an opportunity to diversify with adjacent and integrated multi-family and office uses, new transit service and amenities such as plazas and parks.

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Centers

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Centers are places of relatively higher intensity uses including a mixture of residential, employment, shopping and civic uses, located within an easy walk of a bus stop or transit center. In combination with existing office and other employment-generating uses, new residential units and small-scale retail within these TOD centers will support the development of a live/work environment. These mixed-use areas can create walkable environments, which may contribute new housing opportunities of a product type that is currently underserved in the community. It is important to stress that transit-oriented development is an approach rather than a pre-determined program of development, the object of which is to create pedestrian-friendly activity zones near transit stations. The resulting densities around transit hubs can and will vary to reflect the needs and form of surrounding areas. However, the TOD Center emphasizes land use densities that are sufficient to support transit, maximizing the number of residents and employees within a convenient walk of transit facilities. Multistory office and residential buildings and mixed use retail development are encouraged in TOD Centers.

Urban Center/Downtown

Olathe will have one centralized Urban Center/Downtown area, serving as a primary business, government, and commercial hub and also a place for art, community spaces, and cultural exhibits. At the core of the urban center will be a revitalized historic downtown. Beyond the downtown area, the urban center will include the redevelopment of the Great Mall of the Great Plains and the surrounding area. This expanded Urban Center will provide the necessary households and supporting employment needed to make the Urban Center successful. The Urban Center will include new entertainment options, restaurants, offices, retail, civic and cultural amenities and connections to local and regional transit options.
Neighborhoods

A neighborhood is a geographic area in which the residents have a common sense of identity or perceive that they have common interests. Neighborhoods are a basic building block of Olathe and are the areas that most residents consider “home”. Neighborhoods vary widely in size, composition and configuration throughout Olathe, reflecting the diversity of its residents. Neighborhoods can be formed or united by any number of geographic or demographic factors.

Mixed Use Residential Neighborhoods

The Mixed Use Residential Neighborhood features a carefully integrated mixture of housing of various styles, sizes, and densities generally located within a five to ten minute walk of neighborhood-scale commercial, civic or open space uses. The mix of housing types is oriented more toward attached multifamily units than detached single-family units. True mixed use development is encouraged and other limited commercial and service uses are also permitted. While densities will vary from place to place, average residential densities in the Mixed Use Residential Neighborhoods will average above six dwelling units per acre. Mixed Use Residential Neighborhoods will feature highly-connected street systems, sidewalks, bikeways and transit facilities that contribute to the multimodal character.

Conventional Neighborhoods

The typical neighborhood pattern in Olathe since the close of World War II has been that of a conventional neighborhood design. The Future Land Use Map designates conventional neighborhoods for most of the planning area. Conventional Neighborhoods typically consist of single-family housing on individual building lots. PlanOlathe includes policies to maintain and promote the distinct character and identity of Olathe’s neighborhoods, and encourages neighborhoods that provide a variety of housing types, prices, and styles to enable a range of economic levels, age groups, and lifestyles to live within a community. Neighborhood Centers are distributed throughout Olathe neighborhoods to provide local access to convenience goods and services, reduce the need for lengthy drives, and promote walkability. An extensive open space network integrates with Olathe neighborhoods to provide residents with recreational amenities, mobility options, and environmental benefits.
Conservation/Cluster Neighborhoods balance the protection of sensitive environmental features with the development rights of property owners. The density of development is clustered on the more buildable portion of the property, leaving the balance to be undeveloped as open space. House sites are identified to take advantage of views and access to the preserved land, and streets are designed to access the house sites in a manner that minimizes disturbance of natural areas. Development and housing costs may be reduced by minimizing the necessary infrastructure and providing energy efficient home design. The resulting subdivision may have more compact areas of development, but less paving and more open space when compared to conventional neighborhoods. Conservation subdivision designs are especially appropriate in areas containing steep slopes, woodlands, drainage corridors or other valued natural features.

These new Conservation/Cluster Neighborhoods will also be located to acknowledge the presence of the many existing rural and semi-rural subdivisions which function as part of the Olathe community and to provide, in some cases, transition between existing urban development and rural or open lands.
Corridors provide a connection between different areas or destinations. Major transportation corridors link our destinations and activities and make it easier to move around the City using various modes of travel. Among these are regional and local transit corridors, greenway trails, and multimodal corridors supported by complementing land uses that connect key areas of the City.

**Commercial Corridor**

The Commercial Corridor designation includes the three-mile stretch of commercial development along East Santa Fe Street (K-150) running east from the downtown to a point just west of Pflumm Road. This corridor will continue to accommodate a full range of commercial uses, including auto-oriented uses, but has the opportunity to be transformed over time into a corridor that is more walkable and incorporates other types of uses.

Constraints and challenges for the Commercial Corridor are numerous: dated site design, auto-dependent uses, multiple mid-block driveway accesses, inadequate landscaping, and limited pedestrian access and circulation. Much of the area was developed in an ad-hoc manner, creating a number of parcels that have become functionally obsolete and more difficult to assemble than under a unified development scheme. At the same time, the area is a high-traffic, high-visibility corridor that serves as a major artery for the community. The corridor benefits from substantial newer development constructed near the Black Bob Road intersection, and has many unique opportunities and assets including successful retail shops, healthy surrounding neighborhoods, and the Indian Creek streamway.

**Regional & Local Transit Corridors**

The transit network is focused on access to key destinations and is surrounded by densities sufficient to reach a critical mass for ridership. Regional Transit Corridors stretch along I-35 and K-10, connecting the Olathe City Center District and other Districts to other communities in the Kansas City metropolitan area. These Regional Transit Corridors are the backbone for an expanded multimodal transportation system, which will maximize pedestrian, transit, and vehicular efficiency. Local transit corridors link Olathe’s various activity centers. A system of arterial streets, collector streets, and trails include pedestrian and bicycle facilities that branch off into the community’s Neighborhoods. Routes are simple and efficient, and residents can reach most destinations within the planning area through a combination of multimodal alternatives.

The Future Land Use Map locates the intensity and density of development to promote high levels of ridership. Additional residential density has been strategically placed near Transit Corridors and Centers. It is anticipated that transit stops will be provided within all of the Centers and Districts located on a transit line. Integrating transit with housing and employment has the potential to lower average commute distances, relieve congestion, encourage economic development activity, and improve air quality. Mixed-use areas can create walkable environments which further reduce reliance on the automobile.
**Greenways**

A greenway is defined as a corridor of open space, varying in scale from narrow strips of green to wider corridors, which incorporate diverse natural, cultural and scenic features. Connectivity is the defining characteristic that distinguishes greenways from isolated paths and pockets of open space. While individual parks, preserved lands, undisturbed natural areas and waterways are valuable resources in and of themselves, their environmental and recreational value is compounded when they are linked together.

The greenways can accommodate a multitude of recreational activities and provide cultural and/or conservation opportunities. These greenways are considered multipurpose since they serve both human and wildlife interests. The greenways are not only valued for their recreational, environmental and cultural functions, but for their ability to provide connections between neighborhoods, activity centers, and recreation and community facilities.

**Olathe’s Greenways**

Sometimes overlooked are Olathe’s significant natural resources. These creeks, streams, floodways and wetland systems will form the basis of an expanded greenway and regional trail system. The Primary Greenway system will be comprised of the most significant streamways in Olathe, including Cedar Creek, Mill Creek, Indian Creek, and Coffee Creek. Major parks such as Heritage Park, Lone Elm Park, Lake Olathe, Ernie Miller Nature Center, and the Future Cedar Niles Park will anchor the greenway system. A smaller Secondary Greenway system will link neighborhoods and commercials centers to the primary greenway system. Greenways will not be an afterthought, but instead a deliberate effort to create one of the regions’ most notable linear park systems. The purpose of this system is not only to meet the community’s transportation and recreation needs, but to provide a “green infrastructure” system of interconnected open spaces and natural areas that naturally manage stormwater, reduce flooding risk, improve water quality, and reduce the City’s future infrastructure needs.
Employment and industrial areas provide high quality locations to capture future employment growth and support a strong and diversified economy. These areas promote Olathe as an ideal place for desirable new industries, especially those that would diversify the employment base, reflect the labor force capabilities of the community, and complement Olathe’s high quality of life.

Employment Areas

Employment areas include free standing office buildings, office parks, medical facilities, and multi-tenant professional offices. Employment areas may also include research or other light industrial uses where these uses are compatible with or accessory to the primary office and professional uses in the area. Light assembly or manufacturing may be appropriate where high-quality planned developments integrate a mix of office and light industrial uses. In Employment areas, complementary retail and service uses should be limited in scale and carefully integrated with surrounding employment uses.

Industrial Areas

Industrial areas are designated for more intensive industrial uses, including manufacturing, assembly, and distribution. Research, warehousing, and other light industrial uses are also appropriate in industrial areas. In Industrial areas, complementary retail and service uses should be limited in scale and carefully integrated with surrounding industrial uses.
**Districts**

Districts are where the most significant employment, housing and mixed use activity will take place in the future. These areas will contain a diverse mix of commercial, office, residential and civic uses. Districts will also be planned to be the most transit supportive areas within Olathe. Compared to Neighborhoods and Corridors, Districts are more general in nature and are not intended to precisely correspond to existing or future zoning District boundaries. Districts are intended to be intense areas, each with their own special character. As discussed in Chapter 6, unique zoning tools will help fulfill the intent of these areas. These may include design guidelines, performance standards and overlay zoning tools.

**Industrial and Employment District**

The Industrial and Employment District is intended as the home for industrial employment opportunities, research and development, repair services, wholesale activities, distribution centers and manufacturing and fabrication. Uses that occur in the District may not be compatible with residential land uses. The District provides for a variety of low-intensity office uses that are typically three stories or less in height. Although transit will be provided in the District, not all areas will be easily accessible to transit. Additional uses include retail services located in centers within the District.

---

**Industrial and Employment District Today**

---

**Industrial and Employment District in the Future**
Office District

Located in a high profile location near the convergence of two interstate highways and one state highway, Olathe's Office District already features a number of multi-story, Class A office developments, with approved plans for a convention hotel and facilities. The Office District provides an opportunity to build upon this existing office node to create a campus-type development pattern for office, institutional and related uses. The District will appeal to businesses seeking large parcels or a campus setting. Industries and businesses targeted include national headquarters and other professional offices. With a campus-style development pattern, open spaces, parking lots and structures, service and storage areas, and landscaped buffers and boulevards can all be integrated into a park-like setting. Residential uses can occur in the area, but the balance is more towards non-residential uses. Adjacent supporting residential uses should include home types appropriate for a range of workers, including managers. The District should be directly served by regional transit. Amenities for the district should include trail access, places for families to recreate and workers to exercise and enjoy their lunchtime. Complementary retail and services integrated into the district will promote walkability and provide for workers' needs.
City Center District

The City Center District encompasses the Downtown core, adjacent Original Town neighborhoods, and the Great Mall of the Great Plains and its surrounding commercial properties. The overarching goal of this District is to revitalize the Downtown, mall and surrounding neighborhoods as a vibrant mixed use urban area with civic, commercial and residential uses reinforcing each other. A key to the District’s success is the interplay and relationship between these three major land uses. As this district evolves, it must do so in a way that respects and nurtures the historic character of Original Town.

The area is intended to have an urban footprint. Buildings in this area are encouraged to be mixed use, varied and multi-story. Appropriate uses should include mixed use offices, educational facilities, campuses, restaurants, farmers’ markets, museums, convention facilities, hotels, transit centers, and performing arts centers as well as government or quasi-government buildings. Businesses that locate in this District will benefit from being near the vibrant urban core and regional transit. High density and mixed use residential development can take advantage of the concentrated services and employment in the City Center, and provide employees and customers for City Center businesses.

City Center District Today

City Center District in the Future
Gateway District

Aptly named, the Gateway District provides the entry experience into Olathe from Kansas City. The site is adjacent to Interstate Highway 35 and 119th Street at one of the highest traffic volume intersections in the region, and is an area that will eventually provide a major transit node for the community. The Gateway District is a critical component in the overall image of Olathe, and development in this area should protect and enhance the image of the community and create an inviting environment to welcome travelers and visitors. High quality retail, services, offices and housing are the focus of this District. Superior design compatibility within the Gateway District can be achieved through consideration of building scale, design, proportions, site planning, landscaping, materials and colors.

Gateway District in the Future
Innovation and Technology District

The purpose of the Innovation and Technology District is to create an environment where technology-based industry and other related entrepreneurial enterprises can be successful. The area will appeal to companies seeking high visibility, direct transit access, the ability to live and work in the same area, and access to a number of amenities. The mix of uses within the District, including biotechnology companies, sustainable industries, medical offices, hospitals and educational institutions, will be anchored by the K-State Olathe Innovation Campus and Kansas Bioscience Park supported by surrounding neighborhoods. Additional uses include retail located along the transit corridor, intended to serve the needs of the workforce. Development in this area should embody transit-oriented design principles.
CHAPTER 5.
Guidance

PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES

Introduction

Principles and Policies form the yardstick against which future ordinances and public programs are measured. Principles provide a basis for community decision-making, not only in the development review process, but throughout all sectors of local government. All principles and policies should be compatible with and assist in realizing the Future Land Use Map. However, not all specifically relate to the community’s physical growth, such as policies regarding cultural arts.

Each principle and policy represents a choice, and each choice requires balancing complex and sometimes conflicting issues. Each represents a significant decision to be made about the future form and pattern of a part of the community. In this Plan, Principles are defined as important values or beliefs adhered to by the community. Unlike a goal, a Principle cannot be “checked off” a list once it is completed. Should Principles cease to become relevant, an update of the Comprehensive Plan would be required. Policies are defined as specific strategies to guide decision-making. Significant efforts have been made to ensure that the Principle statements represent the community’s desires. They have been formulated through an extensive participatory process including stakeholder interviews, community group presentations, public workshops, Advisory Committee meetings, and through correspondence with all City service departments.

Each policy has been identified by letters that designate the section of the Plan where it is located and numbers that indicate the sequence of principles and policies within each section. In the Land Use and Community Character section, for instance, a policy might be called “LUCC-1.3.” This would be “LUCC,” a Land Use and Community Character policy; “1,” in the first principle of the Land Use and Community Character section; and “.3,” the third policy for that principle.

Olathe’s Youngest Citizens Share Their Vision

Throughout the planning process, Olathe’s youngest citizens were asked to participate in planning for the future by coloring either their favorite place in Olathe or what they wanted Olathe to look like in the future. A selection of this artwork is included throughout the following chapter.
LAND USE & COMMUNITY CHARACTER

Land use composition should contribute toward achieving the greater vision of the City while providing the opportunity for existing and future residents to live, work, and recreate. This mosaic of land uses should provide a broad range of housing options, integrate multi-modal transit opportunities, ensure vibrant commercial and employment environments and support high quality services for the citizens of Olathe.

PRINCIPLE LUCC-1: PlanOlathe, the City’s Comprehensive Plan, will be the guiding document within the Olathe Growth Area.

LUCC-1.1: Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. Land use proposals should be consistent with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as applicable local ordinances and resolutions.

LUCC-1.2: Compatibility with Intergovernmental Agreements. Work in cooperation with adjoining jurisdictions to ensure that the execution and amendment of intergovernmental agreements are consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

LUCC-1.3: Integration with Adopted Community Plans. A variety of community plans exist to guide decision making. The City is committed to achieving a high level of coordination and integration in development and implementation of PlanOlathe, area plans, corridor plans, neighborhood plans and functional master plans. As described in the Implementation Chapter of this Plan, the Comprehensive Plan synthesizes and supercedes the recommendations of existing area and corridor plans. Design guidelines and overlay districts associated with existing area and corridor plans will be reviewed and adapted to function within the framework of the Comprehensive Plan. Detailed research and analysis within existing area and corridor plans will be retained as supplementary information in the appendices of this plan.

PRINCIPLE LUCC-2: Collaborate with Other Jurisdictions to Provide Coordinated and Sustainable Development of the Community and to Resolve Land Use Issues of Mutual Concern.

LUCC-2.1: Responsibility for Planning. Continue to collaborate with Johnson County within the City’s established Future Growth Area boundary to guide and manage growth beyond the City limits. Such collaboration might include joint planning efforts, intergovernmental agreements, or other strategies.

LUCC-2.2: Intergovernmental Agreements. Enter into intergovernmental agreements with Johnson County or other municipalities and agencies when appropriate to foster intergovernmental planning and cooperation.

LUCC-2.3: Annexation. In accordance with adopted policies;

a. The City may initiate annexation of unincorporated areas within its Future Growth Area where there are indications of urban-intensity development, and as a tool to join incorporated islands and eliminate unincorporated enclaves.
b. Recognize the major lifestyle concerns of unincorporated property owners and work to minimize potential negative impacts of annexation.

c. Require annexation prior to extension of City utility services to property outside of the corporate limits unless a benefit district is authorized that details the process by which annexation and provision of adequate public facilities will occur prior to development of the property.

d. Ensure annexation agreements provide benefit to the City that might otherwise be unattainable.

**LUCC-2.4: Development Referral.** Refer formal development applications that are adjacent to other jurisdictions for comments.

**PRINCIPLE LUCC-3: PROMOTE ADEQUATE RESIDENTIAL DENSITIES TO SUPPORT EXISTING AND FUTURE COMMERCIAL CENTERS.**

**LUCC-3.1: Encourage Housing Near Services.** Encourage higher density housing development near transit services and commercial centers to create activity areas that add to the community’s quality of life.

**LUCC-3.2: Link between Transportation and Land Use.** Implement land use plans and programs that support effective transit, an efficient street system, and alternative transportation modes. Design the transportation system to accommodate the planned land use pattern, which includes higher densities and mixed uses in Original Town, commercial centers, employment centers; and a variety of densities in the fringe areas.

**LUCC-3.3: Residential Zoning Standards.** Ensure that zoning allows for a variety of home types and lot sizes.

**PRINCIPLE LUCC-4: ENCOURAGE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT, ESPECIALLY IN THE DOWNTOWN AREA, TO SUPPORT COMMERCIAL USES, PROMOTE WALKABILITY, AND PROVIDE FOR A VARIETY OF HOUSING OPTIONS.**

**LUCC-4.1: Mixed-Use Neighborhoods.** Support viable mixed-use and mixed-density neighborhoods.

**PRINCIPLE LUCC-5: DEVELOP COMMERCIAL CENTERS OF AN APPROPRIATE SIZE AND SCALE, AND WITHIN THE RIGHT LOCATIONS, TO ENSURE ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY AND SHAPE COMMUNITY FORM.**

**LUCC-5.1: Hierarchy of Activity Centers.** Focus new commercial centers in concentrated activity areas at a variety of scales distributed throughout the community.

**LUCC-5.2: Connections to Centers.** Encourage pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections to and within commercial centers.

**PRINCIPLE LUCC-6: DISCOURAGE “LEAP-FROG” OR SPRAWLING LAND USE PATTERNS BY ENCOURAGING GROWTH IN SERVICEABLE AREAS. PROMOTE THE INFILL OF VACANT PARCELS AND REINVESTMENT IN BUILDABLE AREAS.**

**LUCC-6.1: Targeted Development.** With the guidance of the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map, encourage targeted development, redevelopment and infill so as to channel growth where it will contribute to the long-term community vision and improve access to jobs, housing and services.

**LUCC-6.2: Santa Fe Commercial Corridor.** The Santa Fe Commercial Corridor includes community retail uses, as well as offices, and business and personal services. While the district is largely the location for
highway business and auto-related uses, it also offers opportunities to transform the area, over time, to being a mixed-use, multi-modal area.

**LUCC-6.3: Resource Protection.** Designate land use patterns and intensities so as to minimize adverse impacts on valued natural resources, wildlife habitats and historic sites.

**Principle LUCC-7: Encourage Design Standards that Successfully Enhance Quality of Life in a Manner that is Economically Viable and Sustainable for the City and the Private Sector.**

**LUCC-7.1: High Quality Design.** Encourage economically reasonable efforts toward high quality architecture, urban design and site design. Use design guidelines as a tool for new development and redevelopment. Consider the desired context and character of existing neighborhoods and commercial centers.

**LUCC-7.2: Sustainable Design and Materials.** Promote the use of sustainable design and materials in new development, redevelopment, and maintenance of property throughout the City.

**LUCC-7.3: Provision and Design of Public Spaces.** Recognizing that public spaces bear a special responsibility to exhibit design excellence, ensure that public projects are positive additions to the community’s architectural and design heritage.

**LUCC-7.4: Alternative Zoning Techniques.** Consider alternative zoning techniques within the City Center District and redeveloping areas to elevate the quality of urban design, and encourage higher densities. This may include codes that emphasize the form and mass of buildings in relation to one another, and the scale and types of streets and blocks, and de-emphasize regulation of land use.

**LUCC-7.5: Community Image.** Respect unique community and neighborhood identities, settings, and histories.

**LUCC-7.6: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.** Encourage Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) by employing design techniques and effective use of the built and natural environment to help reduce crime, reduce fear of crime, and improve overall quality of life. Incorporate concepts including natural surveillance and access control, territorial reinforcement, property maintenance and street activity.

**Principle LUCC-8: Achieve a Balanced Mix of Residential and Non-Residential Development Throughout Olathe.**

**LUCC-8.1: Mixture of Complementary Land Uses.** Encourage and enable a mixture of complementary land uses in major new developments. In existing neighborhoods, a mixture of land use types, housing sizes and lot sizes may be possible if properly planned and respectful of neighborhood character. Whenever land uses are mixed, careful design will be required in order to ensure compatibility, accessibility and appropriate transitions between land uses that vary in intensity and scale.

**LUCC-8.2: Compatibility of Adjacent Land Uses.** Where a mixture of uses is not appropriate or uses are not complementary, use zoning as a tool to avoid or minimize conflicts between land uses that vary widely in use, intensity, or other characteristics. This may include buffering, landscaping, transitional uses and densities, and other measures. Protect industry from encroachment by residential development, and ensure that the character and livability of established residential neighborhoods will not be undermined by impacts from adjacent non-residential areas or by incremental expansion of business activities into residential areas.
ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY

Economic sustainability and development plays a vital role in improving the quality of life of the community. Olathe will foster economic development opportunities that encourage private investment within the community, provide employment that offers quality jobs, provide primary employment, and improve the quality of life for Olatheans. Olathe recognizes that a healthy local economy is vital to the community’s ability to provide a highly desirable quality of life, and high levels of services and amenities. The City seeks to ensure that current needs are met without compromising the ability of future citizens to meet their needs.

**Principle ES-1: Utilize Olathe’s strengths, including a highly educated population, affordability, recreation opportunities, business and family-friendly environment, and other quality of life amenities as a tool to attract quality jobs and position Olathe as a regional economic leader.**

**ES-1.1: Economic Partnership.** Support the efforts of public and private organizations to diversify the local economy and pursue partnerships among the public, private and nonprofit sectors. Encourage industries and businesses to establish job partnerships with educational institutions and other economic development organizations.

**ES-1.2: Economic Programs and Strategies.** Support economic vitality programs and strategies that foster innovation, enhance competitiveness and expand markets.

**ES-1.3: Targeted Industries.** Promote Olathe as an ideal place for desirable new industries, especially those that would diversify the employment base, reflect the labor force capabilities of the community, and complement Olathe’s high quality of life.

**ES-1.4: Support for Local Business.** Support the retention, expansion and entrepreneurial activities of existing local businesses and maintain a positive business climate. Promote local shopping and local lodging as a means to support the community’s economy.

**ES-1.5: New Businesses.** Build upon existing economic strengths to encourage new spin-off and start-up businesses.
**Principle ES-2:** Achieve a balanced mix of commercial and residential development to promote fiscal sustainability and ensure that tax revenues are sufficient to support public services provided to the citizens of Olathe.

**ES-2.1:** Balance of Jobs and Housing. **Use the Future Land Use Map, zoning and other tools to ensure that there is an adequate supply of residential, employment and commercial lands, in order to provide a sustainable balance of jobs and housing in the community.**

**Principle ES-3:** Strengthen and revitalize existing commercial centers.

**ES-3.1: Reinvestment in Existing Commercial and Industrial Areas.** Cooperate with the private sector to foster the revitalization of existing commercial and industrial areas in order to create greater vitality.

**ES-3.2: Evaluate Retail Supply and Demand.** Evaluate retail supply and demand and planned retail locations to ensure that new commercial and retail development can draw from an adequate market, rather than being too far ahead of demand.

**ES-3.3: Encourage Commercial Development Downtown.** Consider land use policies that favor retail and commercial development in Downtown and that enable Downtown to be competitive with new development in more peripheral locations.

**Principle ES-4:** Develop distinct employment districts to ensure Olathe's strong and diversified economy

**ES-4.1: Employment Districts.** Distinct employment districts will help maintain Olathe’s economic sustainability. These focused districts will include primary employment and industrial uses, and build upon existing economic strengths. Tailored housing options in each district will put workers within walking distance of their jobs, reducing travel times and impacts to the road system.
**ORIGINAL TOWN**

Original Town is an area of diverse land uses, architecture, history and culture, and includes six distinct neighborhoods with Downtown at the heart. Each Original Town neighborhood contributes its own unique identity and qualities that together provide a foundation for the entire Olathe community.

The objective of the Downtown is to embrace the fullest possible range of human interactions, from the simple buying and selling of goods and services to providing people with the widest spectrum of cultural, educational and entertainment experiences. Diversity means Downtown must include office, finance, civic, government, and entertainment functions in addition to retail shops, services and restaurants – served by a transportation system that incorporates multiple modes of travel. To promote pedestrian activity and vitality, the Downtown should be compact and walkable. Development intensity, land use, building height and urban design should establish Downtown as the focal point of the community.

**Principle OT-1: Continue to support efforts to improve and expand the Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods by locating additional uses and amenities in this area, including entertainment, restaurants, transportation hubs, high density housing, and other compatible uses in a manner that is harmonious with the historic character of Downtown.**

**OT-1.1: Downtown.** Encourage multiple uses Downtown. This includes offices, services, and government uses as well as retail, restaurants, entertainment, and night life, mixed with a diversity of residential housing types.

**OT-1.2: Original Town Neighborhoods.** Encourage a balanced mix of complementary and support land uses in each Original Town neighborhood, with a predominantly residential land use character. Support a mix of housing types for all income levels, family types, and age groups, with a variety of prices and rent levels.

**Principle OT-2: Promote policies and financial incentives that assist Downtown redevelopment efforts.**

**OT-2.1: Improvement Funding.** Utilize various financing techniques such as tax increment financing, industrial revenue bonds, benefit district financing, historic tax credits, and neighborhood revitalization tax rebates to aid revitalization projects. Pursue all forms of state and federal funding to enhance revitalization efforts.

**OT-2.2: Public/Private Partnerships.** Establish public/private partnerships in an effort to initiate revitalization projects and leverage public resources to spur private sector investment.
**OT-2.3: Neighborhood Resources.** Continue to be a resource to assist with the organization and visioning of Original Town neighborhoods, and take an active role in providing opportunities for citizen involvement.

**Principle OT-3: Encourage and implement innovative techniques designed to spur Original Town revitalization activities.**

**OT-3.1: Implement Existing Plans.** Continue implementation of the Envision Olathe Downtown Plan, Streetscape Master Plan, and Original Town Enhancement Plan. Consider Neighborhood Action Plans when making decisions or prioritizing projects that affect the neighborhoods.

**OT-3.2: Housing.** Add high density, multi-family housing within and adjacent to the Downtown that will help support desired uses and amenities. Provide housing to serve a diverse population, including affordable housing, senior housing, special needs housing, and transit-oriented development.

**OT-3.3: Destination for Civic and Community Events.** Promote Downtown as a memorable destination for civic and community events. Provide community gathering spaces Downtown, such as a farmers’ market pavilion and civic square.

**OT-3.4: Pedestrian Friendly.** Provide an appealing pedestrian-friendly landscape and streetscape environment. Make Original Town more pedestrian-friendly through implementation of the Streetscape Master Plan and other improvements such as wayfinding signage.

**OT-3.5: Revitalize Adjacent Areas.** Revitalize areas adjacent to the downtown core, including the reclamation and redevelopment of brownfield sites, new housing investment, and maintenance and preservation of existing building stock.

**OT-3.6: Maintain and Upgrade Aging Infrastructure.** Maintain and upgrade aging infrastructure in the Original Town where possible, particularly in conjunction with new infill and redevelopment projects, and where adequate infrastructure is currently lacking.

**OT-3.7: Downtown Parking Lots and Structures.** Provide downtown parking in a manner that accommodates redevelopment, higher residential densities, and increased pedestrian activity.

**OT-3.8: Property Maintenance.** Continue to require owners of all properties to maintain their property in accordance with all applicable laws and city ordinances. Encourage the use of sustainable design and materials to improve the overall efficiency, durability, and longevity of Original Town structures.
Housing & Neighborhoods

Housing policies are intended to create residential communities that allow residents to live, work, and play in their neighborhoods, and foster a sense of community. These policies should produce positive outcomes for: housing prices, availability and choice, availability of housing for special populations, and neighborhood stability.

Principle HN-1: Maintain the Character and Identity of Existing Residential Neighborhoods.

HN-1.1: Neighborhood Role. Foster the role of neighborhoods to establish community character, provide services needed on a day-to-day basis, encourage community interaction, and offer amenities.

HN-1.2: Mixed Uses and Mixed Incomes. In existing neighborhoods, a mixture of land use types, housing sizes and lot sizes may be possible if properly mitigated and respectful of neighborhood character. Require careful design wherever land uses are mixed in order to ensure compatibility, accessibility and appropriate transitions between land uses that vary in intensity and scale.

HN-1.3: Reduce Impacts from Redevelopment. Design infill and redevelopment to avoid negative impacts and ensure compatibility and appropriate transitions between land uses.

HN-1.4: Minimize Spill-over Impacts to Residents. Protect the character and livability of established residential neighborhoods by minimizing spill-over impacts from adjacent commercial areas and incremental expansion of business activities into residential areas.

HN-1.5: Promote Housing Rehabilitation. Improve and maintain the quality of existing housing stock through public and private sector investment and contribution to housing rehabilitation. Support community organizations and activities that encourage and provide housing rehabilitation and neighborhood improvements.

HN-1.6: Code Compliant Housing. Ensure that housing meets all applicable zoning and building code requirements. Continue to support adopted exterior building maintenance standards ensuring the up-keep of existing neighborhoods.

HN-1.7: Rental Properties. Continue to seek creative solutions to protect and promote the public health of all citizens, and to encourage owners and occupants of rental properties to maintain and improve the quality of rental housing within the community.

HN-1.8: Infill. Encourage infill housing in older residential neighborhoods that is architecturally compatible with surrounding properties.

Principle HN-2: Support Housing Development and Redevelopment that includes a variety of housing types and opportunities to enable a wide range of economic levels, age groups, and lifestyles to live within a community.
**HN-2.1: Full Range of Housing Choices.** Encourage residential development that supports the full range of housing needs in the community by ensuring that a variety of housing types, prices and styles are created and maintained in the community.

**HN-2.2: Complete Neighborhoods.** Encourage a “complete” neighborhood concept for new development which includes a variety of residential densities on appropriately sized parcels, opportunities for shopping, nearby support services and conveniently-sited public facilities, including roads, transit, and pedestrian connections, parks, libraries and schools.

**HN-2.3: Higher Residential Densities.** Target future medium and high-density residential development to locations that are accessible to and integrated with potential employment and transit centers.

**HN-2.4: Accessible Housing.** Encourage accessible housing units for populations with special needs designed to provide, for example, a main floor bedroom, wider hallways/doorways, main floor baths, first floor laundry and level entries without steps.

**HN-2.5: Senior Housing.** Address the housing needs of an aging population. Provide neighborhoods with a variety of housing styles and prices that meet the particular needs of seniors and enable residents to “age in place.”

**Principle HN-3: Promote high quality residential design**

**HN-3.1: High Quality Architecture and Design.** Encourage economically reasonable efforts toward high quality architecture and urban design in residential development.

**HN-3.2: Public Spaces in Neighborhoods.** Create neighborhood areas that provide attractive public spaces, such as civic spaces, community centers, schools, parks, plazas, community gardens, and natural open space.

**HN-3.3: Walkable Neighborhoods.** Increase walkability by creating compact new neighborhoods, attractive destinations, and convenient direct routes.

**HN-3.4: Sustainable Design.** Integrate sustainable design and building practices into new housing construction and rehabilitation of existing housing.

**Principle HN-4: Promote housing strategies to ensure an adequate supply of housing at all price ranges.**

**HN-4.1: Affordable Housing.** Pursue strategies to meet the community’s affordable housing needs, including housing options within the financial means of service workers, new professionals, seniors, students, and low income residents.

**HN-4.2: Move-Up and Executive Housing.** Encourage housing products that will meet the needs and preferences of residents at different stages of life.

**Principle HN-5: Encourage housing densities and styles that will support vibrant retail and transit centers.**

**HN-5.1: Mixed Use Neighborhoods.** Utilize zoning and development designations that encourage and enable a mix of residential, retail and commercial space in areas that are close to public transportation and planned transit nodes and corridors.
**HN-5.2: Density Near Activity Centers and Transit.** Provide for higher density residential housing along major existing and planned public transit corridors and retail and commercial centers, with lower density residential development located further away from these centers.

**PRINCIPLE HN-6: REDUCE PHYSICAL AND SOCIAL BARRIERS BETWEEN NEIGHBORHOODS, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME PRESERVING AND NURTURING UNIQUE NEIGHBORHOOD IDENTITIES.**

**HN-6.1: Neighborhood Planning Areas.** Consider establishing neighborhood planning areas that foster strategic alliances of individual subdivisions defined by shared interests and mutually acceptable boundaries.

**HN-6.2: Support Community Relationships.** Design neighborhoods to encourage social interaction and support family and community relationships.

**HN-6.3: Community Input.** Encourage community input in the design and planning process.

---

Draw your favorite place in Olathe
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PARKS, TRAILS & RECREATION

Parks, trails and recreation are essential elements to the community’s quality of life. A well-planned parks and recreation program enriches people’s lives and helps to attract new residents and businesses by positively impacting community character, real estate values and land development patterns. Trails provide connections to parks, schools, employment areas, and retail centers for recreational and non-motorized use. A system of parks and greenways also provides many environmental benefits that are essential to the health of the community.

PRINCIPLE PTR-1: PROVIDE AND MAINTAIN A DIVERSE, HIGH-QUALITY, SAFE AND AFFORDABLE SYSTEM OF PARKS, TRAILS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES THAT PROVIDES FOR ALL AGES AND ABILITIES.

PTR-1.1: Parks and Recreation. Park facilities and services of the City or other service entities will provide an adequate range of recreational opportunities for its residents. Such facilities and services will be designed in a manner that responds to the needs of the intended users. City park and recreation facilities will provide a variety of park environments, amenities and recreational resources for residents and visitors.

PTR-1.2: Parkland Acquisition Programs. Create and expand programs to acquire additional acres needed for all parks. Apply criteria to provide adequate parkland as recommended by the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

PTR-1.3 Park Maintenance Methods. Investigate alternative methods for maintaining all parks, and identify maintenance costs when acquiring parkland.

PTR-1.4: Coordination with School Districts. Work with the School Districts to coordinate the provision of both active and passive recreational opportunities.

PTR-1.5: Green Solutions. Investigate the use of green solutions at park facilities, including construction of infrastructure and facility improvements, operations of facilities, and preservation of streamways and other hydrologic systems.

PRINCIPLE PTR-2: PROVIDE A SYSTEM OF INTERCONNECTED TRAILS THAT CONNECTS TO NEIGHBORHOODS, SERVICES AND ADJACENT REGIONAL TRAILS.

PTR-2.1 Trails Network. Continue to coordinate with other trail providers and private landowners in trail system planning, construction, management and maintenance. Where compatible with environmental protection goals and conservation easement agreements, trail connections will be developed to enhance the overall functioning of the trails network.

PTR-2.2: Corridor Acquisition. Where appropriate, the City should continue to acquire parcels of land, rights-of-way or easements to provide connections between public lands.
**PTR-2.3: Maximize Health and Safety.** The City’s trail system will be designed to maximize safety and convenience for users of all ages and abilities by providing recreation, health, and fitness opportunities for all residents. Grade separation should be provided wherever feasible.

**PTR-2.4: Incorporate Trails in Development.** Utilize the design review process for private development and public improvements to improve bicycle and pedestrian linkages to new development during the planning and design of all projects.

**PTR-2.5: Prioritize Trail Connections.** Prioritize key links which, when constructed, improve connectivity for both roadway and trail systems.

**PTR-2.6: Connect Activity Centers with Trails.** Pedestrian and bikeway paths should provide links and regional path connections between residential and employment areas, commercial centers, recreational and open space areas and educational facilities.
ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY & RESOURCES

The City of Olathe recognizes that protection and conservation of its local and regional environmental resources is important to City residents. The City should promote environmentally responsible operations, planning, and development. Policies and procedures should be examined to lessen resource consumption, waste generation, stormwater runoff, and air pollution impacts to our community. The City should also strive to promote wise use of natural resources in its own municipal operations.

**Principle ESR-1: The City will protect and preserve significant natural ecological systems.**

*ESR-1.1: Natural Habitat Protection.* Encourage preservation of lands with unique natural habitat, features or other key characteristics through cluster development, gifts, greenway capital projects or other means as appropriate and financially feasible.

*ESR-1.2: Inclusion of Natural Features into Development.* Incorporate natural physical features in new developments.

*ESR-1.3: Greenways.* Greenways should serve as unifying community features. Within available financial means, support the preservation and reclamation of these streamway corridors for natural ecosystems, trails, to improve air quality and wildlife habitat, and to provide a contrast and amenity to urban development.

*ESR-1.4: Land Conservation Techniques.* To the extent reasonably feasible, new development in proximity to significant natural landscapes, or within conservation/cluster neighborhood areas as identified on the Future Land Use Map, should employ open land conservation techniques, including, but not limited to, the use of cluster development.

**Principle ESR-2: Encourage Innovation in Green Building Practices.**

*ESR-2.1: Energy Efficiency.* Encourage the use of energy-efficient lighting, appliances, and other devices in new development, redevelopment and in municipal operations.

*ESR-2.2: Natural Lighting.* Encourage building designs that maximize the use of natural light and passive solar energy, thus diminishing the need for energy consuming supplemental lighting and heating.

*ESR-2.3: Landscape Design.* Encourage the use of landscaping that assists energy savings by the use of buffers and admittance of solar energy in the winter and shade in the summer. It should encourage designs that minimize the need for supplemental irrigation by encouraging the use of drought-resistant and native species.
**ESR-2.4: Alternative Energy.** Encourage the use of alternative energy in new development and redevelopment.

**ESR-2.5: Recycled Materials.** Encourage the use of recyclable building materials and building materials with recycled content in new development, redevelopment and in municipal operations.

**Principal ESR-3: Minimize the Disposal of Solid Waste to Preserve Landfill Space.**

**ESR-3.1: Solid Waste Reduction.** Work with governmental, private and not-for-profit agencies to develop regional approaches to solid waste reduction and management.

**ESR-3.2: City Waste Reduction.** Continue efforts to reduce waste generation from municipal operations and explore methods for additional reduction. Consider the purchase of supplies with recycled content when feasible.

**ESR-3.3: Waste Reduction Education.** Continue to promote public education related to the value, methods and techniques of recycling, resource recovery and waste reduction.

**ESR-3.4: Recycling Programs.** Continue to promote and expand curbside recycling programs.

**Principal ESR-4: Manage Stormwater Runoff and Conveyance Systems to Protect the Water Quality of Olathe’s Streams and Lakes and Protect Property from Flood Damage.**

**ESR-4.1: Sustainable Stormwater Management.** Reduce stormwater runoff velocity and improve water quality with sustainable infrastructure techniques that use soils and vegetation to capture, cleanse, and re-use stormwater runoff.

**ESR-4.2: Stormwater Financing.** Provide an equitable system of financing for stormwater improvements that is based on relative contributions to stormwater runoff.

**ESR-4.3: Stormwater Education.** Educate and involve the public in stormwater management.

**ESR-4.4: Drainage Basin Approach to Stormwater Planning.** Continue to evaluate impacts to upstream and downstream systems with stormwater improvement projects.

**ESR-4.5: Discharge Control Methods.** Apply discharge control methods that control both peak rates and volume of runoff in an economically, aesthetically, and environmentally acceptable manner.
In order to achieve the Community Vision and to allow Olathe to sustain its economic position in the region, it must be accessible to people of all ages and abilities through a variety of transportation modes. By fostering the development of an effective multi-modal transportation system, Olathe will provide greater opportunities for residents and visitors to move throughout the community, while sustaining the small town atmosphere that gives the City its identity. Such a transportation system will have a positive effect on the character of the City and will provide increased connectivity between Olathe and the surrounding region.

PlanOlathe recommends land use patterns that support an efficient roadway system complemented by effective transit, bicycle and pedestrian connections. Through the implementation of this Plan, the City should continue to maintain the integrity of its existing transportation infrastructure by minimizing unnecessary automobile travel, and providing opportunities for transit connections and non-motorized travel to and from major destinations in Olathe and the surrounding region.

**MOBILITY**

In order to achieve the Community Vision and to allow Olathe to sustain its economic position in the region, it must be accessible to people of all ages and abilities through a variety of transportation modes. By fostering the development of an effective multi-modal transportation system, Olathe will provide greater opportunities for residents and visitors to move throughout the community, while sustaining the small town atmosphere that gives the City its identity. Such a transportation system will have a positive effect on the character of the City and will provide increased connectivity between Olathe and the surrounding region.

PlanOlathe recommends land use patterns that support an efficient roadway system complemented by effective transit, bicycle and pedestrian connections. Through the implementation of this Plan, the City should continue to maintain the integrity of its existing transportation infrastructure by minimizing unnecessary automobile travel, and providing opportunities for transit connections and non-motorized travel to and from major destinations in Olathe and the surrounding region.

**PRINCIPLE M-1: PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, SAFE, AND COST EFFECTIVE ROADWAY NETWORK THAT WILL MEET THE CITY’S MOBILITY NEEDS IN A MANNER COMPATIBLE WITH FISCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS.**

**M-1.1: Strategic Roadway Investments.** Continue to strategically invest in roadway and signal timing improvements.

**M-1.2: Alternatives to Road Expansion.** Before constructing additional lanes on arterial roadways, explore alternative techniques or modes of travel that would serve the existing and future demand or result in travel demand reduction.

**M-1.3: Increased Roadway Efficiency.** Maximize the capacity, efficiency and safety of arterial roads through the existing access management plan by controlling the number and spacing of signalized intersections and consolidating driveway access.

**M-1.4: Road Classifications.** The functional classification of the road system should be enforced to protect the community’s investment in the transportation infrastructure. A functional classification system should define the type of transportation service provided by a specific roadway within that classification. Expressway and arterial roadways should be used for through movement. Collectors should convey traffic from neighborhoods to arterials and local streets for driveway access. Road spacing, continuity, access control and the spacing of traffic signals should be designed in accordance with the classification system.
**M-1.5: Context-Sensitive Transportation Design.** Design transportation improvements with consideration to the context or setting of individual project circumstances allowing flexibility in applying the City’s design criteria to safely support vehicles, bikes and pedestrians.

**M-1.6: Protect Neighborhood Livability.** The transportation system should serve regional trips, discourage diversion of pass-through traffic into neighborhood collectors and local streets, and minimize traffic volumes on neighborhood collector and local streets, while encouraging neighborhood connectivity.

**M-1.7: Mitigate Roadway Impacts.** Seek to mitigate potential impacts on noise and air pollution, public safety hazards and aesthetics through appropriate traffic control, facility design, and design on both public and private property adjacent to the transportation facility.

**M-1.8: Truck Routes.** Minimize truck traffic on local streets outside of industrial areas.

**M-1.9: Railroad Interface.** Improve communications with railroad companies to coordinate compatibility between the rail system and the City’s land use and transportation system.

---

**Principle M-2: Purposefully Integrate Transportation and Land Use Decisions to be Mutually Supportive.**

**M-2.1: Transportation Plan.** Promote a transportation plan, bicycle plan, and other plans that support and successfully implement multi-modal transportation and transit-oriented land use goals and policies.

**M-2.2: Transportation and Land Use Compatibility.** The City’s multi-modal transportation system should be compatible with existing and future land use patterns to effectively shape urban growth. Roadways should be appropriately scaled with the density of surrounding development.

**M-2.3: Regional Transportation Impacts Assessed.** Land use development and/or redevelopment decisions should consider the effects of off-site regional traffic impacts and those land use assumptions of adjoining jurisdictions.

**M-2.4: Transportation Improvements with Development.** All new developments should dedicate their share of required right-of-way to the City and install planned transportation improvements per adopted City regulations and approved design standards.

**M-2.5: Transportation Corridors and Transit Nodes.** Encourage growth along existing and planned transportation corridors and transit nodes.

---

**Principle M-3: Provide a Transportation System that Integrates Multiple Modes of Travel.**

**M-3.1: Alternative Modes.** Consider and accommodate alternative modes of transportation including public transportation, bicycling and pedestrian access during the planning and development review process.

**M-3.2: Balance Between Modes.** Street systems should seek to balance auto, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle movements in a manner that efficiently and effectively serves citizens’ transportation needs and offers options for travel in Olathe.

**M-3.3: Expanded Transit System.** Continue to work with Johnson County Transit and other appropriate agencies to expand the existing bus transit network to provide efficient connections to, from and throughout the City, and to provide adequate door-to-door programs for elderly, disabled, and low-income residents.
**M-3.4: Increase Transit Amenities.** Continue to work with Johnson County Transit to provide rider amenities such as bus shelters, lighting, security, and bicycle/pedestrian access for transit users and integrate these into station area designs for all regional transit corridors.

**M-3.5: Regional Transit.** Work cooperatively with KDOT and MARC to shape and implement elements of the Smart Moves Kansas City Metropolitan Area Transit vision.

**M-3.6: Bicycle Facilities.** Incorporate designated bicycle lanes, paved shoulders, or other bicycle facilities within the cross section of roadways where economically and physically possible, and where necessary for critical connectivity, consistent with identified routes in the City’s overall Transportation Master Plan.

**M-3.7: Bicycle Planning.** Incorporate bicycle planning as a part of transportation planning for Olathe. Recognize the transportation and recreation role of cycling.

**M-3.8: Pedestrian Paths and Bikeways.** Pedestrian and bikeway paths should provide connections between residential and employment areas, commercial centers, recreational and open space areas, parks and educational facilities. Grade separation should be provided in key areas when feasible to provide safe connections.

**M-3.9: Pedestrian Environment.** Provide appealing and comfortable pedestrian street environments in order to promote pedestrian activity.

---
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**Cultural Resources & Landmarks**

Cultural resources and landmarks are intended to provide the community with educational amenities that facilitate opportunities for citizens to share experiences and celebrate a common identity, heritage and tradition. Principles should promote a sense of belonging to the City that strives to protect and preserve its cultural legacy and maintain its unique sense of place.

**Principle CRL-1: Promote opportunities for artistic and cultural expression. Support cultural amenities as a contributor to economic health and as a reflection of the importance of the arts and our heritage.**

**CRL-1.1: Art Partnerships, Promotion, and Education.** Promote the development and expansion of cultural facilities, including performing arts and art exhibition facilities, museums and community centers. Continue to foster partnerships with arts organizations and encourage arts education throughout the community.

**CRL-1.2: Public Art.** Support public art that invites interaction and reflects community spirit, history and culture, and support the provision of art in public buildings and spaces.

**CRL-1.3: Libraries.** Library facilities and services of the City of Olathe will be responsive to the needs of all populations, providing an adequate range of informational, educational and intellectual opportunities for all residents.

**CRL-1.4: Cultural Expression.** Promote opportunities for cultural expression and raise awareness of diversity in the community.

**Principle CRL-2: Support historic preservation efforts throughout the city.**

**CRL-2.1: Preservation Board.** Engage input from the Olathe Historic Preservation Board.

**CRL-2.2: Preservation Plan.** Work to develop a preservation plan for Olathe, establishing the community’s goals for its historic properties and the necessary steps to reach those goals.

**CRL-2.3: Historic Resource Identification.** Identify and protect buildings, districts, and sites of historical, architectural, archaeological, or cultural significance. Encourage a survey of local historic resources on a local, state, or federal level and incorporate results and recommendations of a historic resource survey into a preservation plan for the City.

**CRL-2.4: Local Historic Register.** Consider the establishment of a local historic register or other local historic designation for local historic sites and landmarks.
**CRL-2.5: Preservation Incentives.** Utilize available incentives to encourage preservation of historic resources including state and federal historic tax credits, and Neighborhood Revitalization Act tax rebates.

**CRL-2.6 Education and Interpretation.** Continue and expand historic preservation education and outreach with the public through educational and interpretive sites and programs, and through cooperation and coordination with preservation groups.

**Principle CRL-3: Ensure that urban design standards and guidelines will promote community identity, sustainability, and civic pride.**

**CRL-3.1: New Construction.** Where possible, new construction should complement nearby historic buildings.

**CRL-3.2: Development Review.** Incorporate landmark and cultural resource preservation standards into the City’s development review process.
COMMUNITY SERVICES & FACILITIES

The Community Services and Facilities section of PlanOlathe establishes policies linking growth to service standards and provisions found in this plan and the departmental master plans. With the information contained in the master plans and the Capital Improvements Program, the timing of private development and public expenditures can be more effectively coordinated. Planning for the adequate provision of public facilities is intended to promote planned, rational and affordable growth so that residents are ensured equal and adequate service provision.

PRINCIPLE CF-1: IN ORDER TO PROTECT AND USE PAST INVESTMENTS IN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, NEW DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT WILL BE LOCATED IN AREAS WHERE ADEQUATE PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES PRESENTLY EXIST OR ARE PLANNED TO BE PROVIDED.

CF-1.1: Capital Improvement Program. The City’s Capital Improvements Program is a major program for funding an adequate range of urban services and facilities as the City continues to grow. The Capital Improvements Program, within the framework of a responsible budget of balanced revenues and expenditures, schedules the necessary capital projects to ensure maintenance of an adequate range of urban services within the City and to provide urban facilities and services to outlying areas on a phased and orderly basis. The Capital Improvement Program is a tool to direct the location and timing of growth by coordinating and targeting public capital expenditures. The Capital Improvement Program should reflect the Service Master Plans.

CF-1.2: Fiscal Responsibility for Improvements. Since the public costs of developing several areas concurrently could prove excessive, the City will limit said costs to those which can reasonably be accommodated within the Capital Improvements Program and are compatible with anticipated revenues.

CF-1.3: Adequate Public Facilities. When permitting additional development or redevelopment, the City will consider whether public facilities and services are adequate to reasonably maintain current levels of service or service standards given the impacts of such additional development, or whether committed funding sources for such adequate facilities are sufficient to ensure their provision in a timely fashion.

PRINCIPLE CF-2: GROWTH WILL PAY THE FAIR SHARE OF ASSOCIATED COSTS FOR FACILITIES AND SERVICES AND TO MITIGATE NEGATIVE IMPACTS.

Policy CF-2.1: Service Master Plans. Develop and utilize long range plans for determining infrastructure requirements to meet the demand of planned growth.

Policy CF-2.2 Excise Taxes and Impact Fees. Periodically review excise taxes, impact fees, and system development fees on new development based on a standard formula requiring development to pay its calculated share of new public facilities and infrastructure.
**Policy CF-2.3: Service Provider Coordination.** Coordinate with other service providers on development requests to ensure that necessary services not provided by the City should be made available for planned new development and redevelopment.

**Policy CF-2.4: Service Supportive Community Plans.** Development patterns should be planned with the consideration of the alignment and location of existing and future public facilities and infrastructure.

**Policy CF-2.5: Underground Power Lines.** Encourage the undergrounding of overhead distribution lines and associated infrastructure with future development and redevelopment, and in appropriate public infrastructure projects.

**Policy CF-2.6: Developer Responsibilities.** All new developments should dedicate to the City required right-of-ways and install designated public improvements per approved design standards.

**PRINCIPLE CF-3: THE CITY SHOULD PROMOTE THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE COMMUNITY.**

**Policy CF-3.1: Adequate Police Force.** Remain committed to maintaining the police force level of service to ensure the safety of the community.

**Policy CF-3.2: Fire Protection.** Continue to support fire protection services to ensure preservation of life and property. Support and maintain a building and fire code that ensures the safety of buildings and their occupants.

---
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Chapter 5. Guidance

UTILITY SERVICES

Proactive planning for utilities should ensure that the City grows in an efficient and sustainable manner, and continues to provide for health and safety through maintenance and improvement of the existing utility infrastructure including water, sanitary sewer, and storm drainage.

Principle US-1: Provide adequate water, sewer and related utility services to meet the demand of existing and future residents and commercial and industrial growth through a combination of developer-funded infrastructure improvements for new growth and capital investments by the City in major treatment and transmission facilities.

US-1.1: Utility Extensions Consistent with PlanOlathe. The installation and extension of all utilities will be consistent with the provisions of the comprehensive plan and with the responsibilities of the respective utility providers.

US-1.2: System Development Fees. Systems Development Fees should ensure that new development pays for a proportionate share for growth of the water and sewer systems.

US-1.3: Water Quality. The City’s water quality standards and treatment practices should continue to maintain a high level of health protection for its residents.

US-1.4: Adequacy of Service. Ensure that storm drainage, water and wastewater systems are adequate to meet the demands of existing and planned development per the Service Master Plans.

US-1.5: Utility Models. Use water and sewer models to determine demands on existing infrastructure systems and to evaluate new developments.

US-1.6: Improvement and Maintenance. Continue to expand efforts to maintain and improve the infrastructure in the City of Olathe.

US-1.7: Adequate Public Facilities. Periodically review the adequate public facilities section of the Unified Development Ordinance to ensure utilities are available or can be made available in a timely and cost effective manner as development occurs.

Principle US-2: Collaborate with adjacent cities, special service districts, various Federal, State, and County agencies, and appropriate service providers to provide coordinated and sustainable development of the community.


US-2.2: Capital Improvement Program. Use the Service Master Plans and Capital Improvement Program process as a means of guiding development in the City of Olathe.

US-2.3: Utility Provision to Implement Community Goals. Consider the importance of the other objectives of the comprehensive plan in the planning and operation of the water, wastewater, stormwater and flood management utilities. These other objectives include in-stream flow maintenance, enhancement of recreational opportunities, water quality management, preservation of natural ecosystems, and implementation of desired timing and location of growth patterns.
CHAPTER 6.
Implementation

INTRODUCTION

Through the planning process, a clear community vision has emerged based on community input and the premise of ensuring a healthy, prosperous, vibrant City of Olathe that enhances the quality of life for existing and future citizens. The community now must take on the task of implementing realistic strategies to translate the words and images into a physical reality.

The information presented in this chapter is designed to provide a range of actions for consideration and sound decision-making. No one step will effectively achieve the Plan. Rather, implementation will be dependent on a series of actions designed to capitalize on opportunities and overcome challenges. The continued identification of actions and an implementation approach tailored to the unique issues of the community will be key to the successful implementation of the Plan.

THE ROLE OF PLANOLATHE IN SHAPING THE FUTURE OF THE CITY

PlanOlathe, in its broadest form, is a statement of what the community strives to achieve. The Plan provides basic policies to guide activities that are an integral and essential component of community planning. The Plan will help to determine public investment priorities and act as a general framework for future development. The Comprehensive Plan must have the flexibility to address changing conditions and adapt to new situations that may not be anticipated today.

A major goal in the preparation of PlanOlathe was to simplify land use planning by reducing the number of policy layers associated with area plans, corridor plans, neighborhood plans, and other documents while preserving the quality analysis and recommendations that are found in those documents. Toward that end, the land use recommendations within previously adopted land use plans have been integrated into PlanOlathe and have helped to shape the principles, policies, and land use designations found in the Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is the document that will guide the Planning Commission and City Council when evaluating development applications, rezonings, and other land
use policy decisions. Previously adopted design guidelines and overlay districts associated with existing area and corridor plans will remain in effect and continue to be applied. As PlanOlathe is implemented, design guidelines and overlay districts will be reviewed and adapted to function within the framework of the Comprehensive Plan. Detailed research and analysis within existing area and corridor plans will be retained as supplementary information and an ongoing resource in the appendices of this plan.

PlanOlathe is intended to work in concert with the City’s various functional master plans, including the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, Transportation Master Plan, service and utility master plans, and the City’s overall strategic plan for City services. Implementation of PlanOlathe will require coordination and alignment between PlanOlathe and these other plans to ensure a common vision and consistent policy recommendations.

Implementation Tools

As stated in Chapter 1, the Comprehensive Plan is an advisory guide that embodies the community’s vision. Because the Comprehensive Plan is a guide, the City relies on other tools such as the Unified Development Ordinance, the annual operating budget, and the Capital Improvement Program to implement the Comprehensive Plan. The major tools for implementation are outlined below:

Unified Development Ordinance

The primary means of implementing the Comprehensive Plan and its Future Land Use Map is the Unified Development Ordinance. Over time, the City should seek to achieve consistency between the Zoning Map and the Future Land Use Map and between the Zoning Districts and the Future Land Use categories.

Amended Development Standards and Districts: Development standards set the ground rules for new development and redevelopment, and provide property owners and developers with a clear and consistent understanding of the City’s expectations. One of the critical first steps in implementing PlanOlathe is to align the City’s development standards with the vision of the Plan. The following list outlines key updates to the City’s development standards:

- Remove regulatory barriers to redevelopment.
- Promote high quality design in an economically reasonable way.
- Permit and encourage practices for incorporating natural features in new development.
- Update landscaping requirements to allow for energy and water saving landscape treatments.
Protect valued natural areas through requirements for open space, tree preservation, stream buffers, and stormwater management practices.

- Develop viable standards for mixed-use zoning districts, and residential districts that allow for a variety of housing options.
- Ensure that lot size, density, material, and other requirements allow for affordable starter homes.
- Include cluster or conservation subdivision options for residential development.
- Update standards for vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian connections to and within commercial centers.
- Update standards for pedestrian connections to and within neighborhoods.
- Include cluster or conservation subdivision options for residential development.
- Update standards for vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian connections to and within commercial centers.
- Update standards for pedestrian connections to and within neighborhoods.
- Incorporate economically reasonable design features to accommodate multi-modal transportation.

**Overlay Districts:** Overlay districts are special zones that lie on top of existing zoning categories to supplement or supersede existing regulations. Overlay districts can provide a higher level of regulation than required by the underlying zoning classification, but they can also permit exceptions or require less-restrictive standards. Implementation of PlanOlathe will require first that existing overlay districts be reviewed and updated to ensure that they function in a manner consistent with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan. There may also be an opportunity for the creation of new overlay districts as a tool to enhance specific areas that have distinct features or development characteristics.

**Rezoning:** There are two ways that rezoning can serve as a tool to implement the Comprehensive Plan. The first is property owner-initiated rezoning. Typically, property owners request rezoning as part of a proposal to develop their property. Each rezoning application presents an incremental opportunity to evaluate the proposed development pattern with respect to the vision outlined by the Comprehensive Plan.

The second way that rezoning can implement the Plan is through City-initiated rezoning. As new zoning districts and overlay districts are created, and existing districts are updated, City-initiated rezonings present an opportunity to implement new zoning districts that better reflect the community’s vision, and better accommodate development and redevelopment. City-initiated rezoning can remove particular use, height, area, and other regulations that present unnecessary burdens for development and redevelopment, and that do not directly achieve community expectations or benefits.

**Design Guidelines**

Unlike design standards, which are mandatory and specific, design guidelines are more descriptive and suggestive. They do not hold the
weight of law. Rather, they are meant to inspire designers to create buildings, sites and landscaping that are reflective of the character of an area and the community’s expectations for development.

The City has adopted general design guidelines for development throughout the City. There are also specific design guidelines associated with local area and corridor plans. As PlanOlathe is implemented, it will be necessary to update and integrate these existing guidelines so that they function coherently within the framework of the Comprehensive Plan.

**Capital Improvement Program**

The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is a financial planning tool that enables the City to plan for large, high priority capital projects, such as parks, street and drainage improvements, utilities, and public facilities, over a period of time. The CIP matches the cost of capital improvements to anticipated revenues and provides the policy framework for the allocation of funding. The CIP is an essential implementation tool for carrying out PlanOlathe’s policies of orderly and efficient provision of urban facilities and services. Through master planning and annual budgeting the CIP directs resources to provide an adequate range of urban services, and directs the location and timing of growth. It is used as an alternative to considering individual public projects one at a time without reference to overall community priorities or fiscal capacity.

Since public dollars are limited, it is important to balance priorities with available resources and other funding source options to effectively leverage public expenditures. The Principles and Policies contained on the Comprehensive Plan should be considered when updating the annual CIP.

**Incentives**

The City of Olathe provides incentives to encourage community changes while ensuring that this growth contributes to livability and sustainability.

Regulatory incentives make it easier for developers to build in a manner that is consistent with the community’s vision, and encourage providing amenities and benefits that might not otherwise be realized. Regulatory incentives might include measures such as providing density bonuses for development projects where additional open space is preserved, or reductions in parking requirements where bike racks or other multi-modal accommodations are provided.

Direct financial incentives can also be provided that will spur desired outcomes. There are broad range of financial incentive tools available, ranging from industrial revenue bonds to historic tax credits, to transportation development districts. The policies and criteria that the
City establishes for the granting of financial incentives can directly promote the principles and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

**Partnerships**

PlanOlathe cannot be implemented solely by the City of Olathe. Success of the Plan hinges on community partnerships.

A key characteristic of successful communities is their ability to forge partnerships. Community partnerships thrive in an environment where individuals and organizations feel motivated to invest their time and resources for the larger community benefit. They invest time and resources because they believe in the cause for the community and believe that their investment will result in a higher quality of life. In essence, the individual or organization becomes more vested in the future of the community.

Public, private, and non-profit partnerships help to engage and energize the community, strengthen community networks and social bonds, and resolve issues of mutual concern. For example, public partnerships between Olathe and Johnson County, surrounding cities, school districts and other jurisdictions provide a logical way to attempt to resolve growth and development related challenges. Private partnerships between the City, its corporate citizens, and the Chamber of Commerce can help to develop and enhance a thriving local economy. Partnerships with non-profits can enable the City and local groups to mutually assist one another in meeting the needs of Olathe citizens.

**Performance Measures and Fact-Based Analysis**

The principles and policies of PlanOlathe are shaped by the community’s vision for future growth and development. This vision is grounded in a fact-based analysis of existing conditions and future needs. Citizen surveys of community priorities, a land demand analysis, and buildout study are some of the tools employed as part of this planning process to create a reliable picture of Olathe’s challenges and opportunities today, and where Olathe might be headed in the future. Successful implementation of the Plan will require ongoing analysis and review to evaluate where the community’s vision is being successfully fulfilled, and where challenges remain.

**Implementation Matrix**

The following matrix summarizes actions by public agencies in collaboration with the private sector that are necessary to implement policies found in the Plan. These implementation actions are not regulatory, but are intended to provide direction to City departments, public agencies and private entities as they develop work plans, so that staff and resources can be appropriately assigned over time.
## Land Use and Community Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCIPLE LUCC-1:</strong> Plan Olathe, the City's Comprehensive Plan, will be the guiding document within the Olathe Growth Area.</td>
<td>Action) Establish a process or set of criteria to evaluate development applications for consistency with the principles, policies and land use recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan, and to guide and document staff recommendations.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-1.1:</strong> Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. Land use proposals should be consistent with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as applicable local ordinances and resolutions.</td>
<td>Action) Establish a process or set of criteria to evaluate applicable ordinances and resolutions for consistency with the principles, policies and land use recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-1.2:</strong> Compatibility with Intergovernmental Agreements. Work in cooperation with adjoining jurisdictions to ensure that the execution and amendment of intergovernmental agreements are consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Action) Uphold existing intergovernmental agreements with surrounding municipalities and other agencies, and amend agreements at such time that conditions warrant.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-1.3:</strong> Integration with Adopted Community Plans. A variety of community plans exist to guide decision making. The City is committed to achieving a high level of coordination and integration in development and implementation of Plan Olathe, area plans, corridor plans, neighborhood plans and functional master plans. As described in the Implementation Chapter of this Plan, the Comprehensive Plan synthesizes and supercedes the recommendations of existing area and corridor plans. Design guidelines and overlay districts associated with existing area and corridor plans will be reviewed and adapted to function within the framework of the Comprehensive Plan. Detailed research and analysis within existing area and corridor plans will be retained as supplementary information in the appendices of this plan.</td>
<td>Action) Review and update area and corridor plan design guidelines to align with the recommendations and land use categories of the Comprehensive Plan, and to integrate with City wide design guidelines.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-2.1:</strong> Shared Responsibility for Planning. Continue to collaborate with Johnson County within the City’s established Future Growth Area boundary to guide and manage growth beyond the City limits. Such collaboration might include joint planning efforts, intergovernmental agreements, or other strategies.</td>
<td>Action) Identify roles and responsibilities for the City of Olathe and Johnson County through an intergovernmental agreement which pertain to development within the Future Growth Area boundary.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-2.2:</strong> Intergovernmental Agreements. Enter into intergovernmental agreements with Johnson County or other municipalities and agencies when appropriate to foster intergovernmental planning and cooperation.</td>
<td>Action) Explore joint adoption of Olathe’s Comprehensive Plan with Johnson County.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-2.3:</strong> Annexation. In accordance with adopted policies: a. The City may initiate annexation of unincorporated areas within its Future Growth Area where there are indications of urban-intensity development, and as a tool to join incorporated island and eliminate unincorporated enclaves. b. Recognize the major lifestyle concerns of unincorporated property owners and work to minimize potential negative impacts of annexation. c. Require annexation prior to extension of City utility services to property outside of the corporate limits unless a benefit district is authorized that details the process by which annexation and provision of adequate public facilities will occur prior to development of the property. d. Ensure annexation agreements provide benefit to the City that might otherwise be unattainable.</td>
<td>Action) Ensure that all property annexed into the City has an Olathe zoning classification in accordance with the requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance. Develop criteria to evaluate which zoning districts are applied to newly annexed property when applicants do not request a rezoning upon annexation.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-2.4:</strong> Development Referral. Refer formal development applications that are adjacent to other jurisdictions for comments.</td>
<td>Action) Develop a policy that outlines referral procedures for development applications that are adjacent to other jurisdictions.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Land Use and Community Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle LUCC-3:</strong> Promote adequate residential densities to support existing and future commercial centers.</td>
<td>Action) Amend the Unified Development Ordinance to add a new Mixed Use Neighborhood Zoning District that provides for a variety of housing options. Review and amend the Unified Development Ordinance as necessary to accommodate higher density uses in other zone districts.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-3.1: Encourage Housing Near Services.</strong> Encourage higher density housing development near transit services, commercial centers, and planned transit nodes and corridors to create activity areas that add to the community's quality of life.</td>
<td>Action) Amend the Major Street Map designation to align with roadway and transit system designations found on the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-3.2: Link between Transportation and Land Use.</strong> Implement land use plans and programs that support effective transit, an efficient street system, and alternative transportation modes. Design the transportation system to accommodate the planned land use pattern, which includes higher densities and mixed uses in Original Town, commercial centers, employment centers, and a variety of densities in the fringe areas.</td>
<td>Action) Consider density bonuses within a specific radius of identified transit stops which would allow for higher densities than otherwise permitted in standard zoning districts.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-3.3: Residential Zoning Standards.</strong> Ensure that zoning allows for a variety of home types and lot sizes.</td>
<td>Action) Review the Unified Development Ordinance use and design standards for each of the residential zoning districts, as well as residential design guidelines, to assess whether amendments are necessary.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle LUCC-4:</strong> Encourage mixed-use development, especially in the downtown area, to support commercial uses, promote walkability, and provide for a variety of housing options.</td>
<td>Action) Amend the Major Street Map designation to align with roadway and transit system designations found on the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-4.1: Mixed-Use Neighborhoods.</strong> Support viable mixed use and mixed density neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Action) Consider density bonuses within a specific radius of identified transit stops which would allow for higher densities than otherwise permitted in standard zoning districts.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle LUCC-5:</strong> Develop commercial centers of an appropriate size and scale, and within the right locations, to ensure economic sustainability and shape community form.</td>
<td>Action) Review and update Unified Development Ordinance standards for each of the commercial zoning districts.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-5.1: Hierarchy of Activity Centers.</strong> Focus new commercial centers in concentrated activity areas at a variety of scales distributed throughout the community.</td>
<td>Action) Develop criteria to evaluate commercial development with regard to scale and location of commercial uses.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-5.2: Connections to Centers.</strong> Encourage pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections to and within commercial centers.</td>
<td>Action) Develop criteria to evaluate commercial development outside of the commercial centers identified in the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle LUCC-6:</strong> Discourage &quot;leap-frog&quot; or sprawling land use patterns by encouraging growth in serviceable areas. Promote the infill of vacant parcels and reinvestment in buildable areas.</td>
<td>Action) Review and update Unified Development Ordinance standards for vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian connections to and within commercial centers.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-6.1: Targeted Development.</strong> With the guidance of the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map, encourage targeted development, redevelopment and infill so as to channel growth where it will contribute to the long-term community vision and improve access to jobs, housing and services.</td>
<td>Action) Identify areas targeted for infill and redevelopment.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-6.2: Santa Fe Commercial Corridor.</strong> The Santa Fe Commercial Corridor includes community retail uses, as well as offices, and business and personal services. While the district is largely the location for highway business and auto-related uses, it also offers opportunities to transform the area, over time, to being a mixed-use, multi-modal area.</td>
<td>Action) Consider a new Commercial Corridor zoning or overlay district along Santa Fe Street consistent with the Commercial Corridor identified in the Future Land Use Map, with accompanying use and design standards.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-6.3: Resource Protection.</strong> Designate land use patterns and intensities so as to minimize adverse impacts on valued natural resources, wildlife habitats and historic sites.</td>
<td>Action) Take advantage of existing GIS resources to create and maintain a GIS-based natural resource and historic site database to identify and prioritize valued natural and historic areas.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-6.4: Mixed-Use Neighborhoods.</strong> Support viable mixed use and mixed density neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Action) Consider the dedication of easements as one tool to protect valued natural resources as part of the development review process.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Land Use and Community Character**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Action</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lead Department or Agency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-7: Encourage design standards that successfully enhance quality of life in a manner that is economically viable and sustainable for the City and the private sector.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-7.1: High Quality Design.</strong> Encourage economically reasonable efforts toward high quality architecture, urban design and site design. Use design guidelines as a tool for new development and redevelopment. Consider the desired context and character of existing neighborhoods and commercial centers.</td>
<td>Encourage dialogue between the City, landowners and developers to ensure that future development plans meet the community vision for high quality design.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and update existing design guidelines, including city-wide design guidelines and those intended for specific areas and corridors. Develop new design guidelines where necessary.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review the Unified Development Ordinance for opportunities to promote high quality design in an economically reasonable way.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-7.2: Sustainable Design and Materials.</strong> Promote the use of sustainable design and materials in new development, redevelopment, and maintenance of property throughout the City.</td>
<td>Support and maintain up-to-date building, energy efficiency, and plumbing codes.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop guidelines to encourage sustainable building practices.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and update existing design guidelines, including city-wide design guidelines and those intended for specific areas and corridors. Develop new design guidelines where necessary.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review the Unified Development Ordinance for opportunities to promote high quality design in an economically reasonable way.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-7.3: Provision and Design of Public Spaces.</strong> Recognizing that public spaces bear a special responsibility to exhibit design excellence, ensure that public projects are positive additions to the community’s architectural and design heritage.</td>
<td>Review design guidelines for public spaces as part of a comprehensive design guideline update.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote and exemplify sustainable building practices in public buildings and projects.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-7.4: Alternative Zoning Techniques.</strong> Consider alternative zoning techniques within the City Center District and redeveloping areas to elevate the quality of urban design, and encourage higher densities. This may include codes that emphasize the form and mass of buildings in relation to one another, and the scale and types of streets and blocks, and de-emphasize regulation of land use.</td>
<td>Consider form-based regulations or other zoning techniques within the City Center District and create such standards for Mixed-Use Neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and update or replace Central Business District (CBD) and Original Town Overlay Districts.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider developing design guidelines for infill development as part of a comprehensive design guideline update.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-7.5: Community Image.</strong> Respect unique community and neighborhood identities, settings, and histories.</td>
<td>Consider historical context and neighborhood identities when reviewing infill or redevelopment projects.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider the recommendations of neighborhood action plans in the construction of public projects and review of development applications.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify locations for additional interpretive historical markers throughout the community.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-7.6: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.</strong> Encourage Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) by employing design techniques and effective use of the built and natural environment to help reduce crime, reduce fear of crime, and improve overall quality of life. Incorporate concepts including natural surveillance and access control, territorial reinforcement, property maintenance and street activity.</td>
<td>Review Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) features as part of a comprehensive design guidelines update.</td>
<td>Police Department / Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate consideration of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design opportunities as part of the development review process.</td>
<td>Police Department / Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Land Use and Community Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle LUCC-8: Achieve a balanced mix of residential and non-residential development throughout Olathe.</strong></td>
<td>Action) Develop mixed-use development guidelines as part of a comprehensive design guideline update.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-8.1: Mixture of Complementary Land Uses.</strong> Encourage and enable a mixture of complementary land uses in major new developments. In existing neighborhoods, a mixture of land use types, housing sizes, and lot sizes may be possible if properly planned and respectful of neighborhood character. Whenever land uses are mixed, careful design will be required in order to ensure compatibility, accessibility and appropriate transitions between land uses that vary in intensity and scale.</td>
<td>Action) Adopt new Unified Development Ordinance standards for mixed use zoning district(s).</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Develop mixed-use development guidelines as part of a comprehensive design guideline update.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUCC-8.2: Compatibility of Adjacent Land Uses.</strong> Where a mixture of uses is not appropriate or uses are not complementary, use zoning as a tool to avoid or minimize conflicts between land uses that vary widely in use, intensity, or other characteristics. This may include buffering, landscaping, transitional uses and densities, and other measures. Protect industry from encroachment by residential development, and ensure that the character and livability of established residential neighborhoods will not be undermined by impacts from adjacent non-residential areas or by incremental expansion of business activities into residential areas.</td>
<td>Action) Review buffer standards, setting minimum requirements and options for trees, shrubs, berms and other landscape treatments separating uses that vary widely in use, intensity, or other characteristics.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Consider design elements and site plan solutions as part of the development review process where compatibility of adjacent uses is a concern.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Zone for transitional uses and densities between land uses that vary widely in use, intensity, or other characteristics.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Develop criteria to evaluate commercial development outside of the commercial centers identified on the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Maintain a GIS data base providing buildable employment land data that can be accessed by prospective employers or existing businesses.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Economic Sustainability

**Principle ES-1: Utilize Olathe’s strengths, including a highly educated population, affordability, recreation opportunities, business and family-friendly environment, and other quality of life amenities as a tool to attract quality jobs and position Olathe as a regional economic leader.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES-1.1: Economic Partnership.</strong> Support the efforts of public and private organizations to diversify the local economy and pursue partnerships among the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. Encourage industries and businesses to establish job partnerships with educational institutions and other economic development organizations.</td>
<td>Action) The City will continue collaborative efforts with the local school districts, Olathe Chamber of Commerce, educational institutions, and local businesses to promote unified economic development efforts.</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES-1.2: Economic Programs and Strategies.</strong> Support economic vitality programs and strategies that foster innovation, enhance competitiveness and expand markets.</td>
<td>Action) Continue to refine the City’s adopted tax incentive and other economic development policies to reflect methods that will make Olathe more competitive, and to support the vision of the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Resource Management / Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES-1.3: Targeted Industries.</strong> Promote Olathe as an ideal place for desirable new industries, especially those that would diversify the employment base, reflect the labor force capabilities of the community, and complement Olathe’s high quality of life.</td>
<td>Action) Share land use, demographic, and other data with the Chamber of Commerce and the development community that can be used to target specific industries that will be a positive addition to the community.</td>
<td>Development Services / Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES-1.4: Support for Local Business.</strong> Support the retention, expansion and entrepreneurial activities of existing local businesses and maintain a positive business climate. Promote local shopping and local lodging as a means to support the community’s economy.</td>
<td>Action) Support efforts of &quot;buy local&quot; and &quot;stay local&quot; campaigns.</td>
<td>Resource Management / Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES-1.5: New Businesses.</strong> Build upon existing economic strengths to encourage new spin-off and start-up businesses.</td>
<td>Action) Consult with the Chamber of Commerce and identify changes to the Unified Development Ordinance and other City regulations and processes that would directly benefit existing local businesses.</td>
<td>Development Services / Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) Continue to support local business through tax incentive policies that favor expansion of existing businesses.</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) Consider potential impacts on existing businesses when providing economic development incentives to attract new businesses.</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES-2: Achieve a balanced mix of commercial and residential development to promote fiscal sustainability and ensure that tax revenues are sufficient to support public services provided to the citizens of Olathe.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ES-2.1: Balance of Jobs and Housing.</strong> Use the Future Land Use Map, zoning and other tools to ensure that there is an adequate supply of residential, employment and commercial lands, in order to provide a sustainable balance of jobs and housing in the community.</td>
<td>Action) Maintain a GIS database providing buildable employment land data and utility service availability that can be accessed by prospective employers or existing businesses.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) Use the build-out model as one tool to evaluate the fiscal impacts of land use.</td>
<td>Development Services / Resource Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES-2.2: Adequate Locations for Future Growth.</strong> Ensure that the City has adequate high quality locations to capture future employment growth and corporate relocations.</td>
<td>Action) Maintain a GIS database providing buildable employment land data that can be accessed by prospective employers or existing businesses.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES-2.3: Measure Economic Impact of Land Use Decisions.</strong> Use fact-based analysis to evaluate the impact of land use decisions on the local economy and the fiscal health of the City.</td>
<td>Action) Employ tools such as the build-out study or other fiscal impact analysis to evaluate significant development applications that are considered by the Planning Commission and/or City Council. The analysis will focus on potential short and long-term impacts of those decisions made.</td>
<td>Development Services / Resource Management</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Economic Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle ES-3: Strengthen and revitalize existing commercial centers.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-3.1: Reinvestment in Existing Commercial and Industrial Areas.</td>
<td>Cooperate with the private sector to foster the revitalization of existing commercial and industrial areas in order to create greater vitality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) Prioritize infrastructure investment within the Capital Improvement Program that will support existing commercial and industrial areas.</td>
<td>Development Services / Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) Consider economic development and incentive policies that encourage infill, reinvestment, and redevelopment of existing areas.</td>
<td>Resource Management / Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) Create an inventory of redevelopment and infill opportunities and work with the Chamber of Commerce to promote reinvestment and redevelopment of these sites.</td>
<td>Development Services / Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-3.2: Evaluate Retail Supply and Demand.</td>
<td>Evaluate retail supply and demand and planned retail locations to ensure that new commercial and retail development can draw from an adequate market, rather than being too far ahead of demand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) Employ tools such as market demand analysis to evaluate major retail-based development proposals in situations where there is public investment or incentives associated with the project, or there is potential for significant impacts to existing businesses and commercial areas.</td>
<td>Development Services / Resource Management</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) Conduct a city-wide retail vacancy study.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-3.3: Encourage Commercial Development Downtown.</td>
<td>Consider land use policies that favor retail and commercial development in Downtown and that enable Downtown to be competitive with new development in more peripheral locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) The City should identify and leverage publicly-owned parcels that can function as 'catalyst' redevelopment sites and partner with the developer to construct projects that will spur further private sector redevelopment efforts.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) Conduct a city-wide retail vacancy study.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle ES-4: Employment Areas as Districts. Develop distinct employment districts to ensure Olathe’s strong and diversified economy.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-4.1 Employment Districts.</td>
<td>Distinct employment districts will help maintain Olathe’s economic sustainability. These focused districts will include primary employment and industrial uses, and build upon existing economic strengths. Tailored housing options in each district will put workers within walking distance of their jobs, reducing travel times and impacts to the road system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) Consider adoption of design guidelines or overlay zoning for each district, as identified in the Future Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action) Explore location- and industry-specific economic development incentives in identified districts to build upon existing economic strengths, encourage spin-off and start-up businesses, and attract desirable new businesses.</td>
<td>Development Services / Resource Management / Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Original Town

### Policy

**PRINCIPLE OT-1: Continue to support efforts to improve and expand the Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods by locating additional uses and activities in the area, including entertainment, restaurants, transportation hubs, high density housing, and compatible uses in a manner that is harmonious with the historic character of Downtown.**

** OT-1.1: Downtown.**

- **Key Action**: Explore the possibilities for reusing the Central Business District (CBD) zoning for compatibility with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. Revise and/or create new districts as necessary to align with policy and support a mix of housing types.

**OT-1.2: Original Town Neighborhoods.**

- **Key Action**: Review the Original Town Overlay District for compatibility with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. Revise and/or create new districts as necessary to align with policy and support a mix of housing types.

### Lead Department or Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OT-1.1: Downtown.</strong></td>
<td>Explore the possibilities for reusing the Central Business District (CBD) zoning for compatibility with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. Revise and/or create new districts as necessary to align with policy and support a mix of housing types.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OT-1.2: Original Town Neighborhoods.</strong></td>
<td>Review the Original Town Overlay District for compatibility with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. Revise and/or create new districts as necessary to align with policy and support a mix of housing types.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Original Town

**PRINCIPLE OT-2: Promote policies and financial incentives that assist Downtown redevelopment efforts.**

**OT-2.1: Improvement Funding.**

- **Key Action**: Use public owned property as a development incentive downtown, including sale of the property or as an opportunity to create a development partnership.

**OT-2.2: Public/Private Partnerships.**

- **Key Action**: Prepare a profile of Original Town demographics, development, and public investment as resource for prospective businesses.

**OT-2.3: Neighborhood Resources.**

- **Key Action**: Continue to be a resource to assist with the organization and visioning of Original Town neighborhoods, and take an active role in providing opportunities for citizen involvement.

---

**Ordinance No. 10-60, 5 October 2010**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Town</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OT-3.1: Implement Existing Plans</strong></td>
<td>Continue implementation of the Envision Olathe Downtown Plan, Streetscape Master Plan, and Original Town Enhancement Plan when making decisions or prioritizing projects that affect the neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OT-3.2: Housing</strong></td>
<td>Add high density, multi-family housing within and adjacent to the downtown area, including the reclamation and redevelopment of brownfield sites, new housing investment, and maintenance and preservation of housing stock.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OT-3.3: Destination for Civic and Community Events</strong></td>
<td>Promote Downtown as a memorable destination for civic and community events. Provide community gathering space Downtown, such as a farmers' market pavilion and civic square.</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OT-3.4: Pedestrian Friendly</strong></td>
<td>Provide an appealing pedestrian-friendly landscape and streetscape environment. Make Original Town more pedestrian-friendly through implementation of the Streetscape Master Plan and other improvements such as wayfinding signage.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OT-3.5: Revitalize Adjacent Areas</strong></td>
<td>Revitalize areas adjacent to the downtown core, including the reclamation and redevelopment of brownfield sites, new housing investment, and maintenance and preservation of housing stock.</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OT-3.6: Maintain and Upgrade Aging Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Maintain and upgrade aging infrastructure in the Original Town where possible, particularly in conjunction with new revitalization projects.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy**

- **Principle OT-3:** Encourage and implement innovative techniques designed to spur Original Town revitalization activities.

**Original Town Policy Key Action Lead Department or Agency Priority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>OT-3.1: Implement Existing Plans</th>
<th>Development Services</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OT-3.2: Housing</td>
<td>Add high density, multi-family housing within and adjacent to the downtown area, including the reclamation and redevelopment of brownfield sites, new housing investment, and maintenance and preservation of housing stock.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT-3.3: Destination for Civic and Community Events</td>
<td>Promote Downtown as a memorable destination for civic and community events. Provide community gathering space Downtown, such as a farmers' market pavilion and civic square.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT-3.4: Pedestrian Friendly</td>
<td>Provide an appealing pedestrian-friendly landscape and streetscape environment. Make Original Town more pedestrian-friendly through implementation of the Streetscape Master Plan and other improvements such as wayfinding signage.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT-3.5: Revitalize Adjacent Areas</td>
<td>Revitalize areas adjacent to the downtown core, including the reclamation and redevelopment of brownfield sites, new housing investment, and maintenance and preservation of housing stock.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT-3.6: Maintain and Upgrade Aging Infrastructure</td>
<td>Maintain and upgrade aging infrastructure in the Original Town where possible, particularly in conjunction with new revitalization projects.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Original Town**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OT-3.7: Downtown Parking Lots and Structures.</strong> Provide downtown parking in a manner that accommodates redevelopment, higher residential densities, and increased pedestrian activity.</td>
<td>Action) Phase in the construction of new structured parking per the Envision Olathe plan.</td>
<td>Public Works / Development Services</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT-3.7: Downtown Parking Lots and Structures.</td>
<td>Action) Consider adoption of lower parking requirements for all development within the Downtown.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Explore alternative parking techniques for the Downtown area, including off-site parking, shared parking, and on-street parking arrangements.</td>
<td>Public Works / Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OT-3.8: Property Maintenance.</strong> Continue to require owners of all properties to maintain their property in accordance with all applicable laws and city ordinances. Encourage the use of sustainable design and materials to improve the overall efficiency, durability, and longevity of Original Town structures.</td>
<td>Action) Review policies for enforcement of property maintenance violations to determine when proactive enforcement is necessary.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Review resources available to enforce property maintenance codes and identify any key areas in need of additional support.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Periodically review and update municipal codes related to property maintenance.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Coordinate between community enhancement and housing divisions to provide property maintenance incentive information in conjunction with code citations.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Identify tools and policies to address abandoned, dangerous, and blighted buildings in order to protect adjacent properties, maintain the integrity of neighborhoods, and improve the overall image of the City.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Provide a high level of maintenance and upkeep for City buildings, streets, and facilities, as a tool to improve overall neighborhood quality.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing and Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle HN-1: Maintain the character and identity of existing residential neighborhoods.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN-1.1: Neighborhood Role.</strong> Foster the role of neighborhoods to establish community identity, provide services needed on a day-to-day basis, encourage community interaction, and offer amenities.</td>
<td>Action) Support neighborhood gatherings or meetings to encourage interaction with the City and inform residents of City programs.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Implement Original Town Neighborhood Action Plans.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN-1.2: Mixed Uses and Mixed Incomes.</strong> In existing neighborhoods, a mixture of land use types, housing sizes and lot sizes may be possible if properly planned and respectful of neighborhood character. Require careful design wherever land uses are mixed, in order to ensure compatibility, accessibility and appropriate transitions between land uses that vary in intensity and scale.</td>
<td>Action) Develop mixed-use development guidelines as part of a comprehensive design guideline update.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Adopt new Unified Development Ordinance standards for mixed use zoning district(s).</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN-1.3: Reduce Impacts from Redevelopment.</strong> Design infill and redevelopment to avoid negative impacts and ensure compatibility and appropriate transitions between land uses.</td>
<td>Action) Review buffer standards, setting minimum requirements and options for trees, shrubs, berms and other landscape treatments separating uses that vary widely in use, intensity, or other characteristics.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Consider design elements and site plan solutions as part of the development review process where compatibility of adjacent uses is a concern.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Zone for transitional uses and densities between land uses that vary widely in use, intensity, or other characteristics.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Develop criteria to evaluate commercial development outside of the commercial centers identified on the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN-1.4: Minimize Spill-over Impacts to Residents.</strong> Protect the character and livability of established residential neighborhoods by minimizing spill-over impacts from adjacent commercial areas and incremental expansion of business activities into residential areas.</td>
<td>Action) Provide a Housing Rehabilitation Program utilizing Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to assist income qualified property owners with home improvements in order to maintain the value of properties.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Collaborate with Olath Municipal Services to use recycled paint as part of housing rehabilitation programs.</td>
<td>Development Services / Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Continue to publicize Neighborhood Revitalization property tax rebate incentive.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN-1.5: Promote Housing Rehabilitation.</strong> Improve and maintain the quality of existing housing stock through public and private sector investment and contribution to housing rehabilitation. Support community organizations and activities that encourage and provide housing rehabilitation and neighborhood improvements.</td>
<td>Action) Maintain integrity of neighborhoods by providing a community enhancement program that identifies the deterioration of rental properties and collaborates with other divisions and organizations to identify opportunities for assistance in addressing city code violations.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Provide information on financial assistance for qualified applicants through housing rehabilitation programs when citing property owners for code violations.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN-1.6: Code Compliant Housing.</strong> Ensure that housing meets all applicable zoning and building code requirements. Continue to support adopted exterior building maintenance standards ensuring the upkeep of existing neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Action) Explore the possibility of a rental rehabilitation program funded through Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds or partnerships with lenders.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Adopt architectural guidelines applicable to older neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN-1.7: Rental Properties.</strong> Continue to seek creative solutions to protect and promote the public health of all citizens, and to encourage owners and occupants of rental properties to maintain and improve the quality of rental housing within the community.</td>
<td>Action) Continue to process Architectural Reviews for one and two-family residential properties located within the Original Town Overlay District to determine appropriateness and compatibility of design elements.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Housing and Neighborhoods

**Policy** | **Key Action** | **Lead Department or Agency** | **Priority**
--- | --- | --- | ---
**Principle HN-2: Support housing development and redevelopment that includes a variety of housing types and opportunities to enable a wide range of economic levels, age groups, and lifestyles to live within a community.**

**HN-2.1: Full Range of Housing Choices.** Encourage residential development that supports the full range of housing needs in the community by ensuring that a variety of housing types, prices and styles are created and maintained in the community.
- **Action:** Amend the Unified Development Ordinance to encourage a range of housing densities within mixed-use residential neighborhoods and within and adjacent the Downtown, City Center District and Transit Oriented Development Centers.
- **Lead Department or Agency:** Development Services
- **Priority:** Immediate

**HN-2.2: Complete Neighborhoods.** Encourage a “complete” neighborhood concept for new development which includes a variety of residential densities on appropriately sized parcels, opportunities for shopping, nearby support services and conveniently-sited public facilities, including roads, transit, and pedestrian connections, parks, libraries and schools.
- **Action:** Amend the Unified Development Ordinance to add a new Mixed Use Neighborhood Zoning District that provides for a variety of housing options. Review and amend the Unified Development Ordinance as necessary to accommodate higher density uses in other zoning districts.
- **Lead Department or Agency:** Development Services
- **Priority:** Immediate

**HN-2.3: Higher Residential Densities.** Target future medium and high-density residential development to locations that are accessible to and integrated with potential employment and transit centers.
- **Action:** Amend the Unified Development Ordinance to encourage a range of housing densities within mixed-use residential neighborhoods and within and adjacent the Downtown, City Center District and Transit Oriented Development Centers.
- **Lead Department or Agency:** Development Services
- **Priority:** Immediate

**HN-2.4: Accessible Housing.** Encourage accessible housing units for populations with special needs designed to provide, for example, a main floor bedroom, wider hallways/doorways, main floor baths, first floor laundry and level entries without steps.
- **Action:** Reconfigure all public housing unit entrances to be accessible for populations with special mobility needs, as identified through the Johnson County Housing Authority’s capital investment plan.
- **Lead Department or Agency:** Development Services
- **Priority:** Medium Term

**HN-2.5: Senior Housing.** Address the housing needs of an aging population. Provide neighborhoods with a variety of housing styles and prices that meet the particular needs of seniors and enable residents to “age in place.”
- **Action:** Provide zoning districts that permit a variety of housing styles, sizes, and prices that enable residents to “age in place” within their community.
- **Lead Department or Agency:** Development Services
- **Priority:** Immediate

**Principle HN-3: Promote high quality residential design.**

**HN-3.1: High Quality Architecture and Design.** Encourage economically reasonable efforts toward high quality architecture and urban design in residential development.
- **Action:** Encourage dialogue between the City, landowners and developers to ensure that future development plans meet the community vision for high quality design.
- **Lead Department or Agency:** Development Services
- **Priority:** Ongoing

**HN-3.2: Public Spaces in Neighborhoods.** Create neighborhood areas that provide attractive public spaces, such as civic spaces, community centers, schools, parks, plazas, community gardens, and natural open space.
- **Action:** Explore incentives for residential developers to provide additional desired amenities. Incentives may be financial, such as the waiver of fees, or code related, such as permitting additional lots or density.
- **Lead Department or Agency:** Development Services
- **Priority:** Medium Term
## Housing and Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Explore incentives for developers to construct trail connections to and within their projects.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation / Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Identify opportunities for pedestrian connections in existing, developed areas.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Review and update Unified Development Ordinance standards for pedestrian connections to and within neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HN-3.4: Sustainable Design.** Integrate sustainable design and building practices into new housing construction and rehabilitation of existing housing.

- **Action** Explore federal, state, and regional funding opportunities for green building and sustainable design practices as one tool to promote housing rehabilitation.
  - Development Services
  - Ongoing

**Principle HN-4: Promote housing strategies to ensure an adequate supply of homes at all price ranges.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HN-4.1: Affordable Housing.</td>
<td>Action) Provide residential zoning districts that will permit higher densities, small lot single-family houses, town homes and condominiums, and other attached products.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Review Unified Development Ordinance standards to ensure that lot size, density, material, and other requirements allow for affordable starter homes.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Explore all eligible grant funds to purchase foreclosed properties to renovate and sell or rent to income qualified individuals.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Continue to provide rental assisted housing units through Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs to help meet the housing needs of Olathe residents.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HN-4.2: Move-Up and Executive Housing.** Encourage housing products that will meet the needs and preferences of residents at different stages of life.

- **Action** Provide zoning districts that permit a variety of housing styles, sizes, and prices that enable residents to "age in place" within their community.
  - Development Services
  - Immediate

- **Action** Identify the demand and provide opportunities for executive housing in Olathe. Evaluate where executive housing may be used as a tool to help attract new businesses to Olathe.
  - Development Services
  - Medium Term

**Principle HN-5: Encourage housing densities and styles that will support vibrant retail and transit centers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HN-5.1: Mixed Use Neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Action) Adopt new Unified Development Ordinance development standards for mixed use zoning district(s).</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN-5.2: Density Near Activity Centers and Transit.</td>
<td>Action) Amend the Unified Development Ordinance, adding a new Mixed Use Neighborhood Zoning District that provides for a variety of housing options. Review and amend the Unified Development Ordinance as necessary to accommodate higher density uses in other zone districts.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Consider density bonuses within a specific radius of identified transit stops which would allow for higher densities than otherwise permitted in standard zoning districts.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Key Action</td>
<td>Lead Department or Agency</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN-6: Reduce physical and social barriers between neighborhoods, while at the same time preserving and nurturing unique neighborhood identities.</strong></td>
<td>Action 1: Identify Neighborhood Planning areas.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN-6.1: Neighborhood Planning Areas.</strong> Consider establishing neighborhood planning areas that foster strategic alliances of individual subdivisions defined by shared interests and mutually acceptable boundaries.</td>
<td>Action 2: Develop strategies to improve communication and collaboration with neighborhood groups on Planning, Public Works, and other City projects.</td>
<td>Development Services / Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action 3: Facilitate a periodic Congress of Neighborhoods to promote strategic neighborhood alliances and share best practices for neighborhood action and community improvements.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action 4: Explore the feasibility and desirability of Neighborhood Assessments and/or Action Plans for neighborhood planning areas outside of Original Town.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN-6.2: Support Community Relationships.</strong> Design neighborhoods to encourage social interaction and support family and community relationships.</td>
<td>Action 5: Explore design guidelines or incentives that encourage neighborhood amenities and architectural design features that support community relationships. These measures may range from providing community gathering spaces within neighborhoods to providing traditional neighborhood design elements such as large front porches on homes.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HN-6.3: Community Input.</strong> Encourage community input in the design and planning process.</td>
<td>Action 6: Review the neighborhood meeting process for development review, and revise as necessary to facilitate community participation and input in the planning and development process.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action 7: Explore opportunities for improved neighborhood notification and communication in addition to code required notification for the development review process.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Parks, Trails, and Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle PTR-1: Provide and maintain a diverse, high-quality, safe and affordable system of parks, trails and recreational facilities that provides for all ages and abilities.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTR-1.1: Parks and Recreation.</strong> Park facilities and services of the City or other service entities will provide an adequate range of recreational opportunities for its residents. Such facilities and services will be designed in a manner that responds to the needs of the intended users. City park and recreation facilities will provide a variety of park environments, amenities and recreational resources for residents and visitors.</td>
<td>Action) Review and update design standards for parks and recreation facilities.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Use Parks and Recreation Master Plan to identify community needs.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Identify a location, design, and construct a community center, preferably in the downtown area.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Explore strategies to better utilize Olathe's lakes, including improved public access, additional recreation opportunities, and better use of facilities.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTR-1.2: Parkland Acquisition Programs.</strong> Create and expand programs to acquire additional acres needed for all parks. Apply criteria to provide adequate parkland as recommended by the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.</td>
<td>Action) Research alternative funding opportunities to expand the Parks System.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Apply criteria to provide adequate parkland as recommended by the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Explore public-private partnerships for parkland acquisition.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Research alternative funding opportunities for park maintenance.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Regularly review maintenance costs as part of the annual budget process, including an inventory, service level, and maintenance standards assessment.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Research opportunities for volunteer maintenance, HOA maintenance, or other alternative maintenance techniques.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Examine design standards and physical maintenance standards when acquiring parkland to estimate typical maintenance costs and plan for funding accordingly.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTR-1.3: Park Maintenance Methods.</strong> Investigate alternative methods for maintaining all parks, and identify maintenance costs when acquiring parkland.</td>
<td>Action) Research funding opportunities for park maintenance.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Research opportunities for volunteer maintenance, HOA maintenance, or other alternative maintenance techniques.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTR-1.4: Coordination with School Districts.</strong> Work with the School Districts to coordinate the provision of both active and passive recreational opportunities.</td>
<td>Action) Continue regular meetings and partnership between the City and the School Districts to discuss opportunities where appropriate.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation / School Districts</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Consider school - park connections as part of the development review process.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTR-1.5: Green Solutions.</strong> Investigate the use of green solutions at park facilities, including construction of infrastructure and facility improvements, operations of facilities, and preservation of streamways and other hydrologic systems.</td>
<td>Action) Evaluate potential green building practices applicable to parks design, construction and maintenance, including high efficiency lighting and internet-based light management, use of native or low maintenance plants for landscaping, rain gardens, pervious pavement, and other practices.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Use greenway corridors and open space in development projects as a tool to integrate federal, state, and local requirements for floodplain setbacks, stream buffers, stormwater management, and other streamway protections.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation / Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Explore opportunities for interpretive educational sites for environmental sustainability and green solutions.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Parks, Trails, and Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle PTR-2: Provide a system of interconnected trails that connects to neighborhoods, services and adjacent regional trails.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTR-2.1 Trails Network.</strong> Continue to coordinate with other trail providers and private landowners in trail system planning, construction, management and maintenance. Where compatible with environmental protection goals and conservation easement agreements, trail connections will be developed to enhance the overall functioning of the trails network.</td>
<td>Action) Continue to cooperate with adjoining jurisdictions, Johnson County, MARC, and other regional and state agencies to plan and implement an expanded trail system providing greater connectivity throughout the region.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Continue coordination with developers and private landowners through use of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and Unified Development Ordinance in the development review process.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation / Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Consider the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, future Bicycle and Trails Plan, Transportation Plan, and Comprehensive Plan recommendations for greenway corridors and trail connections as part of the development review process.</td>
<td>Development Services / Parks and Recreation / Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Acquire ROW and/or easements as needed.</td>
<td>Development Services / Parks and Recreation / Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Coordinate land acquisition for trails with utility corridors.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation / Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTR-2.2: Corridor Acquisition.</strong> Where appropriate, the City should continue to acquire parcels of land, rights-of-way or easements to provide connections between public lands.</td>
<td>Action) Consider the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, future Bicycle and Trails Plan, Transportation Plan, and Comprehensive Plan recommendations for greenway corridors and trail connections as part of the development review process.</td>
<td>Development Services / Parks and Recreation / Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Maintain and update standards for street, sidewalk, and trail construction.</td>
<td>Public Works / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Support recreation programming for health and safety on trails, including nature hikes, organized bike rides, and other activities.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTR-2.3: Maximize Health and Safety.</strong> The City’s trail system will be designed to maximize safety and convenience for users of all ages and abilities by providing recreation, health, and fitness opportunities for all residents. Grade separation should be provided wherever feasible.</td>
<td>Action) Maintain and update standards for street, sidewalk, and trail construction.</td>
<td>Public Works / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTR-2.4: Incorporate Trails in Development.</strong> Utilize the design review process for private development and public improvements to improve bicycle and pedestrian linkages to new development during the planning and design of all projects.</td>
<td>Action) Adopt and implement a Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan as part of an overall Transportation Master Plan.</td>
<td>Public Works / Parks and Recreation / Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Use the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to identify greenway corridors.</td>
<td>Development Services / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Establish a process to identify park and trail needs during development review.</td>
<td>Development Services / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTR-2.5: Prioritize Trail Connections.</strong> Prioritize key links which, when constructed, improve connectivity for both roadway and trail systems.</td>
<td>Action) Update the Trail and Greenway Plan to coordinate with Parks and Recreation Master Plan and other regional trail and greenway plans.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTR-2.6: Connect Activity Centers with Trails.</strong> Pedestrian and bikeway paths should provide links and regional path connections between residential and employment areas, commercial centers, recreational and open space areas and educational facilities.</td>
<td>Action) Use the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to identify greenway corridor connections between activity centers.</td>
<td>Development Services / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Use a Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan in conjunction with Transportation Plans to create a comprehensive, multi-modal network that connects activity centers.</td>
<td>Public Works / Parks and Recreation / Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Update design guidelines to include pedestrian and bikeway connections between activity centers.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Key Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-1: Natural Habitat Protection</strong></td>
<td>Action Use tools within the Unified Development Ordinance and Municipal Code to protect and preserve significant natural ecological systems.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-2: Encouraging Innovation in Green Building Practices</strong></td>
<td>Action Support and maintain up-to-date building energy efficiency and planning codes.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-3: Streamway Corridors</strong></td>
<td>Action Review and update the Unified Development Ordinance to include specific requirements for maintaining streamway corridors and to provide a contract and amending to urban development.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-4: Local Conservation Techniques</strong></td>
<td>Action Continue to cooperate with adjoining jurisdictions, Johnson County, MARC, and other regional and state agencies to develop a greenway system providing greater connectivity throughout the region.</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-1.1: Natural Habitat Protection</strong></td>
<td>Action Update natural resource maps regularly to reflect new data for wildlife habitat, greenway capital projects, gifts and movement, and other natural resource information.</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-1.2: Inclusion of Natural Features into Development</strong></td>
<td>Action Incorporate natural physical features in new developments.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-1.3: Greenways</strong></td>
<td>Action Develop guidelines to encourage sustainable building practices, including the use of natural light and passive solar energy.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-1.4: Land Conservation Techniques</strong></td>
<td>Action Review and update Trail and Greenway Plan.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-2.1: Energy Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Action Work with the Building Codes Assistance Project (BCAP), funded by the US DOE to update City codes to include energy efficiency standards for all new construction and to retrofit City buildings, or adopt energy efficiency codes, such as the National Green Building Standard (ICCS)’s National Green Building Standard.</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-2.2: Natural Lighting</strong></td>
<td>Action Continue the Facility Conservation Improvement Program for energy conservation and other improvements in City facilities.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-1.5: Sustainable Building Materials</strong></td>
<td>Action Amend the Unified Development Ordinance to include a Cluster Subdivision option for properties within Conservation/Cluster Neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-3.1: Streamway Corridors</strong></td>
<td>Action Research, and apply for funding for the acquisition of greenways, such as within available financial means, support the preservation and reclamation of these streamway corridors for natural ecosystems, trails, to improve air quality and wildlife habitat, and to provide a contract and amending to urban development.</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-3.2: Streamway Corridors</strong></td>
<td>Action Continue to cooperate with adjoining jurisdictions, Johnson County, MARC, and other regional and state agencies to develop a greenway system providing greater connectivity throughout the region.</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-4.1: Local Conservation Techniques</strong></td>
<td>Action Continue to cooperate with adjoining jurisdictions, Johnson County, MARC, and other regional and state agencies to develop a greenway system providing greater connectivity throughout the region.</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-4.2: Local Conservation Techniques</strong></td>
<td>Action Continue to cooperate with adjoining jurisdictions, Johnson County, MARC, and other regional and state agencies to develop a greenway system providing greater connectivity throughout the region.</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lead Department or Agency**

- Development Services / Parks and Recreation
- Development Services / Public Works
- Development Services / Municipal Services

**Priority**

- Ongoing
- Immediate
- Medium Term
## Environmental Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESR-2.3: Landscape Design</td>
<td>Develop guidelines for landscape design treatments that will reduce water use and promote solar access.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR-2.4: Alternative Energy</td>
<td>Develop guidelines for alternative energies, including solar, wind, and others.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR-2.5: Recycled Materials</td>
<td>Develop guidelines for using recycled materials in municipal operations.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle ESR-3: Minimize the Disposal of Solid Waste to Preserve Landfill Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR-3.1: Solid Waste Reduction</td>
<td>Work with governmental, private and not-for-profit agencies to develop regional approaches to solid waste reduction and management.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR-3.2: City Waste Reduction</td>
<td>Explore private partnerships to expand Olathe Transfer Station to include a Material Recovery Facility (MRF).</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR-3.3: Waste Reduction Education</td>
<td>Develop and implement public education programs to promote the value, methods and techniques of recycling, resource recovery and waste reduction.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR-3.4: Recycling Programs</td>
<td>Continue to promote and expand curbside recycling programs.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Key Action</td>
<td>Lead Department or Agency</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-4.1: Sustainable Stormwater Management.</strong> Reduce stormwater runoff velocity and improve water quality with sustainable infrastructure techniques that use soils and vegetation to capture, cleanse, and re-use stormwater runoff.</td>
<td>Action) Continue to enforce stream corridor setbacks for new development.</td>
<td>Public Works / Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Continue to require on or off site detention for all new development.</td>
<td>Public Works / Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Continue to require best management practices for water quality with all new development.</td>
<td>Public Works / Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-4.2: Stormwater Financing.</strong> Provide an equitable system of financing for stormwater improvements that is based on relative contributions to stormwater runoff.</td>
<td>Action) Continue to collect stormwater funds through a stormwater utility where fees are based upon the runoff created by a development, as measured by the size of the site and impervious surface.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-4.3: Stormwater Education.</strong> Educate and involve the public in stormwater management.</td>
<td>Action) Educate the public through the use of the City of Olathe’s website, targeted mailings, and by working with partner organizations to provide learning opportunities.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-4.4: Drainage Basin Approach to Stormwater Planning.</strong> Continue to evaluate impacts to upstream and downstream systems with stormwater improvement projects.</td>
<td>Action) Conduct studies for potential stormwater projects that determine the impact to a stream both upstream and downstream of a project’s location.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESR-4.5: Discharge Control Methods.</strong> Apply discharge control methods that control both peak rates and volume of runoff in an economically, aesthetically, and environmentally acceptable manner.</td>
<td>Action) Continue to require on or off site detention basins for all development in order to control frequent stream damaging storm events. Require additional detention for larger storm events when downstream properties will be at risk from development.</td>
<td>Public Works / Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mobility

### Principle M-1: Provide an efficient, safe, and cost effective roadway network that will meet the City’s mobility needs in a manner compatible with fiscal and environmental constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-1.1: Strategic Roadway Investments.</td>
<td>Continue to strategically invest in roadway and signal timing improvements.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritize capital expenditures for roadway improvements based upon the greatest beneficial impact on facility Levels of Service for the dollar invested, and in accordance with the recommendations of the Transportation Master Plan.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-1.2: Alternatives to Road Expansion.</td>
<td>Before constructing additional lanes on arterial roadways, explore alternative techniques or modes of travel that would serve the existing and future demand or result in travel demand reduction.</td>
<td>Public Works / Parks and Recreation / Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt and implement a comprehensive Bike and Trails Plan as part of an overall Transportation Master Plan.</td>
<td>Public Works / Parks and Recreation / Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate facilities for transit on existing roadways.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Johnson County Transit to examine the viability of transit on specific routes.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote the viability of transit alternatives by encouraging high density land uses near transit routes, in accordance with recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate recommendations of the Transportation Master Plan in the development review process.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that the road network supports the transportation needs and intended trips of local uses.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore opportunities for sidewalk and trail connections between disconnected street systems.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement the Transportation Master Plan, which defines the proper network for regional and local trips.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that the road network supports the transportation needs and intended trips of local uses.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore opportunities for sidewalk and trail connections between disconnected street systems.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to implement neighborhood traffic safety program measures including traffic calming procedures.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action)</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Lead Department or Agency</td>
<td>Key Action</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-1.7: Mitigate Roadway Impacts</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Action: Review MARC’s Clean Air Action Plan for opportunities to implement best practices to improve air quality.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-1.8: Truck Routes</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Action: Continue to cooperate with MARC and DOT on environmental assessments for corridor studies and major transportation projects.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-1.9: Railroad Interface</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Action: Participate in local review of hazardous materials legislation, routing standards, and proposed routes.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle M-2: Purposefully Integrate Transportation and Land Use Decisions to be Mutually Supportive</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>M-2.1: Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-2.2: Transportation and Land Use Compatibility</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Action: Coordinate the update to the Transportation Master Plan with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-2.3: Regional Transportation Impacts Assessed</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Action: Encourage joint transportation studies where appropriate.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-2.4: Transportation Improvements with Development</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Action: Continue to review right-of-way dedication and transportation improvements as part of the development review process.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-2.5: Transportation Corridors and Transit Nodes</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Action: Continue to identify the best locations for futuretransit connections and transit-oriented development opportunities.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Key Action</td>
<td>Lead Department or Agency</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Principle M-3: Provide a transportation system that integrates multiple modes of travel.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Review and update design guidelines and Unified Development Ordinance requirements to incorporate economically reasonable design features to accommodate multimodal transportation.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Consider reductions of off-street parking requirements for proximity to transit stations, provision of bike racks, dedication of easements for planned bus stops, and publicizing parking for transit.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Consider the provision of bicycle access, pedestrian access, and public transit service to residential and other public facilities in the development review process.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Explore alternatives to off-street parking, including shared or consolidated parking solutions that have been successfully implemented in other localities.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Review multi-family housing and large retail projects to evaluate the potential for significant changes in off-street parking requirements for the projects.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M-3.1: Alternative Modes.</strong> Consider and accommodate alternative modes of transportation including public transportation, bicycling and pedestrian access during the planning and development review process.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Review roadway design templates to include multi-modal transportation requirements.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Continue to support the Olathe Transit System in order to encourage the development of transit-friendly land uses.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Review and update design guidelines and Unified Development Ordinance requirements to incorporate economically reasonable design features to accommodate multi-modal transportation.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Continue to support the Olathe Transit System in order to encourage the development of transit-friendly land uses.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M-3.2: Balance Between Modes.</strong> Street systems should seek to balance auto, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle movements in a manner that effectively and efficiently serves the needs of citizens.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Coordinate local and regional transportation proposals with the plan.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Coordinate local and regional transportation proposals with the plan.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M-3.3: Expanded Transit System.</strong> Continue to work with Johnson County Transit to expand the existing bus transit network to provide efficient, congruent, and cost-effective transit service.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Collaborate with Johnson County Transit to improve bus transit service.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Identify new transit facilities as part of the Capital Improvement Program.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M-3.4: Increase Transit Amenities.</strong> Work with Johnson County Transit to incorporate rider amenities such as bus shelters, lighting, security, and bicycle/pedestrian access into station area designs for all regional transit corridors.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Collaborate with Johnson County Transit to improve bus transit service.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Develop a bicycle plan that integrates bicycle facilities within the Olathe Comprehensive Plan and incorporates bicycle facilities into the Olathe Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M-3.5: Regional Transit.</strong> Work with Johnson County Transit to incorporate designated bicycle lanes, laid shoulders, and other bicycle facilities within the Olathe Comprehensive Plan and implement the bicycle plan as part of the Olathe Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Review the current bicycle plan and update as needed.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Coordinate with the MARC Transportation Outlook 2040 Plan, Smart Moves Kansas City Metropolitan Area Transit vision, and the Johnson County Five Year Plan.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Coordinate and participate in regional meetings pertaining to transportation.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M-3.6: Bicycle Facilities.</strong> Incorporate designated bicycle lanes, laid shoulders, or other bicycle facilities within the Olathe Comprehensive Plan and implement the bicycle plan within the Olathe Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Identify locations for bicycle facilities within the Olathe Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Develop a bicycle plan that integrates bicycle facilities within the Olathe Comprehensive Plan and incorporates bicycle facilities into the Olathe Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M-3.7: Bicycle Planning.</strong> Incorporate bicycle planning as a part of the Olathe Comprehensive Plan, and in coordination with the Johnson County Bike Plan.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-3.8: Pedestrian Paths and Bikeways.</strong> Pedestrian and bikeway paths should provide connections between residential and employment areas, commercial centers, recreational and open space areas, parks and educational facilities. Grade separation should be provided in key areas when feasible to provide safe connections.</td>
<td>Action) As new developments come forward, work with adopted regional trail plans to optimize regional connectivity and trail design.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Develop standards for wayfinding signage especially related to regional trails.</td>
<td>Public Works / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Investigate opportunities to retrofit bike and trail connections in existing developed areas.</td>
<td>Public Works / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Review regional trail connections as part of the development review process.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation / Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Identify locations where sidewalk connections are lacking and apply for &quot;Safe Routes to School&quot; and other grant funding for high priority connection gaps.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Investigate opportunities to retrofit bike and trail connections in existing developed areas.</td>
<td>Public Works / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Review regional trail connections as part of the development review process.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation / Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Identify locations where sidewalk connections are lacking and apply for &quot;Safe Routes to School&quot; and other grant funding for high priority connection gaps.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Provide highly visible, safe, pedestrian and trail crossings.</td>
<td>Public Works / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-3.9: Pedestrian Environment.</strong> Provide appealing and comfortable pedestrian street environments in order to promote pedestrian activity.</td>
<td>Action) Include attractive, standardized street lighting and furnishings.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Apply the recommendations of the Streetscape Plan to ensure appropriate streetscape treatment for various street sizes and types.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cultural Resources and Landmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-1.1: Art Partnerships, Promotion, and Education.</strong> Promote the development and expansion of cultural facilities, including performing arts and art exhibition facilities, museums and community centers. Continue to foster partnerships with arts organizations and encourage arts education throughout the community.</td>
<td>Action) Coordinate art programs with the City, school districts, and other public and private organizations.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Explore opportunities for partnership with the Arts Council of Johnson County.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Support events like the Hidden Glen Arts Festival and other community showcases.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-1.2: Public Art.</strong> Support public art that invites interaction and reflects community spirit, history and culture, and support the provision of art in public buildings and spaces.</td>
<td>Action) Support the City’s Public Art &amp; Culture Commission Advisory Board. Explore ideas and opportunities to increase visibility and fundraising throughout the community.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Continue to support and promote public art displays and exhibits like the City’s Downtown Outdoor Sculpture Exhibit and other similar showcases.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Continue to support and explore opportunities for art in our parks, similar to projects incorporated at Lone Elm Park and at the Mahaffie Heritage Center.</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-1.3: Libraries.</strong> Library facilities and services of the City of Olathe will be responsive to the needs of all populations, providing an adequate range of informational, educational and intellectual opportunities for all residents.</td>
<td>Action) Implement Library Master Plan.</td>
<td>Olathe Public Library</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-1.4: Cultural Expression.</strong> Promote opportunities for cultural expression and raise awareness of diversity in the community.</td>
<td>Action) Continue to support the City’s Human Relations Commission as they work to foster understanding and cooperation among the diverse groups that make up our community.</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Work through the Persons with Disability Advisory Board to empower, provide support and promote an accessible community for Olathe citizens through awareness, advocacy and education.</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Work through the Diversity Committee to facilitate and distribute information regarding the various cultures that make up our community. Continue to raise awareness, build understanding and provide avenues and opportunities for dialogue to help unite and foster a sense of community.</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Continue to support and partner with the Kansas School for the Deaf and Deaf Cultural Center.</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cultural Resources and Landmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle CRL-2: Support historic preservation efforts throughout the city.</strong></td>
<td>Action) Consider recommendations from the Preservation Board regarding historic resources, local architecture, cultural heritage, and city-wide historic preservation plan.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-2.1: Preservation Board.</strong></td>
<td>Engage input from the Olathe Historic Preservation Board.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-2.2: Preservation Plan.</strong></td>
<td>Work to develop a preservation plan for Olathe.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-2.3: Historic Resource Identification.</strong></td>
<td>Identify and protect buildings, districts, and sites of historical, architectural, archaeological, or cultural significance. Encourage a survey of local historic resources on a local, state, or federal level and incorporate results and recommendations of a historic resources survey into a preservation plan for the City.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-2.4: Local Historic Register.</strong></td>
<td>Consider the establishment of a local historic register, or other local historic designation for local historic sites and landmarks.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-2.5: Preservation Incentives.</strong></td>
<td>Utilize available incentives to encourage preservation of historic resources including state and federal historic tax credits, and Neighborhood Revitalization Act tax rebates.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-2.6: Education and Interpretation.</strong></td>
<td>Continue and expand historic preservation education and outreach with the public through educational and interpretive sites and programs, and through coordination and cooperation with preservation groups.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle CRL-3: Ensure that urban design standards and guidelines will promote community identity, sustainability, and civic pride.</strong></td>
<td>Action) Through the Preservation Board, conduct an Environs Review for all permits and projects located within a 500 foot radius of any property listed on the state or National Park Service lists.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-3.1: New Construction.</strong></td>
<td>Consider the designation of a local historic district.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-3.2: Development Review.</strong></td>
<td>Incorporate landmark and cultural resource preservation standards into the City’s development review process.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRL-3.3: New Construction.</strong></td>
<td>Consider the development of a local historic preservation ordinance.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Chapter 6: Implementation**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Lead Department or Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle CF-1:</strong> In order to protect and use past investments in capital improvements, new development and redevelopment will be located in areas where adequate public services and facilities presently exist or are planned to be provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CF-1.1: Capital Improvement Program.</strong> The City’s Capital Improvement Program is a major program for funding an adequate range of urban services and facilities as the City continues to grow. The Capital Improvements Program, within the framework of a responsible budget of balanced revenues and expenditures, schedules the necessary capital projects to ensure maintenance of an adequate range of urban services within the City and to provide urban facilities and services to outlying areas on a phased and orderly basis over the planning period. The Capital Improvement Program is a tool to direct the location and timing of growth by coordinating and targeting public capital expenditures. The Capital Improvement Program should reflect the Service Master Plans.</td>
<td>Action) Ensure master plans, CIP and the Comprehensive Plans are coordinated to guide growth.</td>
<td>Development Services / Public Works / Municipal Services / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CF-1.2: Fiscal Responsibility for Improvements.</strong> Since the public costs of developing several areas concurrently could prove excessive, the City will limit said costs to those which can reasonably be accommodated within the Capital Improvements Program and are compatible with anticipated revenues.</td>
<td>Action) Use the buildout model as one tool to evaluate service costs, infrastructure investments, and other fiscal impacts of development in different areas of the City.</td>
<td>Development Services / Resource Management</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CF-1.3: Adequate Public Facilities.</strong> When permitting additional development or redevelopment, the City will consider whether public facilities and services are adequate to reasonably maintain current levels of service or service standards given the impacts of such additional development, or whether committed funding sources for such adequate facilities are sufficient to ensure their provision in a timely fashion.</td>
<td>Action) Develop a set of criteria to evaluate community benefit with annexation requests.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CF-2.1: Service Master Plans.</strong> Develop and utilize long range plans for determining infrastructure requirements to meet the demand of planned growth.</td>
<td>Action) Share CIP Plans with other utilities, such as Atmos, JCW, KCP&amp;L, SBC, Time Warner, WaterOne and Westar, for coordination.</td>
<td>Municipal Services / Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CF-2.2: Excise Taxes and Impact Fees.</strong> Periodically review excise taxes, impact fees, and system development fees on new development based on a standard formula requiring development to pay its calculated share of new public facilities and infrastructure.</td>
<td>Action) Continue the annual fee and tax impact review.</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CF-2.3: Service Provider Coordination.</strong> Coordinate with other service providers on development requests to ensure that necessary services not provided by the City are made available for planned new development and redevelopment.</td>
<td>Action) Continue to provide applicants with information and contacts for non-City service providers where appropriate.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CF-2.4: Service-Supportive Community Plans.</strong> Development patterns should be planned with the consideration of the alignment and location of existing and future public facilities and infrastructure.</td>
<td>Action) Use the buildout model as one tool to evaluate service costs, infrastructure investments, and other fiscal impacts of development in different areas of the City.</td>
<td>Development Services / Resource Management</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Ensure master plans, CIP and the Comprehensive Plans are coordinated to guide growth.</td>
<td>Development Services / Public Works / Municipal Services / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Key Action</td>
<td>Lead Department or Agency</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CF-2.5: Underground Power Lines</td>
<td>Encourage the undergrounding of overhead distribution lines and associated infrastructure with future development and redevelopment, and in appropriate public infrastructure projects. Action) Review the underground utility ordinance for the potential of reducing exemptions. Action) Explore funding sources for relocating utility lines underground. Action) Explore opportunities for additional cooperation or partnership with utilities for the purpose of relocating utility lines underground.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CF-2.6: Developer Responsibilities</td>
<td>All new developments should dedicate to the City required rights-of-way and easements, and install designated public improvements per approved design standards. Action) Continue to apply Unified Development Ordinance requirements for dedications and public improvements.</td>
<td>Public Works / Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle CF-3: Promote the health and safety of the community.</td>
<td>Policy CF-3.1: Adequate Police Force. Remain committed to maintaining the police force level of service to ensure the safety of the community. Action) Provide resources to the police department that enable it to serve, protect and work with the community in a professional manner to prevent, reduce, and solve crime.</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CF-3.2: Fire Protection</td>
<td>Continue to support fire protection services to ensure preservation of life and property. Support and maintain a building and fire code that ensures the safety of buildings and their occupants. Action) Support and maintain up-to-date building and fire codes. Review standard code language for compatibility with local policies and objectives.</td>
<td>Fire Department / Development Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Key Action</td>
<td>Lead Department or Agency</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle US-1: Provide adequate water, sewer and related utility services to meet the demand of existing and future residents and commercial and industrial growth through a combination of developer-funded infrastructure improvements for new growth and capital investments by the City in major treatment and transmission facilities.</strong></td>
<td>Action) Utility extensions should follow the Service Master Plans which have been coordinated with the Comprehensive Plan to ensure that adequate public facilities are available or can be installed in a timely and cost effective manner as development occurs.&lt;br&gt;US-1.1: Utility Extensions Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The installation and extension of all utilities will be consistent with the provisions of the Comprehensive Plan and with the responsibilities of the respective utility providers.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Review System Development Fees annually with the rate model to ensure that these fees are adequate.&lt;br&gt;US-1.2: System Development Fees. Systems Development Fees should ensure that new development pays for a proportionate share for growth of the water and sewer systems.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Meet or exceed all federal and state regulations for finished water quality for water and wastewater.&lt;br&gt;US-1.3: Water Quality. The City's water quality standards, and water and wastewater treatment practices should continue to maintain a high level of health protection for its residents.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Follow the MS4 permit for stormwater, including NPDES Phase II.&lt;br&gt;US-1.4: Adequacy of Service. Ensure that storm drainage, water and wastewater systems are adequate to meet the demands of existing and planned development per the Service Master Plans.</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Authorize user charges in line with the annual Rate Model to ensure charges are adequate for operations and capital investments.&lt;br&gt;US-1.5: Utility Models. Use water and sewer models to determine demands on existing infrastructure systems and to evaluate new developments.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Continue to devote a portion of utility service charges to refine, update, finance, and implement utility asset management plans.&lt;br&gt;US-1.6: Improvement and Maintenance. Continue to expand efforts to maintain and improve the infrastructure in the City of Olathe.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Use the Comprehensive Plan in alignment with Service Master Plans to guide development and ensure that adequate public facilities are available or can be installed by the developer in a timely and cost effective manner as development occurs.</td>
<td>Development Services / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Approve development only in areas where adequate public facilities are readily available.&lt;br&gt;US-1.7: Adequate Public Facilities. Periodically review the adequate public facilities section of the Unified Development Ordinance to ensure utilities are available or can be made available in a timely and cost effective manner as development occurs.</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle US-2: Collaborate with adjacent cities, special service districts, various Federal, State, and County agencies, and appropriate service providers to provide coordinated and sustainable development of the community.</strong></td>
<td>Action) Update and maintain agreements with WaterOne, Johnson County Wastewater, and other wholesale utility customers.&lt;br&gt;US-2.1: Utility Provider Agreements. Maintain agreements with utility providers.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Periodically update Utility Service Master Plans.&lt;br&gt;US-2.2: Capital Improvement Program. Use the Service Master Plans and Capital Improvement Program process as a means of guiding development in the City of Olathe.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Avoid unnecessary use of sewer lift stations where a gravity sewer option is reasonably available.&lt;br&gt;US-2.3: Utility Provision to Implement Community Goals. Consider the importance of the other objectives of the Comprehensive Plan in the planning and operation of the water, wastewater, stormwater and flood management utilities. These other objectives include in-stream flow maintenance, enhanced recreational opportunities, water quality management, preservation of natural ecosystems, and implementation of desired timing and location of growth patterns.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Minimize clearcutting of temporary and permanent easements.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Sanitary sewer easements along the creeks should be coordinated with the &quot;Corridor Acquisitions&quot; discussed in PTR-2.2 and with Greenways discussed in ESR-1.3.&lt;br&gt;</td>
<td>Municipal Services / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Encourage common use of utility easements when practical.&lt;br&gt;</td>
<td>Municipal Services / Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Establish multiuse stream/utility/recreation corridors.&lt;br&gt;</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation / Municipal Services</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action) Monitor Erosion and Sediment Control during utility installations.</td>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 7.
Reference

INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes background materials including supplementary maps, summaries of adopted plans, and technical documents used to inform the recommendations of the Plan.

Prior to the development of PlanOlathe, an inventory of more than two dozen existing plans was completed which were in place or adopted since 1986. A brief summary was prepared of each document for incorporation into this chapter.

Alongside these existing plans are two technical studies which were conducted during the creation of PlanOlathe and helped provide the underpinnings for the Plan’s conclusions: 1) Land Demand Forecast; and 2) Buildout Analysis.

The listing here of a plan or supporting document does not necessarily mean that the City of Olathe ascribes to all provisions or conclusions of such Plans or studies. However, these past plans and studies provide useful analysis that has been consulted for their relevance.
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**AREA AND CORRIDOR PLANS**

**THE LONE ELM VICINITY PLAN**

**Status**

The original Lone Elm Vicinity Plan (1997) was prepared when the area was still a part of unincorporated Johnson County. The Plan was subsequently updated and approved by the Planning Commission in 2007.

**Purpose**

The purpose of the Plan is to outline the range of infrastructure improvements and expansions of service necessary to meet the community’s long term needs as it transitions from rural to suburban and urban uses. It evaluates social, economic and physical conditions to project the likeliest growth patterns for a phased approach to infrastructure and expansion implementation.

**Key Conclusions**

- Encourage moderate intensity uses to provide transportation access as well as a buffer between employment areas and residences;

- Designate employment and business park uses in the area surrounding the I-35/159th Street Interchange, the area along the BNSF Railroad, and corridors between major highways (K-7 to I-35, and K-7 to U.S. Highway 169);

- Designate Commercial Center uses where two major highways, K-7 and U.S. Highway 169 intersect a major arterial at 175th Street;

- Designate Mixed use residential areas along 175th Street which is planned as a major arterial with considerable commercial development, and between the proposed realignment of K-7 and US Highway 169, south of 175th Street;

- Designate low-density residential areas in the southwestern portion of the plan where areas of moderate slope are less ideal for employment and business park developments than the flatter areas north of 175th Street;

- Add 2 fire stations; one just to the north of the Lone Elm Vicinity along either 159th Street or Old 56 Highway, and one south of 175th Street;

- Create two potential interchange locations along 167th Street, at I-35 and K-7;
• Provide grade separations between rail lines and streets for east-west arterials (167th, 175th, and 183rd Streets) where local street access will not be prohibitively impacted;

• Provide neighborhood residential areas with public open space such as a park, square, plaza, green, or sites for civic buildings;

• Create a comprehensive greenway and trail system that links parks, open space, community facilities, residential areas and employment centers;

• Designate parks and open space primarily along streams, floodplains, and other land where development is inappropriate;

• Utilize open space as a tool to buffer residential uses from potential negative impacts of non-residential uses and the railroad.

**Coffee Creek Master Plan**

**Status**

The Coffee Creek Master Plan was adopted by the Planning Commission in 2005.

**Purpose**

The Coffee Creek Master Plan provides a framework for future development decisions and serves as a guide for the Coffee Creek Plan Area. It identifies infrastructure improvements, delineates development locations, outlines types of uses and recommends development parameters to ensure the unincorporated area acquiring levels of service that meets municipal standards prior to annexation.

**Key Conclusions**

**Vision**

• Locate Transitional Residential areas (characterized by large residential lots from 2-10 acres) south of 175th Street;

• Locate Neighborhood Residential (70% are single-family detached with 2-4 dwelling units per acre) north of 175th Street;

• Extend 167th Street to Lackman/Black Bob to provide east-west access through Coffee Creek; ensure the street alignment meanders slightly north and south to preserve tree stands and add visual interest; 167th will be at least one-half of a divided arterial;

• Provide an interconnected local road network;

• Provide roundabouts at major arterial roads;
• Provide access to trails and open space within every residential neighborhood development thereby creating pedestrian connections with surrounding residential and commercial developments;

• Locate Mixed Use Retail developments at major arterial intersections;

• Mixed Density Residential should be located along 175th Street between major arterial intersections;

• Limit Retail/Business Park uses to areas adjacent to major arterials such as 175th Street and Ridgeview Road;

• Establish Village Retail uses as a neighborhood mixed use node at the intersection of Renner Road and 167th Street;

• Provide at least three seven to eight-acre neighborhood parks with an interconnected trail system along Coffee Creek;

• Locate the potential elementary school (minimum 10 acres) adjacent to potential middle school (minimum 15 acres);

• Provide a comprehensive greenway and trail system that links parks, open space, community facilities, residential areas and employment centers; and

• Preserve and enhance the quality of natural areas, open space and greenways/trails.

**Woodland Road Corridor Plan**

**Status**

The original Woodland Road Corridor Study was prepared in 1996, when almost the entire corridor was part of the unincorporated County. The corridor was annexed in 1999 and the latest Woodland Road Corridor Plan adopted in 2004.

**Purpose**

The Plan builds on the previous plan’s intent of providing mixed residential densities, safe streets for vehicles and pedestrians, and prohibiting commercial development west of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Rail lines, while addresses issues related to new development in and adjoining the corridor.

**Key Conclusions**

• Provide a mixture of residential densities within the corridor;

• Create a safe environment for vehicular and pedestrian traffic;
• Prohibit commercial development west of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Rail lines;
• Expand sanitary sewers throughout the area;
• Improve Woodland Road through a phased improvement process;
• Integrate new residential development with existing development;
• Develop a community park;
• Preserve tree groves on all undeveloped land;
• Allow R-3 use on the east side of Woodland Road and the 80 acre parcel north of Olathe Northwest High School;
• Strengthen landscaping adjoining the BNSF railroad and apply a minimum setback of 50-100 feet.

K-7 Corridor Study and Design Guidelines

Status
The K-7 Corridor Study and Design Guidelines were originally approved in 1997 and subsequently revised in 2002.

Purpose
The 1997 Olathe Comprehensive Plan Foundations for the Future recommended sixteen corridor studies in the short and mid-term. The K-7 Highway study was one of eleven corridors recommended for study in the short term, and was the largest and most undeveloped major business development corridor designated for further study. The study analyzed the current and anticipated ecological impact, and socio-economic and infrastructure needs of College Boulevard between K-7 Highway and Clare Road. Key elements of the plan included recommended future land uses, recommended road system improvements and design guidelines for the corridor.

Key Conclusions
• Develop a street system which balances the conflicting issues of access to adjoining properties and through traffic movement;
• Create a grade separation along Cedar Creek tributary to accommodate the Olathe Parks and Recreation Strategic Master Plan’s vision of making this corridor a future pedestrian trail system;
• Provide additional east-west access points as to not isolate the west side of the study area;
• Utilize Residential 12 land use units as a buffer between non-residential land uses or high volume roadways and Low Density Residential land uses;

• Utilize Residential 7 land use category to provide for a mixture of housing products or to buffer lower density land uses from non-residential uses;

• Utilize Low Residential land use for land that is too rolling to develop for employment and commercial uses or has significant topographic features and natural vegetation worthy of preservation;

• Prevent shallow commercial strips along College Boulevard and 119th Street;

• Ensure Commercial/Local land use that serves surrounding neighborhoods be connected to the areas it serves through building design, use and transportation linkages for vehicles and pedestrians;

• Ensure regional shopping areas adjoin a minimum of two arterial streets and be within close proximity to existing or planned residential areas;

• Research/development/flex district (light manufacturing, product assembly, research or storage) should increase office uses further west from K-7 Highway to serve as a transition to the Cedar Creek office development;

• Continue the 1997 K-7 Corridor Study ban on distribution centers or other warehousing operations requiring large numbers of trucks, except for the area north of College Boulevard and between K-7 Highway and the eastern half section line;

• Encourage small scale office buildings through multi-story buildings with multi-leveled parking structures along arterials running parallel to K-7;

• Locate public/semi-public uses near local commercial centers, possibly on the ridgeline between 119th and 127th street, west of K-7 Highway;

• Pursue additional arterial interchanges at K-10 Highway and Clare Road and an interchange or overpass at K-10 Highway and Lone Elm Road;

• Immediately identify what improvements are possible and prepare preliminary designs for these structures to reserve and purchase necessary right-of-ways;

• Provide signalization at 127th Street/ K-7 Highway intersection;

• Provide additional arterials at Clare Road north of College Boulevard and Clare Road between 119th Street and 127th;

• Move the intersection of Hedge Lane and 119th Street to the west;
• Move the Monticello Terrace/ College Boulevard intersection east of the K-7 Highway northbound ramps;

• Continue proposed trail system along Cedar Creek through employment portions using easements and greenways;

• Encourage public or recreational use along the ridgeline between the corner of 127th Street and Hedge Lane and the corner of 119th Street and Clare Road as the hilltop would benefit views afforded by high position;

• Acknowledge the constraints of rugged terrain and the Little Cedar Creek between College Boulevard and 119th Street, which make connections between these two roads highly unlikely, as the City has no plans to build or require developers to make such connections;

• Locate Local/Commercial land use along major intersections east of Clare Road;

• Maintain the view sheds along the ridgeline between 119th and 127th Streets west of K-7 Highway, the southward views from the intersection of College Boulevard and K-7, and from the hill at the Cedar Creek School;

• Provide the ability to cross K-7 by foot and bicycle.

**North Ridgeview Road Corridor Guidelines**

**Status**

The North Ridgeview Road Corridor Guidelines were approved in 2001.

**Purpose**

The purpose of the North Ridgeview Road Corridor Guidelines is to assure land use, development patterns and designs along the corridor are attractive and functional. Individual developers are encouraged to expand upon these guidelines to attain a level of development quality that will ultimately generate an economically enhanced and pedestrian friendly area.

**Key Conclusions**

Due to topography, the interchange at North Ridgeview Road and K-150 is much more visible to highway traffic than any of Olathe’s other interchanges. Consequently, the intersection is viewed as a major gateway into Olathe.
159th Street Corridor Study

Status
The 159th Street Corridor Study was approved in 1995.

Purpose
This study led the City of Olathe to construct a new folded, or half diamond interchange at 159th Street/Lone Elm Road and I-35 to provide better access and relieve traffic congestion in this rapidly developing area.

151st Street Corridor Study

Status
The 151st Street Corridor Study was approved 1986.

Purpose
The 151st Street Corridor Study recommends overpasses at 167th Street and 151st Street and is looking at adding interchanges at 167th Street and 151st.
ORIGINAL TOWN AND NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS

SANTA FE STREETSCAPE PLAN

Status
The Santa Fe Streetscape Plan was approved in 2005.

Purpose
An integral component of the Envision Olathe Downtown Master Plan, the Santa Fe Streetscape Plan is the first phase of the Streetscape Master Plan and Downtown Design Guidelines that recommends various improvements to enhance the image of Santa Fe Avenue from Kansas City Road to Kansas Avenue. The plan develops a phased approach for landscape improvements, gateways and pedestrian-oriented enhancements such as curb extensions at intersections, street furniture and pedestrian lighting.

Key Conclusions
• Establish an authentic and consistent street character to enhance the perception of downtown;
• Build upon the existing downtown character to create a unique place and enhance downtown identity;
• Create a pedestrian oriented environment that is safe, visually pleasing, accessible and comfortable;
• Strengthen downtown’s connections both visually and functionally;
• Respect and preserve adjacent residential neighborhoods;
• Encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation to get to and from the downtown area.

ORIGINAL TOWN ENHANCEMENT PLAN

Status
The Original Town Enhancement Plan was approved in 2004.

Purpose
The Original Town Enhancement Plan identifies revitalization programs and partnerships for the six neighborhoods in the Original Town area.
through 2009. This plan builds on the 1996 Original Town Enhancement Plan that provided the foundation for Olathe’s current neighborhood planning programs. The Original Town Enhancement Plan is intended to supplement, not supersede, the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

**Key Conclusions**

**Vision**

- Improve the appearance of Original Town Neighborhoods through organized neighborhood clean-ups;
- Revise the architectural review process;
- Enact Neighborhood Revitalization Program that allows municipalities to provide property tax rebates as an incentive for residents to invest in their property;
- Develop a program to promote historic preservation and the historic resources in Olathe;
- Install signage recognizing the Original Town and its neighborhoods;
- Develop a voluntary downzoning program to prevent conversion of single-family homes to commercial or multi-family uses;
- Establish neighborhood plans in each Original Town neighborhood by 2009.

**Neighborhood Revitalization Area Plan**

**Status**

The Neighborhood Revitalization Area Plan was approved by City Council in 2004.

**Purpose**

The Neighborhood Revitalization Plan is based upon a state law that allows municipalities to develop a property tax rebate program to encourage rehabilitation and development in aging and deteriorating areas. The rebate reimburses all or a portion of the increased property tax incurred by an improvement made to a property.

**Key Conclusions**

The Neighborhood Revitalization Plan for Olathe is open to both commercial and residential property within the Original Town area. Eligible improvements must result in an increase in the assessed value of 5% for residential and 10% for commercial properties. The proposed
rebates are 90% of the tax increment for residential property and 80% of the tax increment for commercial property.

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Status**

The Historic Preservation Management Recommendations were approved by City Council in 2004.

**Purpose**

The Historic Preservation Management Recommendations review the status of the historic resource survey and designation in Original Town as well as provide a strategy for the future preservation of the area’s historic resources. The findings include recommendations for future survey efforts, identification of individual buildings and groups of buildings that may be potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or in the Register of Historic Kansas Places, and provides strategies and tools for preserving the historic built environment.

**Key Conclusions**

- Identifies the following as Potential Historic Districts:
  - West Original Town Historic District: Encompasses a nine-block area south and west of downtown, west of the railroad tracks and south of Santa Fe Avenue;
  - Southeast Original Town Historic District: Encompasses a twelve-block area south of downtown, east of Kansas Avenue, north of Southgate Street, and east of Harrison;
  - East Cedar Street Historic District: Includes twelve residential properties adjacent to and immediately west of Hycrest;
  - East Loula Street Historic District: Includes twenty-six dwellings and one church constructed on lots facing East Loula Street;
  - Navy Hill Historic District: Includes twenty-five duplexes constructed in 1942-1943 as housing for the Olathe Naval Air Station;
  - North Cherry-West Poplar Streets Historic District: Includes a dense node of sixteen early twentieth century properties constructed just north of the central business district;
  - Cherry Street Commercial District: Encompasses three buildings on the east side of South Cherry Street at the intersection of Park Street;
○ Kansas School for the Deaf Campus:
○ Olathe Memorial Cemetery: Located southwest corner of Harold Street and South Woodland Road.

• Forge a consensus in the community regarding preservation;
• Develop goals, policies and initiatives to assist the City in the future identification, interpretation, evaluation and protection of remaining cultural resources;
• Encourage the City to develop a clear public policy that promotes historic preservation and provides a level of certainty and stability that is necessary to attract investment;
• Encourage the City to nominate Olathe’s historically and architecturally significant properties to the National Register of Historic Places;
• Encourage City to monitor post-World War II development because many of these properties may become eligible for register listing;
• Update survey to reflect properties that have become recently eligible;
• Establish a local historic register;
• Encourage nominations to the National Register Multiple Property Submission; and
• Establish conservation districts for several areas.

**ENVISION OLATHE DOWNTOWN PLAN**

**Status**
The Envision Olathe Downtown Plan was approved in 2003.

**Purpose**
The goal of this master plan is to provide recommendations to help revitalize the economic and physical conditions of downtown Olathe. The plan recommends building on existing neighborhood and business strengths, and providing improvements that enable interaction between government and office uses. The recommendations also identify the market opportunities for additional retail, office, civic and residential uses, and the type of physical and public policy improvements necessary to attract desired development.

**Key Conclusions**
• Ensure downtown embraces its role as the County seat and is rejuvenated as a diverse mixed-use center consisting of a rich blend
of government and professional services, support businesses, niche retail stores, housing, and cultural/entertainment venues;

- Encourage the community to provide an appealing pedestrian-friendly landscape and streetscape environment while preserving historic tradition;
- Create a memorable destination through authentic and diverse public places and expand the range of attractions and economic development opportunities that downtown offers;
- Integrate downtown neighborhoods with a mix of infill housing and services for local neighbors;
- Achieve a more unified and equitable downtown through an improved transportation system that minimizes barriers;
- Create a hard-surfaced urban plaza on the block where the post office is currently located;
- Acquire the Mill Creek Center for community or recreational facilities and programs if the School District determines that it no longer needs this facility;
- Develop a hotel that has some meeting space to accommodate smaller meetings and conferences;
- Develop Structured Parking on the southeast corner of Santa Fe and Kansas Avenue;
- Develop City office expansion building on the northeast block of Santa Fe and Kansas Avenue;
- Build three blocks of mixed use development fronting Santa Fe;
- Relocate library onto Park Avenue and replace with retail;
- Develop a parking structure and office building on the corner of Kansas and Park Avenue;
- Remove office building in front of Johnson County administration building and replace with a formal courtyard;
- Provide pedestrian improvements on Santa Fe Street;
- Create grade separation for the BNSF railroad;
- Improve transit shelters, furnishings, signage and wayfinding;
- Provide additional parking;
- Create new trails to provide better connections to and between existing trails;
• Provide regional gateways at I-35 and Santa Fe, Santa Fe and K-7, Whitney Street and Northgate Parkway, E. Dennis Ave and S. Harrison Street.

**Streetscape Master Plan and Downtown Design Guidelines**

**Status**
The Streetscape Master Plan and Downtown Design Guidelines were approved in 2003.

**Purpose**
The Streetscape Master Plan and Downtown Design Guidelines is a two-part document that establishes a design framework for public and private redevelopment in the downtown area and along the Santa Fe corridor. This plan contains both the Downtown Streetscape Master Plan, describing public realm improvements in downtown and along the Santa Fe corridor; and design standards and guidelines, which establish standards for redevelopment of private property within the downtown area.

**Key Conclusions**

- Direct public and private improvements;
- Build high quality improvements to enhance the character of downtown;
- Unify the visual image of downtown by implementing a series of street trees and street/pedestrian lighting, and providing landscaping that provides shade, seasonal color and visual interest;
- Create a pedestrian oriented environment that is safe, visually pleasing, accessible and comfortable;
- Strengthen downtown’s connections both visually and functionally by connecting both sides of Santa Fe Street, Mill Creek, and future downtown redevelopment;
- Respect and preserve adjacent residential neighborhoods;
- Encourage and accommodate the use of alternative modes of transportation;
- Designate Santa Fe and Kansas Avenue as arterial streets;
- Designate all other streets as collector streets.
CENTRAL CORE NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION PLAN

Status
The Central Core Neighborhood Action Plan was approved by City Council in 2003.

Purpose
The Central Core Neighborhood Action Plan was written by the Central Core Neighborhood Committee, with staff support from the Olathe Development Services Department. The purpose of the Neighborhood Action Plan is to encourage continued revitalization efforts, provide insight and guidance to the City Council and other city staff, and improve communication between neighborhood residents, business owners, city staff and officials.

Key Conclusions
• Develop cultural and entertainment attractions;
• Provide lit walking paths;
• Create an architecturally-themed streetscape;
• Provide commuter rail on railroads, not freight;
• Encourage additional small businesses to serve the neighborhood;
• Preserve historically significant buildings;
• Balance business, residential and governmental land uses;
• Remove and keep industrial land uses out;
• Develop and implement historically themed streetscape;
• Encourage all new development to include structured parking;
• Encourage the City to implement Neighborhood Revitalization Act;
• Maintain existing parking footprints;
• Develop vacant land with residential, green space and office uses.

WESTVIEW NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION PLAN

Status
The Westview Neighborhood Action Plan was approved by City Council in 2000.

Purpose
The Westview Neighborhood Action Plan is written by the neighborhood committee and facilitated by City staff. The plan’s broader objective is to maintain the quality of life for Westview residents as a comfortable and secure residential community. Action steps are identified to catalyze the planning process, encourage revitalization efforts and improve communication between residents, the housing committee and City officials.

Key Conclusions

- Maintain historic quality of the neighborhood;
- Provide adequate streets, sidewalks, crosswalks and lighting;
- Promote a safe, friendly and livable neighborhood;
- Promote single-family residential use with adequate greenspace;
- Redevelop vacant commercial structures and lots;
- Improve neighborhood access hindered by railroad;
- Decrease rental properties and absentee landlords;
- Decrease on-street parking;
- Improve communication process for infrastructure improvements;
- Enhance pedestrian movement throughout neighborhood;
- Develop additional parks and greenways;
- Encourage activities and improvements throughout the neighborhood that will increase the overall safety of residents;
- Recommend improvements to reduce traffic speed, noise and congestion.

Community Development Block Grant Eligible Area Plan

Status

The Community Development Block Grant Eligible Area Plan was approved as part of the 2000 Census effort.

Purpose

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is a flexible program that provides communities with resources to address a wide range of unique community development needs. The annual CDBG appropriation is allocated between States and local jurisdictions. HUD
determines the amount of each grant by using a formula comprised of several measures of community need.

**Key Conclusions**

The extent of poverty, housing overcrowding, age of housing, and population growth lag in relationship to other metropolitan areas.
MISCELLANEOUS CITY PLANS

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)

Status
The latest Capital Improvement Program (CIP) was approved by the City Council in 2009.

Purpose
The City of Olathe addresses infrastructure growth annually by conducting a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) process and preparing a CIP document. The program consists of a five-year priority listing of all capital projects, accompanied by project financing that is consistent with the City’s debt management policies.

BALANCED SCORECARD

Status
Olathe’s Organizational Balanced Scorecard was initially developed in 2004. The 2009 Annual Performance Report was presented the City Council in April 2009.

Purpose
The Organizational Balanced Scorecard is intended to help manage progress toward strategic targets, promote continuous improvement in efficiency, and provide better service delivery and value for tax dollars invested. At the heart of the Organizational Scorecard is the City’s vision to “set the Standard for Excellence in Public Service.” To further clarify the City’s vision, eight “Key Result Areas” were identified. These Key Results Areas are Transportation, Public Safety, Downtown, Economic Sustainability, Active Lifestyles, Public Services, Diversity, and Service Delivery Support.

Key Conclusions
Despite cuts in expenditures and personnel in 2009, citizen satisfaction with City services continued to improve. Targets were met or exceeded in 11 of 12 measured indicators.
PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Status
The latest update to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan was approved by City Council in 2006.

Purpose
The Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update focuses on existing and future needs of the Parks and Recreation Department as it applies to land, recreation facilities and program needs to create a more balanced Parks and Recreation System. The plan presents a ten year strategy wherein the majority of the initiatives will be completed in the first five years. However as a living document, the plan requires annual updates as well as additions to meet the communities’ evolving vision and needs for parks and recreation in Olathe. The development of the Master Plan was performed in close coordination with the Park and Recreation Staff, Park Foundation, the City Manager’s Staff, and the City Council.

Key Conclusions
- To be a best-in-class Parks and Recreation provider by creating a balance of parks, recreation facilities and programs that create community pride, unity and supports the economic and livability goals of the City;
- Identify and develop core businesses of the parks system that serve all age segments and create a lifetime user;
- Create and implement as many funding sources as possible to manage and maintain a quality park and recreation system;
- Develop an indoor recreation and aquatic center at the 75,000 sq ft level minimum and include space for indoor aquatics, Broaden the program offerings in the system to support wider age segments particularly for youth, teens, seniors, family related programs and special events;
- Increase maintenance standards in parks;
- Implement new funding sources and seek to find a dedicated funding source from the General Fund for operations of the system to keep the quality of services;
- Create additional signature parks in the City similar to Stagecoach Park;
- Continue to build trail networks;
- Update Black Bob Pool Complex to meet facility needs over the next 30 years;
- Continue to add sports fields to support the youth and growth in the City;
- Continue to add park land to the system for neighborhood and community parks by increasing the park excise tax to both acquire land and develop parks;
- Enhance older parks in the City to increase the value of living in older neighborhoods;
- Locate neighborhood parks (3-15 acres) within a half mile radius of residential neighborhoods and within close proximity to multi-family complexes and schools;
- Locate community parks (15-200 acres) within a one mile radius of residential neighborhoods and light business or manufacturing districts;
- Locate regional parks (200+ acres) within or adjacent to an urban community, ideally in areas of varied topography with diverse environmental qualities;
- Make park improvements at the 10 million dollar level at Lone Elm, Black Bob, Prairie Center and Oregon Trail, Cedar Lake and Lake Olathe. Complete the Development of Stagecoach Park;
- Utilize Mill Creek Center as a performing Arts/ Cultural Center.

**Bicycle Transportation Plan**

**Status**

The Bicycle Transportation Plan is a Working Document last discussed at a City Council Worksession in December 2008.

**Purpose**

The Bicycle Transportation Plan serves as a guide for city staff to plan and coordinate the development of a comprehensive city-wide bicycle system. It encourages a two-tiered system that is based on rider skill level to accommodate the needs of a diverse user group. Type A Network is intended for advanced bicyclists and is designated in bicycle lanes on half arterial streets, bicycle lanes on collector streets, and interim bicycle routes on existing arterials and unimproved streets where bicyclists and motorists share the road. Type B Network reflects shorter trips made by less-skilled and adolescent bicyclists, yet allows users the opportunity to connect to a much larger system. Type B is typically located along existing, proposed and future greenways, multi-use trails and wide sidewalks (8’-10’).
TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Status
The Transportation Study was presented to the City Council in 2006.

Purpose
The Transportation Study involves the development of a new travel demand model that can provide sufficient additional detail to accurately forecast future traffic demand outside the current urban fringe, provide the opportunity to model alternative modes of travel such as buses, commuter trains, bicycling, and walking, and integrate with the City’s GIS. The model results can be used to evaluate the need for new transportation corridors, provide background traffic growth forecasts for development impact analysis, prioritize roadway capital improvement projects, and integrate alternative modes into the system.

OLATHE STRATEGIC PLAN

Status
The Olathe Strategic Plan was approved by the City Council in 2004.

Purpose
The 2003 Strategic Planning Steering Committee compiled this ongoing report to provide a series of planning goals and objectives for the City’s continued growth and maintenance over the next twenty years. The plan outlines specific goals and action items that target issues involving transportation and infrastructure needs, service expansion, economic development, downtown revitalization, and public safety.

Key Conclusions
• Ensure all basic service responsibilities such as water, wastewater, solid waste, storm water management, snow removal and environmental health are supported by a professional, customer-focused and efficient cadre of public servants;
• Provide consistent infrastructure to support those services and ensure it is consistent with and reflective of development and redevelopment demands by citizens;
• Ensure costs of those services are borne by users and competitive with other regional service providers;
• Provide services that are fully integrated with, supported by, and coordinated with other City services and other governmental service providers;

• Balance economic development with prudent financial management practices; it is a City that maintains the lowest possible tax rate while maintaining a commitment to high quality service;

• Develop Downtown Olathe into a government and business center that is integrated with the neighborhoods;

• Provide a well-maintained and mature parks and recreation program that promote wellness for residents to enjoy;

• Communicate City finances in a convenient, clear and accountable manner to the citizens of Olathe;

• Maintain a cost-benefit advantage with other regional governments while providing excellent services;

• Maintain adequate service levels for water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling and storm water;

• Establish policies which address the needs for long-term growth and its impact on existing services;

• Improve east/west traffic flow such as the 127th Street overpass, 159th Street connection and the College Boulevard corridor;

• Consider opportunities that move traffic north/south in west Olathe;

• Actively pursue all modes of mass transit systems as appropriate;

• Develop and implement sustainable growth strategies and incentives that balance commercial and residential development; and

• Capitalize on proximity to transportation hubs such as the interstate, railroads and local airports.

**MAJOR STREET MAP**

**Status**

The Major Street Map was adopted by the City Council in 2002. An unadopted update to the Major Street Map was prepared in 2003.

**Purpose**

The Major Street Map displays a hierarchy of City streets that includes expressways, arterials, collectors, and local streets. The Major Street Map also lays out a conceptual network of future streets.
TRAILS AND GREENWAYS PLAN

Status

The Trails and Greenways Plan was adopted by the City Council in 1993.

Purpose

As a supplement to the Olathe Park Master Plan adopted in 1991, the Trails and Greenways Plan focuses in greater detail on the recommendations of the park master plan related to the development of a greenway and bicycle / pedestrian trail system.

Key Conclusions

The Trails and Greenways Plan investigates current and future opportunities for trail development within Olathe. Recommendations focus on coordinating the trail and greenway system with development and other capital improvement projects. Considerations emphasize the use of the trail system as an alternative means of transportation. The Trails and Greenways Plan is intended as a planning tool to integrate a comprehensive trail and greenway system into the infrastructure of the City of Olathe.
REGIONAL PLANS

COMPREHENSIVE ARTERIAL ROAD NETWORK PLAN

Status
The latest Johnson County Comprehensive Arterial Road Network Plan (CARNP) was approved by the Johnson County BOCC in June 2009.

Purpose
The purpose of CARNP is to maximize the use of the existing arterial road system. The plan includes a classification system for County arterial roads with ultimate design standards ranging from two-lane rural section line roads with shoulders to four-lane parkways with landscaping and pedestrian and bicycle paths as well as accommodations for possible future public transit service. The plan identifies the type and location of the future road improvements and shows three different levels of improvements: Type I - Minor Arterials; Type II -Major Arterial; and Type III – Parkways.

SMART MOVES REGIONAL TRANSIT VISION

Status
The Smart Moves Regional Transit Vision is a development between area residents, local cities, the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC), the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (KCATA), Unified Government Transit (UGT) and Johnson County Transit (JCT).

Purpose
The intent is to coordinate the planning and development around a dynamic regional transit system. Johnson County has six regional transit corridors. This includes one Commuter Service corridor, one Urban Service corridor and four Major Fixed-Route Service corridors. MARC is working with local communities to support updating local service visions that can be integrated into the regional service vision.

Key Conclusions
Important corridors within Johnson County could include arterials such as Roe, Lamar, Quivira, Antioch, 63rd Street, 95th Street, 135th Street, 119th Street and U.S. 169.
JOHNSON COUNTY RURAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Status
The last major update to the Rural Comprehensive Plan occurred in 2004. The Plan is an “active document” and is reviewed at least annually. Periodic refinements may result from the reviews at the direction of the County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.

Purpose
The overall objective of the review and Plan modification process is to maintain relevancy for both current and long-range development. While the Plan focuses on the unincorporated portions of Johnson County, its scope includes the entire County, making recommendations to cities and the County on how to cooperate and coordinate growth and resources.

K-10 CORRIDOR STUDY

Status
The latest update to the 1991 K-10 Corridor Study was made in 2004.

Purpose
The Update summarizes the major changes that have occurred within the corridor over the past ten years and provides an overview of the continued potential for development within this fast growing highway corridor. This multi-jurisdictional plan is intended as a resource supplement for all the communities within the corridor. The boundaries used for this Update are the 33 mile stretch of K-10 Highway from East Hills Business Park in Lawrence to the terminus of K-10 Highway at I-435 near the border of Lenexa and Overland Park.

Key Conclusions
- Encourage an overall cohesive corridor-wide plan that involves all jurisdictions. Currently, there are eight separate and independent zoning jurisdictions within the Focus Area where each community has its own independent plan, enforcement and implementation mechanisms;
- Design an overall plan that respects and secures the protection of scenic views, natural environmental resources and protected species within the corridor;
- Enforce high quality development that is sensitive to its context to establish a positive design precedent;
• Limit development where topographic and/or soil characteristics make the areas unsuitable, difficult and expensive to develop.

**MARC’s MetroGreen Plan**

**Status**
The MetroGreen Plan was launched in 2001 by the Mid-America Regional Council of Governments.

**Purpose**
Mid-America Regional Council’s MetroGreen Plan is a proposed 1,144-mile interconnected system of public and private open spaces, greenways and trails designed to link seven counties in the Kansas City metropolitan area. The plan covers Leavenworth, Johnson and Wyandotte counties in Kansas and Cass, Clay, Jackson and Platte counties in Missouri.

**Key Conclusions**
- proposes alternative travel options for area residents commuting from home to work or school;
- heightens awareness of recreational facilities throughout the region and improves access to them;
- unifies the seven counties in the metro; and
- connects economic, cultural and historic destinations throughout the region.

**K-150 Corridor Plan**

**Status**
The K-150 Corridor Plan was jointly approved the Cities of Olathe, Overland Park and Leawood in 1986.

**Purpose**
Kansas City Highway 150 (K-150) is an uninterrupted traffic route which connects Olathe, Overland Park and Leawood to the southern part of Kansas City. The K-150 Corridor Plan is a multi-jurisdictional plan that forecasts development trends along the corridor and recommends a phased roadway improvement program as development occurs. The plan recommends a consistent highway configuration and character throughout the corridor as well as a mix of land uses and intensities.
Key Conclusions

- Design a future land use plan which considers the entire corridor as an integral development area, as well as three separate municipal jurisdictions;
- Locate high density residential uses and nonresidential uses along K-150 and US Highway 69;
- Transition high intensity to low intensity land uses from thoroughfares to interior of sections;
- Utilize reverse frontage roads as access to intensive land uses along K-150 and as a separation between land uses;
- Locate Commercial and office uses at major intersections;
- Preserve 100 year flood plain areas as open space;
- Coordinate land uses across city boundaries to ensure appropriate transitions along borders;
- Assign the majority of land use as low density residential.
**TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS**

**ECONOMIC ANALYSIS AND LAND DEMAND FORECASTS**

Economic and Planning Systems as a sub consultant to AECOM (formerly EDAW) evaluated economic and market trends in Olathe and Johnson County as they relate to land use and economic issues in PlanOlathe. This report summarizes EPS’ findings on Olathe’s ability to capture a share of the region’s economic and population growth. The report includes the following:

- Baseline economic and demographic trend data which form the basis of future land demand forecasts
- A housing and residential land demand projection for a 2008 to 2030 planning period
- Employment land demand forecasts for Olathe based on an employment forecast and Olathe’s expected market share of office and industrial/flex development in Johnson County
- An estimate of future retail demand in Olathe based on the residential development projection
- A comparison of the land demand forecast results to the future land use map of the Comprehensive Plan, and recommendations for land use changes that can be considered by the City
- A review of quality of life impacts and broad economic considerations of adopting policies identified in PlanOlathe

**BUILD-OUT ANALYSIS**

In May 2009, the consultant firm Springsted Incorporated prepared a Build-Out Study and Model for the City of Olathe to assist the City in analyzing the projected public costs and benefits associated with the projected growth of the City to full build-out. The future land use recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan have been input into this Build-Out Model to evaluate the long term fiscal implications of these recommendations.
Buildout Analysis

An Evaluation of the Fiscal Sustainability of Future Land Use Recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan

In May 2009, the consultant firm Springsted Incorporated prepared a Build-Out Study and Model for the City of Olathe to assist the City in analyzing the projected public costs and benefits associated with the projected growth of the City to full build-out. The future land use recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan have been input into this Build-Out Model to evaluate the long term fiscal implications of these recommendations. Below are excerpts from the Build-Out Study explaining the process and methodology of the build-out model, followed by a comparison of PlanOlathe’s recommended future land uses with a baseline scenario that projects future development with a similar mix of uses to Olathe’s existing land use pattern.

Background

The City of Olathe, Kansas, with a population of approximately 125,000, is the fourth largest suburb in the Kansas City Metropolitan Area and the fifth most populous city in Kansas. In 2008, the U.S. Census Bureau ranked Olathe the 24th fastest growing city in the nation and CNN/Money and Money magazine ranked Olathe 11th in its list of “100 Best Cities to Live in the United States.” Money magazine highlighted the strong corporate presence – Honeywell, ALDI, Garmin and Farmers Insurance Group – and its abundant outdoor opportunities.

While the City of Olathe is a relatively established, mature suburb, it maintains potential for further growth. Within the current City boundaries, the City is approximately two-thirds developed. However, the City has long-term agreements with neighboring jurisdictions to make additional expansion possible. Throughout this report, the total area is referred to as the “Build-Out Area.” If the entire build-out area is included, the City is approximately 50% developed.

In early 2008, the City began the process of updating their Comprehensive Plan, which last had a major update in 1997. At the same time, the City was discussing how the City’s finances may look upon full build-out, which is expected to take approximately 40-50 years. There were many questions with unknown answers, for example:

- How is the City going to ultimately develop and at what pace?
- Will the mix of residential, commercial, office, industrial, etc. be similar to what is there today?
- Will the tax structure be similar to what it currently is?

The need for a tool that was dynamic to update assumptions (e.g. land use) and current law (e.g. tax rates) to project the public costs and benefits to the City upon full build-out became clear. The primary and immediate need was for a fiscal impact analysis to inform the Comprehensive Plan process and ensure any land use plan that came out of the Comprehensive Plan be financially feasible. Secondly, the City wanted a tool to use in the future, well after the completion of the Comprehensive Plan. In the spring of 2008, the City hired its financial advisor, Springsted Incorporated to conduct a Build-Out Impact Study (“Study”) and Model (“Model”).

Study Scope and Process

In accordance with the work plan agreed to by Springsted and the City, the Model and the Study include the following elements:

- Identification of all main infrastructure to accommodate future development
- Identification of when main infrastructure will need to be in place to accommodate development
- Identification of the annual costs of growth on the community
- Identification of additional staffing levels needed to maintain current service levels
- Identification of projected City property and sales tax revenues based on the proposed land uses at build-out
The study was conducted in four phases:

**Phase I: Review Background Information and Assumptions**

Task I included a comprehensive review of the City’s background information. The ultimate purpose of the review is to most accurately model and project future fiscal impacts. The primary review included historical financial performance and trends, the City’s Capital Improvement Plan, financial and planning policies, and existing land use policies.

Once an understanding the City’s operations was obtained, Springsted reviewed the City’s Balanced Scorecard Annual Report. The measures and goals outlined throughout the report were used in the development of the Model and Study. Lastly, previous reports on the City’s water, sewer, transportation, facilities, and parks systems were reviewed and analyzed.

**Phase II: Develop Framework for Build-Out Model and Study**

The second phase took the background information and analysis in Phase I to develop a conceptual framework for what kind of Model and Study would most benefit the City. Given the amount of developable land in the build-out area, measured analysis of future development from a financial perspective is required. As such, a typical report based on one land use scenario would seem insufficient to its needs.

For example, infrastructure reports such as water and sewer plans are typically based on a single scenario for future land use. Because Olathe’s ultimate land use proportions upon full build-out are unknowable, such a report would be of limited value.

For these reasons, the Build-Out Model and Study is based on a flexible framework which will allow the City to entertain multiple land use scenarios and to analyze the fiscal implications for each scenario.

**Phase III: Develop Initial Build-Out Analysis**

Given the framework developed in Phase II, a financial model was developed in Microsoft Excel that integrated all the major components of the City’s budget – General Fund (GF) Operations, Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), and enterprise funds. Next, a planning and land-use component was added to integrate various land uses into the operating and capital budgets over a 50-year period.

The initial build-out analysis, referred to in this Study as the “Baseline” land-use scenario, assumes the City will develop in a pattern similar to its current development profile. In this scenario, it is assumed that land currently zoned as Agricultural/Vacant and Rural Residential will develop into residential, commercial, and other land uses in proportions essentially identical to those currently existing in the already-developed areas of the City. For example, if the current developed area of the City is 50% residential, 30% commercial, and 20% industrial, the undeveloped portion of the City (Agricultural/Vacant and Rural Residential) is assumed to be developed in to 50% residential, 30% commercial, and 20% industrial.

The final component to be included in the Model and Study was an analysis of future infrastructure needs. The infrastructure analysis identifies the need, timing, and cost of new infrastructure to accommodate the anticipated development and maintain the existing infrastructure. The Model and Study project the following infrastructure needs:
Phase IV: Develop Alternative Build-Out Scenarios

In addition to the Baseline build-out scenario, Section 5 of this report looks at an alternative build-out scenario. This scenario shows a financially sustainable land use mix; one that will support the future operational and capital infrastructure requirements of the City.

Comparison of Comprehensive Plan and Baseline Future Land Use Scenarios

The future land use recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan were input into the Build-Out Model to evaluate whether the mix of uses and densities recommended in the Comprehensive Plan are fiscally sustainable for the City in the long term. That is, whether the recommended mix of uses and densities can accommodate a population and employment base that provides balanced sources of revenue to fund the infrastructure and services that Olathe’s citizens expect.

The Build-Out Model is designed to evaluate many different future land use scenarios, some of which may be fiscally sustainable, and some of which may not. In this case, the focus is one particular scenario: the recommended land uses of the Comprehensive Plan. For the purpose of comparison, a baseline scenario that projects Olathe’s current land use mix proportionally to future development was also examined.

Existing Land Use Mix

The existing land use mix is displayed in the table below. The build-out model assumes that land that is currently vacant or used for agricultural or rural residential uses will be developed over the planning period until full build-out. These land uses currently comprise approximately 49% of the total build-out area. The recommended future land uses in the Comprehensive Plan also envision some existing developed areas that may redevelop as different uses or change in density over time.

The land use types used in this model conform to the land use types utilized by the Johnson County Appraisers Office; therefore, the outcomes in the model are subject to the data in the County’s system. There are a small number of dwelling units currently listed in non-residential areas. This is likely due to land being mislabeled in the assessment process. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that dwelling units will be developed only on land zoned for residential use.

Currently, agricultural, vacant, and rural residential land comprise approximately 49% of the build-out area. Non-taxable uses such as public uses, parks, and right-of-way make up approximately 23% of the total build-out area. Residential uses cover 20% of the land area, and non-residential uses such as commercial, office, and industrial uses account for 8% of the build-out area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Treatment</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Storage</td>
<td>Water Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Maintenance</td>
<td>Water Transmission Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Collection Lines</td>
<td>Sewer Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and Lane Miles</td>
<td>Sewer Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Stations</td>
<td>Road Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Support Vehicles</td>
<td>Fire Apparatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Vehicles</td>
<td>Police Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Vehicles</td>
<td>Solid Waste Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Current Land Use and Values Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Land Use</th>
<th>Current Number of Acres</th>
<th>Current Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Total Appraised Value</th>
<th>Total Assessed Value</th>
<th>Per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Per Acre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>10,683</td>
<td>32,416</td>
<td>$6,862,807,510</td>
<td>$642,422</td>
<td>$73,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family Residential</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>$341,639,950</td>
<td>$774,272</td>
<td>$88,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>12,644</td>
<td>$1,086,721,830</td>
<td>$1,177,903</td>
<td>$90,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residential</td>
<td>12,047</td>
<td>48,381</td>
<td>$8,291,169,290</td>
<td>$910,003,740</td>
<td>$90,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Per Acre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$466,333,180</td>
<td>$1,080,601</td>
<td>$171,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motels</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>$52,257,300</td>
<td>$1,430,140</td>
<td>$357,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$900,174,130</td>
<td>$769,090</td>
<td>$186,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$769,352,920</td>
<td>$233,936</td>
<td>$33,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Residential</td>
<td>4,927</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,188,117,530</td>
<td>$416,646,760</td>
<td>$84,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Taxable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Per Acre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$101,265,290</td>
<td>$31,111</td>
<td>$10,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>6,590</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Taxable</td>
<td>13,346</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,020,495,530</td>
<td>$13,582,063</td>
<td>$10,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Per Acre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>6,459</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>$68,013,680</td>
<td>$10,531</td>
<td>$8,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural /Vacant</td>
<td>21,975</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>$185,060,030</td>
<td>$8,421</td>
<td>$19,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other</td>
<td>28,453</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>$253,073,710</td>
<td>$27,340,136</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>58,773</td>
<td>48,682</td>
<td>11,752,856,060</td>
<td>1,367,572,699</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 2008 Assessments
Existing Land Use Mix

The recommended land use mix for the Comprehensive Plan shows a higher percentage of residential, commercial, office, and open space land than the baseline scenario. Compared to the baseline scenario, the Comprehensive Plan envisions less industrial, public, and right-of-way.

Residential Uses: Both the baseline scenario and Comprehensive Plan scenario project approximately 30% of the total build-out area for single-family residential uses. However, the Comprehensive Plan envisions approximately 10% of the total build-out area for multi-family residential uses, compared to only 3% for the baseline scenario. Because of the higher density of multi-family uses, the Comprehensive Plan scenario projects a much higher ratio of multi-family units compared to multi-family units in the baseline scenario. This increasing mix of units and densities is consistent with emerging demographic trends, and increasing preferences for a variety of housing styles and options in addition to detached, single family homes. Because the build-out model projects the maximum possible buildout, it may overestimate the actual ratio of multi-family units to single family units. Areas appropriate for higher density residential uses may develop with multi-family projects, but single family residential developments with smaller lots or home sizes would also accommodate increased residential densities in these areas.

Industrial and Office Uses: The reduced industrial percentage can be explained in part by lands that are currently used for quarry and landfill uses. As these quarry and landfill functions are completed, many of these areas cannot be redeveloped, and so this land will transition over time from industrial to open space. The reduced industrial percentage is also concurrent with an increase in office lands, as the City makes strategic goals to encourage professional, high-tech, research, and other industries that are more typically associated with office uses.

Commercial Uses: Commercial uses in the Comprehensive Plan scenario comprise roughly 6% of total land area, compared to roughly 3% in the baseline scenario. This increase is possible because the higher residential densities recommended in the Comprehensive Plan allow for a much larger population to live without the build-out area. This larger population is able to support more retail, service, and other commercial uses.

Public and Right-of-Way Uses: The assumptions of the build-out cause the baseline scenario to overstate the proportion of non-taxable land at build-out. Currently, non-taxable lands such as public uses, right-of-way, and parks comprise roughly 23% of the total build-out area. The baseline scenario projects this percentage at 49%. This can be explained partly because areas agricultural and rural areas that are envisioned to be developed already have some public uses, parks, and street infrastructure that is being counted as part of the existing total. As these areas develop they will not require an additional 23% of non-taxable land, but some lower percentage.

The percentage of public uses and right-of-way in the recommended land uses of the Comprehensive Plan was projected by calculating the existing ratio of these uses within City limits, and then applying that ratio to undeveloped areas, excluding parks and open space areas, which would not require these uses. For the recommended land uses of the Comprehensive Plan, all developed areas would continue to have the same ratio of public and right-of-way uses that they have today.

Parks and Open Space: The Comprehensive Plan recommends an extensive system of interconnected greenways and parks, resulting in almost double the ratio of parks and open space lands in the Comprehensive Plan scenario compared to the baseline scenario. However, the total percentage of non-taxable land in the Comprehensive Plan scenario is less than the baseline scenario for the reasons stated above.
Fiscal Impact of Future Land Uses

The graph below indicates that the baseline scenario results in an imbalance between revenues and expenditures over time where expenditures increase at a rate faster than revenue. The graph also indicates that the land uses recommended by the Comprehensive Plan are fiscally sustainable over time, with revenues matching expenditures. There are several reasons why the Comprehensive Plan scenario is more fiscally balanced, but they all relate to an overall theme of the Comprehensive Plan to encourage higher density development in strategic locations, to encourage efficient use of services and infrastructure, support commercial centers, and provide close access to employment.

The Comprehensive Plan recommends a greater proportion of the total build-out area for multi-family residential uses at densities higher than typical single-family residential subdivisions. Higher residential densities have a number of positive impacts on the fiscal health of the city. Because they are developed more intensely, multi-family residential areas have a higher assessed value per acre than single-family residential uses. This results in greater tax revenue for the same area than single-family residential uses.

For many City services, there are efficiencies in serving populations in compact geographies. For example, higher density development allows police, fire, and emergency vehicles to reach a greater number of people in the same service radius. Less street and utility infrastructure is needed to serve a population in a compact area than one that is spread over a larger geographic area at lower densities. This reduces the per capita costs for these services. Because the land uses recommended in the Comprehensive Plan include an extensive network of open space, this reduces the total area where it is necessary to provide development infrastructure.

Higher density development also allows for a greater total population to be accommodated within the growth area. A greater population can support more retail, service, and other commercial uses, which generate both property and sales tax. Thus, higher densities support more of these positive revenue generating commercial uses. A greater population can also support more businesses and industries. While each new resident creates new costs for the City, the overall benefits of new residents, stores, and businesses outweighs these costs when developed in an efficient manner.
Assumptions

The Build-Out Model is a complex tool with more than one thousand separate data inputs. Many of these inputs are based on assumptions. As these assumptions change, so might the outcome of the model. These assumptions vary from standard square feet per employee for different types of industries to projections for future property tax valuations to costs and service levels for various types of infrastructure. Because of the complexity of the model, the results should be taken as a snapshot of a particular set of circumstances and assumptions at a particular time, and not as a definitive predictor for future.

For the purpose of comparison in this analysis, everything in the Build-Out Model was identical between the baseline scenario and Comprehensive Plan scenario except for the future land use mix.
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1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Economic & Planning systems as a sub consultant to AECOM (formerly EDAW) evaluated economic and market trends in Olathe and Johnson County as they relate to land use and economic issues in Plan Olathe. This report summarizes EPS’ findings on Olathe’s ability to capture a share of the region’s economic and population growth. The report contains seven chapters including this Executive Summary:

**Chapter 2** provides baseline economic and demographic trend data which form the basis of future land demand forecasts. It describes employment trends in Olathe and Johnson County, major employers, population trends, and other demographics.

**Chapter 3** provides a housing and residential land demand projection for a 2008 to 2030 planning period. EPS forecasted residential land demand based on historic construction trends in Johnson County and Olathe’s expected future market share. EPS’ forecast is compared to the Mid America Regional Council of Governments (MARC) forecast as a reference point.

**Chapter 4** provides employment land demand forecasts for Olathe based on an employment forecast and Olathe’s expected market share of office and industrial/flex development in Johnson County. The forecast accounts for multi-tenant/speculative office development and the single user build to suit market.

**Chapter 5** estimates future retail demand in Olathe based on the residential development projection. The retail forecast addresses neighborhood/community, regional, and downtown/mixed use retail development formats.

**Chapter 6** compares the land demand forecast results to the future land use map and makes recommendations on zoning and land use changes that can be considered by the City.

**Chapter 7** addresses the quality of life impacts and broad economic considerations of adopting new policies identified in Plan Olathe, including transit; expanded parks, open space, and recreation amenities; and revitalizing Downtown.

**Summary of Findings**

1. **Olathe has established itself as an attractive location for new businesses locating in the Kansas City metro area and is well positioned to continue growing its primary job base.**

Olathe is home to several private employers including Farmer’s Insurance (2,600 employees), Honeywell (1,000 employees), Olathe Health System (1,800 employees), and Trans Am Trucking (1,100 employees). In 2003 Garmin International constructed a 391,000 square foot headquarters building in Olathe. Farmers Insurance completed a 145,000 square foot expansion in 2005. In 2008, US Bank located its national data center in Olathe. Recently in 2009, John Deere announced that it will locate its North American sales and marketing headquarters in Olathe. Representatives from these major employers have indicated that Olathe’s high quality of life and excellent schools were one of the primary reasons for their location decisions.
From 2001 to 2006, Johnson County added 30,700 jobs compared to 63,890 in the Kansas City metro area, indicating that Johnson County hosted 48 percent of the region’s job growth. Johnson County employment grew by 1.6 percent per year during this time period, outperforming the metro area and national economies which grew at 1.0 and 1.4 percent per year, respectively. Johnson County is one of the dominant areas for employment growth in the region.

2. **Olathe is expected to continue to be one of the dominant locations in the metro area for residential growth.**

Olathe and Johnson County’s ability to attract new jobs has supported high levels of residential construction and population growth. From 2000 to 2008 Johnson County added 83,000 people, which was half of the total metro area population increase. During this time period, Olathe added 27,000 new residents, or 33 percent of the County’s population increase. As a growing location for professional and “white collar” jobs and with large areas of undeveloped residential land, Olathe is expected to continue to be one of the dominant locations in the metro area for residential growth.

Looking at the entire metro area, Johnson County’s share of residential construction declined from 2001 to 2004, from 43 percent of the total in 2001 to 30 percent in 2004. Since 2004, Johnson County’s market share has been relatively stable at 30 to 32 percent of metro area construction. This may indicate that other counties are becoming more attractive and competitive for residential development, and Olathe and Johnson County should examine building and planning practices in these other areas to maintain a competitive quality of life environment in Olathe.

Residential development in Johnson County has declined significantly over the past few years due to the national recession. Once the economy stabilizes and residential development recovers, Olathe is expected to continue to capture similar proportions of the County’s growth. The residential construction forecasts presented later in this report account for a gradual economic recovery over the next few years, and base future year growth on a long term trend which includes several economic cycles.

This report provides a residential development forecast that estimates a total of 22,470 new housing units by 2030. This translates to approximately 6,100 acres of new residential development at current development densities. However, the Plan is recommending new policies to promote infill, cluster development, and higher density residential development in appropriate locations that may reduce land demand compared to current trends. It is difficult to forecast the impact that these new policies will have on development patterns.

3. **Olathe is well positioned to capture a large share of new office development and employment growth.**

Olathe is located in the South Johnson County office submarket which is the one of the best performing and largest submarkets in the metro area. This submarket has 14.6 million square feet of office space which is approximately 30 percent of the metro area office inventory. South Johnson County captured 41 percent of metro area office development over the past decade, adding 3.8 million square feet of inventory. The K-10 and College Boulevard corridors are
strategically located close to executive housing and major freeways and will likely be an attractive location for continued office and flex/R&D development.

Johnson County is forecasted to add 232,000 jobs by 2030 which translates to demand for approximately 11.6 million square feet of new office development. Based on office construction trends over the past 7 years, Olathe is estimated to capture 30 percent of the market for new development. Including speculative multi tenant space, build to suit space, and smaller general offices, office demand in Olathe is forecasted at 5.2 million square feet by 2030. This translates to 1,050 acres of new office development.

4. **Olathe is also expected to capture a significant amount of the region’s growth in industrial, flex space, and R&D building development.**

Johnson County is the second largest industrial submarket in the metro area with 50.4 million square feet. Jackson County with 54.5 million square feet is the largest submarket. However, Johnson County attracted 11.2 million square feet of new development over the past 10 years, accounting for 46 percent of the industrial growth in the metro area. Jackson County developed 4.9 million square feet during this time period. While Olathe is a strong location for office jobs, the market for industrial, R&D, and flex space is also strong and contributes to the area’s employment base.

By 2030, the Johnson County industrial market is forecasted to grow by 27.8 million square feet and Olathe is estimated to capture 30 percent of this demand, or 8.3 million square feet of new industrial, flex, and R&D space by 2030. This would require approximately 1,500 acres.

5. **Olathe appears to be capturing the majority of its resident’s expenditures and is not experiencing major sales leakage.**

Based on a comparison of resident expenditure patterns by store category and Olathe’s retail store inventory, Olathe appears to be well served in terms of sales capture in the convenience goods, general merchandise, shoppers’ goods, eating and drinking, and building materials categories. The only major store category not represented in Olathe is a warehouse club, such as Costco or Sam’s Club. The City is therefore experiencing some minor sales tax leakage in this store category.

6. **The City should create a retail development strategy to address modernization of its existing retail, the overall tenant mix, a large amount of older obsolete space, and the repositioning of the Great Mall of the Great Plains.**

Olathe’s older arterial roads, such as Santa Fe, Old Highway 56, and South Harrison Street, as well as Downtown Olathe, have large areas of outdated retail space with high vacancies and deferred maintenance. The Great Mall has transitioned from its primary anchor tenants to a mix of second tier and off brand tenants. Also, many of the major brand retailers are not present in Olathe, but are present in other areas of the Kansas City metro area. As Olathe’s existing retail declines it detracts from the image of the community, as many of these aging retail properties are located along highly visible corridors.

A retail development strategy would categorize existing retail properties into those with potential for successful reinvestment or repositioning and those that have little or no future viability as retail. For properties that are no longer viable, the City could examine rezoning options to
higher density residential uses or employment uses such as office or flex/R&D space for example. This strategy would also identify clear criteria for incentives, such as a location in an underserved area of the City, redevelopment of an existing site, and having a viable business plan. The retail strategy would also identify more detailed gaps in the cities tenancy inventory based on its demographics, the existing inventory, and competition from nearby jurisdictions.

Neighborhood and community retail uses should still continue to follow residential growth to ensure that new neighborhoods are well served by convenience goods. At the same time however, the City should be wary of approving new retail in greenfield locations ahead of residential development to avoid vacancies, unless these new projects are located strategically to capture sales from underserved areas of adjacent communities. Regional serving retail uses could be potentially re-directed to existing areas, such as the area around the Great Mall, or strategically in greenfield areas where it may be important to capture sales tax that could leak to an adjacent jurisdiction.

7. **Olathe’s demographics can support far more downtown style retail than currently exists. The City should continue its planned public investments and aggressively pursue a public/private catalyst project.**

This analysis shows that Olathe can support approximately 60,000 square feet of downtown style retail development over the next 10 years and 110,000 square feet over the next 20 years. The community is also large enough, with enough household income, to redirect some of its retail expenditures to shift some existing retail demand to Downtown. However, the physical environment in Downtown combined with continued suburban retail growth and competition are currently deterrents to creating a vibrant Downtown. The City owns several key parcels in Downtown and should continue to pursue redevelopment projects on its own and with private sector partners. A citywide retail strategy as discussed above could also help to redirect a portion of the City’s retail growth to Downtown.

8. **The City has a large supply of undeveloped land that will accommodate approximately 100 years of growth at current absorption rates. The Comprehensive Plan has designated numerous strategic sites for employment and retail development.**

At the forecasted absorption rates, the City has approximately 80 years of supply in commercial/retail land. The office land supply is estimated at about 60 years, while the industrial land supply is approximately 35 to 40 years. The supply of residential land is estimated to last approximately 50 years. The Plan is judged to adequately accommodate the City’s expected economic and population growth for 2030 and beyond.
The Plan designates extensive areas for employment development along key corridors such as K-10/College Boulevard and K-7, and the K-7/I-35 area. These areas are strategically located along major regional access roadways and are ideal for high visibility corporate sites. It is an important strategic decision to ensure sufficient land capacity in these locations in order to be competitive for regional employment growth. However, considering the areas of underperforming, obsolete, and vacant retail, the City could consider reducing the amount of retail in the Plan and/or future zoning as part of a strategy to redirect retail growth to redevelopment areas. This should be done strategically to ensure that locations for new regional retail projects (e.g. a lifestyle center or "town center" project, or power centers) are reserved in the path of growth, surrounded by a large enough trade area (housing), or located such that they could capture sales leakage to adjacent communities.

9. **Despite Olathe’s recent successes, the impacts of unmitigated growth and the declining condition of existing development may threaten Olathe’s image and quality of life.**

Like many fast growing Cities, Olathe is beginning to encounter difficulties keeping up with the infrastructure demands of new growth and in maintaining infrastructure in existing developed areas. The continued expansion of the City without a focus on older existing areas will over the long term be detrimental to the City’s economic and social health. There are already large perception differences between older areas of the City and new growth areas. Reinvestment in Downtown and older commercial areas and neighborhoods is needed to prevent the further decline of these areas, which could become fiscal burdens and detract from the high quality of life Olathe residents enjoy.

10. **Growing and maturing Cities need to maintain and continue to invest in quality of life amenities and infrastructure to be competitive in the modern economy.**

A growing body of academic and economic development research links quality of life and community amenities to economic success and sustainability. Metropolitan areas in the U.S. are transitioning from heavy industry and manufacturing towards more knowledge-based industries and ‘footloose industries’ whose profits are not tied to their locations. These industries rely less on access to raw materials, heavy infrastructure, and energy supplies and more on skilled labor. As a result, attracting a skilled and talented labor pool is key to economic development for knowledge-based industries. Knowledge workers often have more flexibility than others in choosing where to live and quality of life is often a major factor in their decisions. As a result, businesses seek out high-amenity locations to satisfy their labor force requirements.

Quality of life investments have also been shown to have a positive impact on residential and commercial real estate values. Research shows that proximity to parks, open space, and vibrant walkable commercial areas increases property values. Having these amenities close to workplaces can also increase worker productivity and satisfaction. While these investments have a fiscal cost to the City and its residents, the cost of not maintaining quality of life may be an even greater cost in reduced economic competitiveness.
2. **Regional Economic Framework**

This chapter describes economic and demographic trends and forecasts for the City of Olathe, Kansas, Johnson County and the Kansas City Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). These trends help establish the current and future context of the City as well as its role in the regional economy. This information will be used to inform future land use planning in Olathe.

Olathe is located just over 20 miles southwest of Kansas City, KS along Interstate 35 in Johnson County. Johnson County is one of 15 counties comprising the Kansas City MSA. These include Johnson County (KS), Leavenworth County (KS), Miami County (KS), Cass County (MO), Clay County (MO), Clinton County (MO), Jackson County (MO), Lafayette County (MO), Platte County (MO), Ray County (MO), and Wyandotte County (KS). In 2003, the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, which maintains MSA definitions, added Bates County (MO), Caldwell County (MO), Franklin County (KS), and Linn County (KS) to the Kansas City MSA.

Johnson County is bordered by Leavenworth and Wyandotte Counties to the north, Jackson and Cass Counties to the east, Miami County to the south, and Douglas County to the west. Douglas County is not part of the Kansas City MSA. With a population of 534,000 residents, Johnson County is the second most populous county in the MSA behind Jackson County (pop. 668,890).

Olathe serves as the county seat of Johnson County and has a population of 125,255 as of 2009. It is the second most populous city in Johnson County behind Overland Park (pop. 173,719). Downtown Olathe is accessed just 1 mile west of Interstate 35 and sits near the geographic center of the county.

**Employment Trends**

**Regional Trends**

Employment data presented in this section comes primarily from the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, which produces annual estimates of total employment\(^1\) for all counties and metropolitan areas in the U.S. The data lags two years behind the current year but is generally accepted as the best source of data for macro level employment trend analysis, such as this type of analysis for long range community planning.

As of 2006, employment in the Kansas City MSA totaled roughly 1.28 million jobs, as shown in Table 1. This represents an increase of 64,000 jobs since 2001, or 1.0 percent annually. This growth is slightly slower than the national economy, which grew by 1.4 percent over this same time period.

\(^1\) Total employment consists of wage and salary jobs covered by unemployment insurance, plus proprietors’ employment (self employed), and government jobs. Other more current sources of employment data only include wage and salary jobs and therefore underestimate total jobs in a study area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>Ann %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining (D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (D)</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>73,420</td>
<td>71,510</td>
<td>72,780</td>
<td>74,450</td>
<td>78,450</td>
<td>81,810</td>
<td>8,390</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>90,250</td>
<td>87,160</td>
<td>85,950</td>
<td>86,970</td>
<td>86,540</td>
<td>86,610</td>
<td>-3,640</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>55,720</td>
<td>54,880</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>131,920</td>
<td>132,050</td>
<td>137,690</td>
<td>138,170</td>
<td>138,270</td>
<td>139,020</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>51,550</td>
<td>49,240</td>
<td>47,960</td>
<td>49,680</td>
<td>48,970</td>
<td>51,930</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>59,650</td>
<td>54,860</td>
<td>51,610</td>
<td>49,340</td>
<td>46,910</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td>71,960</td>
<td>73,220</td>
<td>72,440</td>
<td>73,480</td>
<td>73,770</td>
<td>77,320</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>43,120</td>
<td>44,020</td>
<td>44,670</td>
<td>47,970</td>
<td>50,950</td>
<td>54,870</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and technical services</td>
<td>83,100</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>81,940</td>
<td>88,670</td>
<td>90,870</td>
<td>96,830</td>
<td>13,730</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of companies and enterprises</td>
<td>15,520</td>
<td>13,760</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>13,540</td>
<td>16,470</td>
<td>16,290</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and waste services</td>
<td>71,760</td>
<td>71,250</td>
<td>71,670</td>
<td>75,770</td>
<td>78,550</td>
<td>79,870</td>
<td>8,110</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>16,160</td>
<td>16,740</td>
<td>17,540</td>
<td>18,360</td>
<td>18,210</td>
<td>19,170</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>96,850</td>
<td>99,920</td>
<td>103,970</td>
<td>104,590</td>
<td>106,470</td>
<td>10,470</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>26,990</td>
<td>27,410</td>
<td>28,160</td>
<td>28,520</td>
<td>29,370</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>75,880</td>
<td>76,910</td>
<td>77,790</td>
<td>79,380</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>81,890</td>
<td>6,010</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>64,600</td>
<td>66,960</td>
<td>67,040</td>
<td>67,200</td>
<td>68,600</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and government enterprises</td>
<td>157,250</td>
<td>159,610</td>
<td>160,080</td>
<td>162,640</td>
<td>162,400</td>
<td>164,250</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Farm Employment</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,215,410</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,209,210</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,204,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,228,610</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,250,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,279,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,890</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (D) indicates non-disclosed data for confidentiality
Source: BEA, Economic & Planning Systems

All industries in the MSA experienced growth during the five-year time period with the exception of Manufacturing, which decreased 0.8 percent annually. The five industries that experienced the largest total growth between 2001 and 2006 were Professional and Technical Services (13,730 new jobs), Real Estate and Rental and Leasing (11,750 new jobs), Healthcare and Social Assistance (10,470 new jobs), Construction (8,390 new jobs), and Administration and Waste Services (8,110 new jobs). The fastest growing industry in the Kansas City MSA over the five-year time span was Real Estate and Rental and Leasing Services at 4.9 percent annually. Other fast growing industries included Educational Services (3.5 percent annually), Professional and Technical Services (3.1 percent annually), Construction (2.2 percent annually), and Administrative and Waste Services (2.2 percent annually).
When compared to the national economy, the Kansas City MSA has a larger proportion of employment in Transportation and Warehousing, Finance and Insurance, Professional and Technical Services, Management of Companies, Administrative and Waste Services, and Arts, Entertainment and Recreation. The national economy has the largest proportional advantage in Healthcare and Social Assistance, as shown in Figure 1. The Agriculture, Mining and Utilities employment totals are not available due to confidentiality regulations in the data.

Figure 1
MSA Employment by Industry, 2006
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

Source: US Bureau of Economic Analysis
Johnson County Trends

As of 2006, employment in Johnson County totaled 405,000 jobs, as shown in Table 2. Between 2001 and 2006, Johnson County employment grew at an annual rate of 1.6 percent, faster than both the Kansas City MSA (1.0 percent annually) and the national economy (1.4 percent annually). This growth represents a total of almost 31,000 new jobs from 2001 to 2006.

Table 2
Johnson County Total Non-farm Employment by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>-150  -2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>-50   -0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,990</td>
<td>21,090</td>
<td>21,810</td>
<td>1,710  1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>21,290</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>20,880</td>
<td>21,940</td>
<td>22,430</td>
<td>22,810</td>
<td>1,520  1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>20,510</td>
<td>20,070</td>
<td>20,480</td>
<td>21,160</td>
<td>21,610</td>
<td>21,150</td>
<td>640   0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>48,750</td>
<td>47,890</td>
<td>46,580</td>
<td>45,380</td>
<td>44,930</td>
<td>44,640</td>
<td>-4,110 -1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>9,470</td>
<td>9,370</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,010</td>
<td>10,420</td>
<td>470   0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>28,790</td>
<td>28,240</td>
<td>26,370</td>
<td>24,920</td>
<td>23,590</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>28,330</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>29,460</td>
<td>30,240</td>
<td>32,390</td>
<td>4,990 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>15,340</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>18,960</td>
<td>3,760 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and technical services</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>33,240</td>
<td>33,350</td>
<td>36,690</td>
<td>37,690</td>
<td>40,330</td>
<td>6,580 3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of companies and enterprises</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>180   12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and waste services</td>
<td>28,070</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,410</td>
<td>30,390</td>
<td>33,570</td>
<td>33,950</td>
<td>5,880 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>5,580</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>6,230</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>1,110 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>30,120</td>
<td>30,700</td>
<td>32,190</td>
<td>34,190</td>
<td>35,030</td>
<td>35,830</td>
<td>5,710 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>7,470</td>
<td>7,580</td>
<td>7,820</td>
<td>8,130</td>
<td>8,450</td>
<td>1,350 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>23,490</td>
<td>23,430</td>
<td>23,960</td>
<td>24,190</td>
<td>24,670</td>
<td>1,270 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>17,820</td>
<td>19,210</td>
<td>19,540</td>
<td>19,670</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and government enterprises</td>
<td>29,940</td>
<td>31,130</td>
<td>31,430</td>
<td>31,520</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>32,020</td>
<td>2,080 1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>373,890</td>
<td>373,810</td>
<td>373,450</td>
<td>384,110</td>
<td>393,910</td>
<td>404,590</td>
<td>30,700 1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (D) indicates non-disclosed data for confidentiality
Source: BEA, Economic & Planning Systems
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Between 2001 and 2006, Professional and Technical Services added the most jobs in the County with 6,580 new jobs, followed by Administrative and Waste Services (5,880 new jobs), Healthcare and Social Assistance (5,710 new jobs), Finance and Insurance (4,990 new jobs), and Real Estate and Rental and Leasing (3,760 new jobs). Similar to the MSA, the fastest growing industry in the County was Real Estate and Rental and Leasing at a rate of 4.5 percent annually. Other fast growing industries in the County included Administrative and Waste Services (3.9 percent annually), Educational Services (3.8 percent annually), Professional and Technical Services (3.6 percent annually), and Healthcare and Social Assistance (3.5 percent annually).

In order to better determine the primary industries driving Johnson County’s economy, a location quotient is utilized. A location quotient is a tool frequently used to measure the concentration of industries in a particular economy. It is calculated by the following formula:

\[
LQ = \frac{\text{(Local Industry Employment)}}{\text{(Total Local Employment)}} / \frac{\text{(Regional Industry Employment)}}{\text{(Total Regional Employment)}}
\]
Thus, a location quotient of less than 1.0 means the local economy has a lower concentration of this industry than the regional economy. A location quotient greater than 1.0 means a local economy has a higher concentration of this industry than the regional economy, indicating some specialization and local competitive strengths in the industry.

As shown in Table 3, applying this measure to Johnson County reveals a high concentration of employment in several “white-collar” industries compared to the MSA. These industries include Administrative and Waste Management Services (LQ of 1.34), Professional and Technical Services (LQ of 1.32), Finance and Insurance (LQ of 1.32), Real Estate, Rental and Leasing (LQ of 1.09), and Educational Services (LQ of 1.08). High concentrations of these industries typically correlate to demand for upper-middle income housing, as these industries often require a college level education and pay average to above average wages. This concentration also indicates a high quality of life in Johnson County, as high paying jobs and employers are frequently attracted to such areas.

### Table 3
Johnson County Total Non-farm Employment Compared to MSA, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Johnson County</th>
<th>Kansas City MSA</th>
<th>Johnson County Location Quotient1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and technical services</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of companies and enterprises</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and waste services</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and government enterprises</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Johnson County % divided by KCMSA %. A value greater than 1 indicates Johnson County has a higher concentration of jobs in an industry compared to the MSA.

Source: BEA, Economic & Planning Systems
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Johnson County is home to a number of large employers in a variety of industries. Sprint, with 9,600 employees, is the largest single employer in the County. Other significant private employers include Black and Veatch, an engineering firm with 3,600 employees; Garmin International, an electronics manufacturer primarily known for GPS products with 2,747 employees; Farmers Insurance with 2,645 employees; Embarq, a telecommunications company with 2,466 employees; United Parcel Service (UPS) with 2,206 employees; and Deffenbaugh Industries, a solid waste collection agency with almost 1,600 employees. School districts, including the Olathe Unified School District, Shawnee Mission School District, and the Blue Valley School District are also large employers with over 12,000 employees in total, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Johnson County Major Employers
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Product/Service</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sprint</td>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>Wireless Telecommunications</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Olathe Unified School District</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Schools</td>
<td>4,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Shawnee Mission School District</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Schools</td>
<td>4,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Johnson County Government</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Black and Veatch</td>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Blue Valley School District</td>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Schools</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Shawnee Mission Medical Center</td>
<td>Shawnee Mission</td>
<td>General Medical and Surgical Hospitals</td>
<td>2,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Garmin International, Inc.</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Wireless Communication Manufacturing</td>
<td>2,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Johnson County Community College</td>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>2,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Farmers Insurance</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Embarq</td>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>Wired Telecommunications</td>
<td>2,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 United Parcel Service</td>
<td>Lenexa</td>
<td>Couriers and Express Delivery</td>
<td>2,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Overland Park Regional Medical Center</td>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>General Medical and Surgical Hospitals</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Olathe Health System</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>General Medical and Surgical Hospitals</td>
<td>1,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Johnson County Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Shawnee Mission</td>
<td>Nature Parks and Institutions</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Deffenbaugh Industries</td>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td>Solid Waste Collection</td>
<td>1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 City of Overland Park</td>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 YRC Worldwide, Inc.</td>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>General Trucking</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Embarq</td>
<td>New Cntury</td>
<td>Wired Telecommunications</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 TransAm Trucking Inc.</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Specialized Trucking</td>
<td>1,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Honeywell</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Aerospace/Electronics</td>
<td>1,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 City of Olathe</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Encore Receivables Management</td>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 JCPenney Catalog Logistics</td>
<td>Lenexa</td>
<td>Catalog Publishers</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Community Economic Research Institute, City of Olathe, Economic and Planning Systems
Olathe Employment

As of 2006, non-farm employment in the City of Olathe totaled roughly 51,000 workers, as shown in Table 5. Between 2002 and 2006, Olathe experienced significant employment growth at an annual rate of 4.1 percent. This is more than twice as fast as the national rate (1.8 percent), two times faster than the County rate (2.0 percent) and almost three times faster than the Kansas City MSA (1.4 percent annually).

Table 5
Olathe Total Wage and Salary Employment by Industry, 2002-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total # Annual %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10 2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-50 -10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-45 -43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>760 6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>510 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>580 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td>670 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>160 1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>-120 -4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>140 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>240 10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and technical services</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>730 10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of companies and enterprises</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>90 23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and waste services</td>
<td>3,920</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>640 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>4,760</td>
<td>5,790</td>
<td>1,030 5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>630 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>140 7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>980 7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>290 6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and government enterprises</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>100 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Wage and Salary Jobs</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,190</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,675</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,485 4.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau LEHD, Economic and Planning Systems

Between 2002 and 2006, Educational Services added the most jobs in the City with 1,030 new jobs, followed by Accommodation and Food Services (980 new jobs), Construction (760 new jobs), Professional and Technical Services (730 new jobs), and Retail Trade (670 new jobs). The fastest growing industry in Olathe was Management of Companies, at 23.0 percent annually. Real Estate, Rental and Leasing Services, and Professional and Technical Services both grew at double-digit annual rates of 10.9 and 10.6 percent, respectively. Other fast growing industries included Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation (7.3 percent), and Accommodation and Food Services (7.1 percent). The above growth demonstrates both significant primary job growth, as well as service job growth.
Overall, the largest industry in Olathe in terms of employment is Retail Trade with 7,170 workers, or 14.1 percent of total jobs, as shown in Figure 2. Educational Services is the second largest industry with 5,790 employees, or 11.4 percent of total jobs. As the County seat, Olathe is also home to a significant number of Government jobs with 4,780 employees, or 9.4 percent of the workforce. Other significant industries include Healthcare (9.7 percent), and Administrative and Waste Services (9.0 percent).

Figure 2
Olathe Employment by Industry, 2006
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

Source: US Census Local Employment Dynamics
Olathe is also home to a number of large employers in a variety of industries, as shown in Table 6. Two public institutions, the Olathe School District (4,570 employees) and Johnson County Government (3,628 employees), are two of the three largest employers in the City. Garmin International is the largest private employer with 2,747 employees. Other large private employers include: Farmers Insurance (2,645 employees) and Honeywell (1,032 employees), as well as TransAm Trucking (1,079), a trucking/distribution firm.

Table 6
Major Employers in Olathe, KS
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Product/Service</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Olathe School District</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Johnson County Government</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Garmin International</td>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>2,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Farmers Insurance</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Olathe Health System</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>1,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 TransAm Trucking Inc.</td>
<td>Trucking</td>
<td>1,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Honeywell</td>
<td>Aerospace/Electronics</td>
<td>1,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 City of Olathe</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Encore Receivable Management</td>
<td>Accounting/Collections</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sysco Food Services of Kansas City Inc.</td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Community Economic Research Institute, City of Olathe, Economic and Planning Systems
Olathe Commuting Patterns

The majority of Johnson County residents also work in Johnson County, with 64 percent of residents employed in the County, as shown in Figure 3. The remaining 36 percent commute outside the County for work. Jackson County serves as the second largest place of work, with 16 percent of Johnson County residents commuting to the County, followed by Wyandotte County with 6 percent.

Figure 3
Place of Work for Johnson County Residents, 2006
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

Source: US Census Local Employment Dynamics
Olathe serves as the largest employment center for Olathe residents with 27 percent of all employed residents remaining in the City for work, as shown in Figure 4. Overland Park is the second largest employment center with 21 percent of employed Olathe residents commuting to the City, followed by Lenexa with 14 percent. Kansas City, Missouri employs 9 percent of Olathe workers, and 4 percent work in Kansas City, Kansas. The remaining 26 percent of Olathe workers commute to a variety of locations throughout Kansas and Missouri.

**Figure 4**  
Place of Work for Olathe Residents, 2006  
Olathe Comprehensive Plan  
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Olathe Laborshed

Of those who work in Olathe, 33 percent reside in Olathe and 12 percent reside in Overland Park, as shown in Figure 5. Commuters from Kansas City comprise nearly 12 percent of the Olathe workforce. The remaining 43 percent of employees commute to Olathe from a variety of locations throughout Kansas and Missouri.

Figure 5
Laborshed for Olathe, 2006
Olathe Comprehensive Plan
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- Olathe, Kansas: 33.4%
- Overland Park, Kansas: 12.2%
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- Topeka, Kansas: 2.0%
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- Lee's Summit, Missouri: 1.1%
- All Other Locations: 26.8%

Source: US Census Local Employment Dynamics
Population and Housing Growth Trends

Population Trends

The Kansas City MSA has grown steadily over the last 17 years. Between 1990 and 2000, the MSA population grew at a rate of 1.2 percent annually, as shown in Table 7. Johnson County grew at roughly twice the rate of the MSA, or 2.4 percent, between 1990 and 2000. The City of Olathe experienced even greater growth, with a population increase of more than three times the rate of the MSA, or 3.7 percent annually. Despite a slowdown in growth, this relationship remained relatively constant over the last eight years (2000 to 2008), with annual growth rates of 1.1 percent (Kansas City MSA), 2.1 percent (Johnson County), and 3.2 percent for Olathe according to US Census estimates. The City’s estimate of 124,378 people in 2008 suggests even faster growth in Olathe. Between 1990 and 2000, Olathe was the second fastest growing municipality in Johnson County with a population growth rate of 3.7 percent annually. Between 2000 and 2008 Olathe was the fastest growing major municipality in Johnson County, and had the largest absolute growth with 27,000 new residents.

In terms of absolute population growth, Johnson County added over 83,000 residents between 2000 and 2008, representing over half of the total population growth for the MSA. Of the municipalities in Johnson County, Olathe added the most total residents over the eight-year time span with an increase of 27,000. Other municipalities with significant population additions include Overland Park (22,000 new residents) and Shawnee (13,000 new residents). These three municipalities comprise 75 percent of the County population growth.

Table 7
Population, 1990-2008
Olathe Comprehensive plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>4,773</td>
<td>9,396</td>
<td>17,462</td>
<td>4,623</td>
<td>8,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leawood</td>
<td>19,683</td>
<td>27,656</td>
<td>31,342</td>
<td>7,973</td>
<td>3,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenexa</td>
<td>34,268</td>
<td>40,238</td>
<td>46,822</td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>6,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriam</td>
<td>11,837</td>
<td>11,008</td>
<td>10,814</td>
<td>-829</td>
<td>-194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe ¹</td>
<td>64,592</td>
<td>92,962</td>
<td>119,993</td>
<td>28,370</td>
<td>27,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>111,803</td>
<td>149,080</td>
<td>171,231</td>
<td>37,277</td>
<td>22,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Village</td>
<td>23,186</td>
<td>22,072</td>
<td>21,479</td>
<td>-1,114</td>
<td>-593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td>37,970</td>
<td>47,996</td>
<td>60,954</td>
<td>10,026</td>
<td>12,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of County</td>
<td>46,942</td>
<td>50,678</td>
<td>53,996</td>
<td>3,736</td>
<td>3,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td>355,054</td>
<td>451,086</td>
<td>534,093</td>
<td>96,032</td>
<td>83,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC MSA</td>
<td>1,636,528</td>
<td>1,836,038</td>
<td>1,998,646</td>
<td>199,510</td>
<td>162,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ City of Olathe estimate for population in 2008 is 124,378. Census estimates are shown to make consistent comparisons.
Residential Construction

Residential construction is directly related to population growth. Olathe and Overland Park both experienced the greatest total gains in population in Johnson County between 2000 and 2008 and both have consistently issued the most residential building permits over this time period. Between 2000 and 2008, Olathe averaged 1,207 new residential units annually, while Overland Park averaged 1,236 units. In 2007 and 2008, both Olathe and Overland Park experienced a significant reduction in residential permit activity as a result of the national recession, as shown in Figure 6. Olathe dropped from 1,385 units in 2006 to 376 units in 2008, while Overland Park dropped from 1,098 to 469 units. While total residential building permit activity was down significantly in 2007 and 2008, the City of Lenexa experienced average permit activity.

Figure 6
Total New Residential Units, 2000-2008
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

Source: MARC
Over the last eight years, Olathe and Overland Park have accounted for 50 to 60 percent of all residential building permit activity in Johnson County, as shown in Table 8. Both Gardner and Lenexa have experienced growth in residential construction during this time period, reaching highs of 15 percent and 17 percent of county market share, respectively in 2007. Through 2008, Lenexa has continued this trend with 24 percent of building permits issued in 2008, although this maybe due to the decline in construction in all other jurisdictions, while Lenexa’s construction activity remained relatively constant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Soto</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgerton</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. Johnson County</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leawood</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenexa</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriam</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Village</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandotte</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Area Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MARC, Economic & Planning Systems
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Residential construction activity in Johnson County is primarily single-family, comprising 70 percent of all new residential units constructed between 2000 and 2008, as shown in Table 9. Of all the municipalities in the County, Olathe has the highest annual level of single-family construction with 929 units per year, or 76 percent of the permits issued in the City. Overland Park has the second highest average with 656 single-family permits per year.

The remaining 30 percent of residential construction in Johnson County is multifamily. Overland Park has the highest average of multifamily units in the County with 581 units per year, or 46 percent of residential activity in the City, well above the average for the County. Olathe has the second highest average with 278 multifamily units per year, or 24 percent of residential activity in the City.
Looking at the entire metro area, Johnson County’s share of residential construction declined from 2001 to 2004, from 43 percent of the total in 2001 to 30 percent in 2004. Since 2004, Johnson County’s market share has been relatively stable at 30 to 32 percent of metro area construction. This may indicate that other counties are becoming more attractive and competitive for residential development, and Olathe and Johnson County should examine building and planning practices in these other areas to maintain a competitive quality of life environment in Olathe. However, there was an unusually large amount of multifamily construction in Johnson County in 2001 (nearly 2,600 units) which explains some of the increase and decrease in market share.

Residential development in Johnson County has declined significantly over the past few years due to the national recession. Once the economy stabilizes and residential development recovers, Olathe is expected to continue to capture similar proportions of the County’s growth. The residential construction forecasts presented later in this report account for a gradual economic recovery over the next few years, and base future year growth on a long term trend which includes several economic cycles.
### Table 9
Residential Construction by Type for Selected Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and Type</th>
<th>2000-2008 Avg. Units Per Year</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gardner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leawood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lenexa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olathe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overland Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shawnee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Johnson County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Johnson County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,163</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MARC, Economic & Planning Systems
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Olathe Demographics

Household Characteristics

As of 2007, both Olathe and Johnson County have a higher share of owner-occupied housing than the Kansas City MSA as a whole, as shown in Table 10. Average household size is also higher in both Olathe and Johnson County than the larger MSA. In contrast, the MSA has more than doubled the amount of vacant housing (8.6 percent) than both Olathe (3.6 percent) and Johnson County (4.5 percent). Due to the increase in housing foreclosures in 2008 and 2009, vacancies are likely higher at this time. As the market recovers, vacancies will return to stabilized levels similar to those in 2007. High rates of homeownership and household size combined with low vacancy rates are representative of suburban communities with a high percentage of families with children and a relatively stable housing market.

Table 10
Housing Tenure and Household Size, 2007
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Olathe</th>
<th>Johnson County</th>
<th>KC MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average HH Size</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MARC, Claritas, Economic & Planning Systems
Income

With median household incomes of roughly $72,000 and $70,000, respectively, both Olathe and Johnson County are considerably more affluent than the Kansas City MSA, as shown in Table 11. The largest household income bracket for all three geographies is the $50,000 to $74,999 range with Olathe at 22.4 percent of total households, Johnson County at 21.4 percent, and the Kansas City MSA at 21.7 percent. Olathe and Johnson County have approximately twice the proportion of households earning $100,000 to $149,999 than the MSA. The MSA also has a considerably higher proportion of lower income households, resulting in a much lower median household income of $54,000 annually.

Table 11
Household Income Distribution, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Olathe</th>
<th>Johnson County</th>
<th>KC MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$24,999</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$249,999</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000-$499,999</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 &gt;</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olathe</th>
<th>Johnson County</th>
<th>KC MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$71,965</td>
<td>$70,143</td>
<td>$54,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MARC, Economic & Planning Systems
H:\18806-Olathe KS Comprehensive Plan\Data\18806-Framework Data Revised.xls\HHI Dist.
**Education**

Both Johnson County and Olathe are generally more educated than the Kansas City MSA as a whole. Almost 50 percent of Olathe residents and over 40 percent of Johnson County residents have attained a Bachelor Degree or higher versus just 29 percent of residents in the MSA, as shown in Figure 7. Of the three geographies, Johnson County, as a whole, has the highest percentage of individuals with a graduate or professional degree at 16 percent.

![Figure 7: Educational Attainment, 2007](image)

Source: MARC
Age

The largest proportion of population in Olathe and Johnson County is in the 35 to 44 age bracket, with 17 and 16 percent, respectively. In Olathe, population over 65 comprises only 5.9 percent of the total, while Johnson County and the larger MSA, with 10.5 and 11.7 percent, respectively, have much higher shares of population over 65.

The City of Olathe is generally younger than both Johnson County and the Kansas City MSA. The median age of residents in Olathe is just under 32, while the median age of both Johnson County and the Kansas City MSA is just under 36 years of age, as shown in Figure 8.

Figure 8
Population Age Distribution
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

Source: MARC
Conclusions

Both Johnson County and Olathe are well positioned in the Kansas City regional economy. Both areas have diversified service-oriented economies that have experienced growth above that of the regional and national economies. Olathe, in particular, has experienced a surge in its employment, growing at an annual rate of over 4.0 percent between 2001 and 2006 and adding nearly 7,500 jobs. Johnson County has a high concentration of “white collar” industries, including Administrative, Professional and Technical, Finance and Insurance, Real Estate, and Educational Services. These are typically well paying jobs that draw an educated workforce and affluent demographic.

The economic growth in Olathe and Johnson County has translated into high population growth. While Johnson County is growing at nearly double the rate of the region, Olathe’s population grew three times faster than the region. This high growth has also been captured in residential construction.

Olathe consistently captures 30 percent of total county residential construction, and issued an average of 1,200 new residential building permits per year from 2000 to 2008. In Olathe, single family homes comprise 76 percent of annual construction, on average. Households in both Olathe and Johnson County are considerably more affluent and well-educated with median incomes and educational attainment levels well above those of the Kansas City MSA. Olathe has a younger population with a median age below that of the Kansas City MSA.

Olathe plays an important role in both the local and regional economies, especially in accommodating new employment and residential growth. However, Olathe no longer functions solely as a stand alone community and government center. It is part of the larger Johnson County and Kansas City metropolitan area economy. Regional and national economic events will affect Olathe, as well as local growth and economic development issues. Pending national economic recovery, Olathe and Johnson County are expected to continue experiencing strong employment and residential growth.
This chapter presents housing unit forecasts for the City of Olathe through 2030. First, historic housing growth rates are determined from building permits and housing unit trends in Johnson County and Olathe to form a baseline housing unit forecast. Second, the Mid-American Regional Council (MARC) forecasts are compared to the historical trends for housing units and building permits to determine a reasonable 2030 forecast. Finally, the housing forecast is converted to acreage to estimate land demand over the plan’s time horizon.

In this section, historic housing unit trends in Johnson County and Olathe are analyzed to determine a projected rate of housing growth. Next, Olathe’s current and expected market share is determined to project Olathe’s housing unit growth for the next 30 years.

### Historic Housing Unit Growth and Building Permit Trends

From 2000 to 2008 there were a total of 37,500 residential building permits issued in all of Johnson County, as shown in Table 12. New residential construction occurred at an average pace of 4,200 units per year. In Olathe, there were 10,900 new residential permits issued, or 1,200 per year from 2000 to 2008. From 2000 to 2008 Olathe captured 29 percent of new residential construction in Johnson County.

#### Table 12

**Historical Residential Unit Construction, 2000–2008**

Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Ann. Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>11,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,476</td>
<td>6,155</td>
<td>4,036</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>4,314</td>
<td>4,308</td>
<td>3,755</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>37,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>8,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>10,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of County</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Through September 2009

Source: City of Olathe, MARC, Economic & Planning Systems
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To establish the forecast base, City and County building permit are added to the 2000 census housing counts. In 2000, Johnson County had 181,612 housing units. After adding the 37,468 of housing units permitted since 2000, there are an estimated 219,080 housing units in Johnson County in 2008. During the past eight years, Olathe permitted 10,864 housing units making the total housing unit count for Olathe 44,207 in 2008, as shown in Table 13. Over the 18-year period from 1990 to 2008, Johnson County added over 74,925 housing units, at an annual rate of increase of 2.4 percent. This is equivalent to 4,200 new units per year. Over this same time period, Olathe added over 21,000 new housing units, or almost 1,200 annually. This results in a capture of 28 percent of the Johnson County housing market.

Table 13
Historical Housing Unit Growth, 1990-2008
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>Ann. #</td>
<td>Ann. %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>144,155</td>
<td>181,612</td>
<td>219,080</td>
<td>74,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>22,908</td>
<td>33,343</td>
<td>44,207</td>
<td>21,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of County</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MARC, City of Olathe, Economic & Planning Systems
Table 14 projects housing unit growth for Johnson County and Olathe based on the historical trends shown above. As shown above, the pace of housing unit growth in Johnson County has been consistent from 1990 to 2000 and from 2000 to 2008, at approximately 4,150 units per year. Olathe has consistently captured 28 percent of the new housing construction in the County, which is equivalent to 1,180 units per year. Based on the assumption that Johnson County growth will remain consistent, as it has for the past 18 years, Olathe is estimated to continue to capture 28 percent of the County’s housing growth.

Building permit totals through September 2009 show a large slow down in housing construction in Johnson County and Olathe. For 2009, Johnson County is on track to permit 1,000 housing units and Olathe is expected to permit just over 300. To develop a long range housing development forecast, a figure for average annual housing unit construction is calculated based on historical trends. For a development forecast that spans several decades, this average figure accounts for the ups and downs of individual development cycles. For the purpose of this long term forecast, it is estimated that in 2010 construction will begin to increase with 2,000 units in Johnson County and 560 for Olathe. From 2011 to 2015 the forecast shows a gradual recovery to historic permit levels in Johnson County and Olathe, with 4,000 units permitted in 2015. For the remaining forecast years, County construction is estimated to return to an average pace of 4,150 units per year, consistent with the past 18 years which included at least two recessions.

Table 14
Forecasted Housing Unit Growth Based, 2008-2030
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>Ann. #</th>
<th>Ann. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,250</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>219,080</td>
<td>220,080</td>
<td>222,080</td>
<td>224,080</td>
<td>226,580</td>
<td>229,580</td>
<td>233,080</td>
<td>237,080</td>
<td>257,830</td>
<td>299,330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Units</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,470</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>44,207</td>
<td>44,487</td>
<td>45,047</td>
<td>45,607</td>
<td>48,307</td>
<td>47,147</td>
<td>48,127</td>
<td>49,247</td>
<td>55,057</td>
<td>66,677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Units</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MARC, City of Olathe, Economic & Planning Systems
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Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) Forecasts

As part of its role as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Kansas City Region, the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) produces population and household forecasts by census tract and city through 2030. This section examines the MARC forecast and compares their forecast to historic growth patterns and market trends in order to judge the reasonableness of the housing unit projection.

MARC forecasts Johnson County will grow by 96,000 households, 23,000 households in Olathe, by 2030. Household projections can be translated to housing unit demand by applying a vacancy rate to account for vacant units, as shown in Table 15. Based on Census data, Olathe and Johnson County have historically averaged between 3 and 5 percent vacancy. By applying a 4 percent vacancy rate, the resulting demand for new housing units is approximately 100,000 in Johnson County between 2008 and 2030, or over 4,500 units annually. Applying this same vacancy rate to Olathe household projections results in 24,000 new housing units by 2030, or almost 1,100 annually. The overall pace of growth forecasted by MARC is slightly higher than the independent housing unit projections shown in Table 14 and does not account for the impact of the current recession.

Table 15
Household and Housing Unit Forecasts, 2008-2030
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>2008 1</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Change 2008-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>Ann. #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td>208,639</td>
<td>262,729</td>
<td>304,713</td>
<td>96,075 4,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>4% Vacancy</td>
<td>217,332</td>
<td>273,677</td>
<td>317,410</td>
<td>100,078 4,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,752</td>
<td>54,707</td>
<td>64,928</td>
<td>23,176 1,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>4% Vacancy</td>
<td>43,492</td>
<td>56,986</td>
<td>67,633</td>
<td>24,141 1,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of County</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2008 total derived from 2007 base number increased by MARC’s forecasted growth rate

Source: MARC, Economic & Planning Systems
Baseline Housing and Land Demand Forecast

In this section, EPS’ housing unit projection is converted to land demand for the 2008 to 2030 planning horizon.

Baseline Housing Forecast

By 2030, Olathe is forecasted to have 66,700 housing units, as shown in Table 16. The housing forecast is converted to different unit types by applying the city’s distribution of new construction by type over the past five years. Based on this distribution, 16,340 new single-family detached homes are projected to be added by 2030, or roughly 740 units per year. Olathe is also projected to add 2,340 low density multifamily units (e.g. townhomes and duplexes), or 104 per year, and 3,850 multifamily units (e.g. apartments and condos), or 175 per year.

Table 16
Projected Housing Units by Type, 2008-2030
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Types</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Change 2008-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum. Housing Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,207</td>
<td>55,057</td>
<td>66,677</td>
<td>22,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in Structure (^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Detached</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>32,140</td>
<td>40,029</td>
<td>48,477</td>
<td>16,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Multifamily</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>6,768</td>
<td>2,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (5+ units)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7,579</td>
<td>9,440</td>
<td>11,432</td>
<td>3,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44,207</td>
<td>55,057</td>
<td>66,677</td>
<td>22,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Housing Demand</th>
<th></th>
<th>2008-2020</th>
<th>2021-2030</th>
<th>Change 2008-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>Ann. #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>11,620</td>
<td>22,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in Structure (^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Detached</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>7,888</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>16,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Multifamily</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>2,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (5+ units)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>3,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>11,620</td>
<td>22,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Based on City Building Permits 2002-2008
Source: City of Olathe, Economic & Planning Systems
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Baseline Residential Land Demand Forecast

Housing unit demand is converted to land demand by dividing the number housing units by a density factor (gross units per acre) derived from the existing residential densities in Olathe. In order to accommodate projected housing growth, Olathe is forecasted to require a minimum of 6,100 additional residential acres by 2030. This translates to 310 new residential acres annually, as shown in Table 17. Required acres were estimated using gross residential densities set per existing residential densities by housing type. Based on this distribution, 5,400 single-family (detached) acres, 400 low density multifamily acres and 300 multifamily acres are projected to be required. This demand would be accommodated in a combination of existing platted but unbuilt lots and new subdivisions.

Existing residential densities were used because it would be difficult to forecast the amount of development that would occur in existing platted but unbuilt lots rather than new subdivisions at the recommended Plan densities which are higher in some cases. Some new development would also occur as infill. Infill and redevelopment could be in the range of 5 to 15 percent of new development. On average, new development may approximate the existing densities as the majority of the residential land in the Plan is Conventional Neighborhood which is expected to develop at approximately 3 units per acre.

Table 17
Projected Residential Land Demand (Acres), 2008-2030
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Types</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>2008-2020</th>
<th>2021-2030</th>
<th>Change 2008-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>11,620</td>
<td>22,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Detached</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>7,888</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>16,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Multifamily</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>2,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (5+ units)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>3,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>11,620</td>
<td>22,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Absorption (Acres)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Gross Density(^2)</th>
<th>2008-2020</th>
<th>2021-2030</th>
<th>Change 2008-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF Detached</td>
<td>3 DU/Acre</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Multifamily</td>
<td>6 DU/Acre</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (5+ units)</td>
<td>12 DU/Acre</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Rounded to Nearest 10

\(^2\) Based on City of Olathe Residential Zoning

Source: City of Olathe, Economic & Planning Systems
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4. **EMPLOYMENT LAND DEMAND**

This chapter presents an analysis of office market, industrial market, and employment trends and forecasts in order to estimate future land demand for employment uses as an input to the Comprehensive Plan. It begins with an overview of office and industrial regional market trends. Next, City of Olathe office and industrial construction trends are evaluated to estimate Olathe’s market share for these land uses. Finally, an Olathe employment land demand forecast is presented.

**Office Market**

This analysis of office market trends is based on information provided by Colliers, Turley, Martin and Tucker, the Kansas City Office of Colliers International. The data set includes single tenant and multi-tenant leased buildings larger than 10,000 square feet. It does not include owner occupied buildings. Johnson County has two major office submarkets: North Johnson County and South Johnson County. The City of Olathe falls within in the South Johnson County office submarket as shown in Figure 9. The South Johnson County submarket is bounded by the K-10 on the north and the Johnson County border to the east, south, and west. It includes Olathe and portions of Lenexa, Overland Park, and Leawood.

**Inventory**

The South Johnson County office submarket is the largest in the Kansas City Metro Area in terms of total space with 14.6 million square feet, as shown in Table 18 and Figure 10. The South Johnson County submarket accounts for almost 30 percent of the total space in the metro area. The South Johnson County submarket has added the most office space of any submarket in the last decade with 3.8 million square feet of new space, which is a 3.4 percent annual increase. By comparison the Kansas City Metro Area as a whole has grown at an annual rate of 2.5 percent. The South Johnson County submarket accounted for 41 percent of the metro area office market growth from 1999 to 2008. The majority of the office development in Johnson County has taken place along the I-435/Highway10 Corridor and College Boulevard Corridor.
Figure 9
Kansas City Metro Area Office Submarkets
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

Source: Colliers International
### Table 18
Office Space Inventory, 1999-2008
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>Ann. #</td>
<td>Ann. %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>9,980,000</td>
<td>9,980,000</td>
<td>10,255,000</td>
<td>10,525,000</td>
<td>11,049,000</td>
<td>10,925,000</td>
<td>11,295,000</td>
<td>11,390,000</td>
<td>11,193,000</td>
<td>11,193,000</td>
<td>1,213,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>27,393,000</td>
<td>29,091,000</td>
<td>30,681,000</td>
<td>31,366,000</td>
<td>32,030,000</td>
<td>32,490,000</td>
<td>32,866,000</td>
<td>33,687,000</td>
<td>34,253,000</td>
<td>35,318,000</td>
<td>7,925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Johnson County</td>
<td>10,766,000</td>
<td>11,507,000</td>
<td>12,333,000</td>
<td>12,622,000</td>
<td>12,794,000</td>
<td>12,929,000</td>
<td>13,110,000</td>
<td>13,556,000</td>
<td>13,977,000</td>
<td>14,565,000</td>
<td>3,799,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Johnson County</td>
<td>5,111,000</td>
<td>5,427,000</td>
<td>5,515,000</td>
<td>5,694,000</td>
<td>6,061,000</td>
<td>6,150,000</td>
<td>6,186,000</td>
<td>6,135,000</td>
<td>6,304,000</td>
<td>6,468,000</td>
<td>1,357,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>1,987,000</td>
<td>2,330,000</td>
<td>2,740,000</td>
<td>2,740,000</td>
<td>2,740,000</td>
<td>2,784,000</td>
<td>2,877,000</td>
<td>3,141,000</td>
<td>3,141,000</td>
<td>3,443,000</td>
<td>1,456,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East/SE Jackson County</td>
<td>2,826,000</td>
<td>2,873,000</td>
<td>3,120,000</td>
<td>3,171,000</td>
<td>3,309,000</td>
<td>3,222,000</td>
<td>3,286,000</td>
<td>3,379,000</td>
<td>3,340,000</td>
<td>3,351,000</td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kansas City</td>
<td>2,902,000</td>
<td>2,902,000</td>
<td>2,921,000</td>
<td>3,087,000</td>
<td>3,087,000</td>
<td>3,087,000</td>
<td>3,073,000</td>
<td>3,073,000</td>
<td>3,088,000</td>
<td>3,088,000</td>
<td>186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
<td>2,365,000</td>
<td>2,616,000</td>
<td>2,616,000</td>
<td>2,603,000</td>
<td>2,882,000</td>
<td>2,882,000</td>
<td>2,928,000</td>
<td>2,928,000</td>
<td>2,928,000</td>
<td>2,928,000</td>
<td>563,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,436,000</td>
<td>1,436,000</td>
<td>1,436,000</td>
<td>1,436,000</td>
<td>1,436,000</td>
<td>1,436,000</td>
<td>1,452,000</td>
<td>1,475,000</td>
<td>1,475,000</td>
<td>1,475,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Total</td>
<td>37,373,000</td>
<td>39,071,000</td>
<td>40,936,000</td>
<td>41,891,000</td>
<td>43,079,000</td>
<td>43,415,000</td>
<td>44,161,000</td>
<td>45,077,000</td>
<td>45,446,000</td>
<td>46,511,000</td>
<td>9,138,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Colliers International; Economic & Planning Systems
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Figure 10
Office Inventory
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

Source: Colliers International
Vacancy

The average office vacancy rate for the South Johnson County submarket over the past decade was 13.8 percent, as shown in Table 19. The average vacancy rate for the metro area over the past decade was 16 percent. The entire Kansas City metro area office market is recovering from a period of high vacancies that began in 2001 and 2002. In 2003, metro area vacancy peaked at 20.8 percent. In 2007, vacancy dropped to 15.9 percent, but increased again to 17.1 percent by the end of 2008, reflecting a slowing national and regional economy. The South Johnson County vacancy rate has been consistently lower than or equal to the vacancy rates in the Downtown submarket, the combined suburban submarkets, and the metro wide average for the last 10 years. This lower vacancy and the large amount of development over the past 10 years illustrate Johnson County’s competitiveness in the office market.

Table 19
Office Space Vacancy Trends, 1999-2008
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submarket</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East/SE Jackson County</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Johnson County</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Johnson County</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kansas City</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Total</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Colliers International; Economic & Planning Systems
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Industrial Market

Inventory

The Industrial submarkets in the Kansas City Metro Area are shown in Figure 11. Johnson County is the second largest industrial submarket in the Kansas City metro area with just over 50 million square feet of industrial space, as shown in Table 20. Johnson County is second to Jackson County, Missouri, which has over 54 million square feet of industrial space. Johnson County has experienced the most growth in industrial space with the addition of 11.2 million square feet from 1999 to 2008. Johnson County captured 47 percent of the industrial growth over the past 10 years.
Figure 11
Kansas City Metro Area Industrial Submarkets
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

Source: Colliers International
Table 20
Johnson County Industrial Space Trends, 1999-2008
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>Ann. %</td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>Ann. %</td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>Ann. %</td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>Ann. %</td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>Ann. %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson County</td>
<td>49,577,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>51,095,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>51,927,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>52,560,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>52,965,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>53,378,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td>39,164,000</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>41,098,000</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>42,644,000</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>43,712,000</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>44,320,000</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>45,332,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandotte County</td>
<td>24,653,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>25,071,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>25,381,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>25,648,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>25,770,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>25,701,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Park/Northland Park</td>
<td>12,640,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>13,674,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>13,862,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>14,187,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>14,187,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>14,187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kansas City</td>
<td>15,356,000</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>15,356,000</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>15,345,000</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>15,345,000</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>15,289,000</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>15,289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland/Other</td>
<td>13,457,000</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>13,759,000</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>14,041,000</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>14,302,000</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>14,407,000</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>14,803,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCI</td>
<td>3,091,000</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3,230,000</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3,490,000</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3,490,000</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3,576,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>1,617,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1,617,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1,617,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1,716,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1,716,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1,716,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass County</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>308,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Total</td>
<td>159,864,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>165,208,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>168,524,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>171,268,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>172,468,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>174,251,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176,379,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>177,921,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>180,697,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>183,876,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,012,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Colliers International; Economic & Planning Systems

H:\18806-Olathe KS Comprehensive Plan\Data\18806-Office and Industrial Data.xls\Industrial Inventory Trend
Vacancy

Over the past decade, Johnson County’s average vacancy rate of 7.1 percent is the lowest of all the submarkets in the Kansas City Metro area, as shown in Table 21. The metro wide average vacancy rate in the past 10 years has been 7.8 percent. In 2008 in Johnson County the vacancy rate was 6.2 percent, which is lower than the metro wide average of 6.6 percent, and lower than Jackson County’s vacancy rate of 7.3 percent.

Table 21
Johnson County Industrial Space Vacancy, 1999-2008
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submarket</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jackson County</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandotte County</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Park/Northland Park</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kansas City</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland/Other</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCI</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass County</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Total</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Colliers International; Economic & Planning Systems
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Metro-wide industrial vacancy peaked at 10.3 percent in 2003 and has dropped to 6.6 percent at the end of 2008. The industrial vacancies rates are generally less than half the office vacancy rate, indicating that the industrial market is more stable than the office market.
**Olathe Construction Trends**

Commercial construction in the City of Olathe has been strong over the last seven years averaging over 1.0 million square feet per year as shown in Table 22. Between 2002 and 2008, the City of Olathe permitted 2.2 million square feet of industrial space and almost 2.3 million square feet of office space. Approximately 70 percent of the new office and industrial space permitted over the last seven years was built from 2005 to 2007, or 5.2 million square feet of the 7.5 million of new permitted space. In 2008, the City permitted 658,350 square feet of space, suggesting a return to levels experienced between 2002 and 2004 during a national recession.

Table 22
**City of Olathe Commercial Building Permit Trends, 2002-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Types</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ann. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>58,266</td>
<td>513,410</td>
<td>67,848</td>
<td>469,225</td>
<td>387,729</td>
<td>463,021</td>
<td>303,057</td>
<td>2,262,556</td>
<td>323,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>478,302</td>
<td>136,967</td>
<td>165,657</td>
<td>680,358</td>
<td>302,883</td>
<td>326,439</td>
<td>87,991</td>
<td>2,178,597</td>
<td>311,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>131,100</td>
<td>79,909</td>
<td>109,155</td>
<td>465,454</td>
<td>51,166</td>
<td>1,403,151</td>
<td>46,643</td>
<td>2,277,578</td>
<td>325,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61,441</td>
<td>326,660</td>
<td>247,436</td>
<td>220,659</td>
<td>857,595</td>
<td>122,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>667,668</td>
<td>721,286</td>
<td>342,660</td>
<td>1,676,478</td>
<td>1,069,838</td>
<td>2,440,046</td>
<td>658,350</td>
<td>7,576,326</td>
<td>1,082,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Olathe, Economic & Planning Systems

To compare the metro area and Johnson County office trends to City of Olathe office construction data, EPS analyzed the Olathe data by building size to isolate construction in multi tenant buildings larger than 10,000 square feet. This was necessary because the County and metro area trend data only include multi tenant buildings larger than 10,000 feet. Between 2002 and 2008, Olathe permitted over 2.2 million square feet of office space. Of the 2.2 million square feet of office space, 44 percent (990,606 square feet) was in buildings larger than 10,000 feet. Between 2002 and 2008, Olathe permitted over 2.2 million square feet of office space. Of the 2.2 million square feet of office space, 44 percent (990,606 square feet) was in buildings larger than 10,000 feet, as shown in Table 23. The majority of the remaining office space was in single user owner-occupied buildings, both public and private, or in medical office buildings. Single user build-to-suit buildings represented 31 percent of the total square footage built, as shown in Table 23.

Between 2002 and 2008, there were 6 buildings permitted larger than 100,000 square feet. These six buildings represented 47 percent of the total permitted office space since 2002. Four of these six large buildings were built for single users, including a 391,450 square foot building built for Garmin International in 2003. This was the largest office building constructed between 2002 and 2008. The 163,353 square foot US Bank National Data Center was built in 2008. Farmers Insurance constructed a 144,720 square foot building in 2005. A 127,935 square foot office building for Johnson County built in 2005. Two of the six largest permitted buildings were speculative office buildings. These two buildings were 141,000 and 104,000 square feet respectively. The presence of these types of buildings shows that the City of Olathe is attracting speculative office development, single user, and build-to-suit development.
Table 23  
City of Olathe Office Building Permits, 2002-2008  
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Ann. Avg</th>
<th>Total % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spec./Multi-tenant Over 10,000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>70,143</td>
<td>40,564</td>
<td>48,090</td>
<td>294,972</td>
<td>376,037</td>
<td>109,300</td>
<td>141,515</td>
<td>990,606 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec./Multi-tenant Under 10,000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>23,918</td>
<td>76,257</td>
<td>6,703</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>17,813</td>
<td>124,691 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single User/Build to Suit</td>
<td>39,145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144,720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163,353</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99,932</td>
<td>699,523 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,136</td>
<td>180,244</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,435</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,402</td>
<td>247,815 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Service</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>8,925</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,253</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,486</td>
<td>11,582</td>
<td>11,855</td>
<td>82,987 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/Other</td>
<td>38,562</td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td>9,872</td>
<td>16,712</td>
<td>116,984</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58,266</td>
<td>513,410</td>
<td>67,848</td>
<td>469,225</td>
<td>387,729</td>
<td>463,021</td>
<td>303,107</td>
<td>323,229</td>
<td>2,262,606 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Olathe, Economic & Planning Systems  
H:\18806-Olathe KS Comprehensive Plan\data\18806-permit data.xls\Office by type

Olathe Capture Rate

The City of Olathe has captured a large share of new office development in Johnson County. The two Johnson County office submarkets, North Johnson County and South Johnson County, have added over 3.1 million square feet of new office space between 2002 and 2008 in leased buildings over 10,000 square feet in size. During that same time period, the City of Olathe permitted slightly less than 1.0 million square feet of office space in buildings over 10,000 square feet in size. Therefore, Olathe captured approximately 31 percent of the Johnson County office market and 18 percent of the metro area office market, as shown in Table 24.

The City of Olathe permitted 2.2 million square feet of industrial space from 2002 and 2008. This represents a 29 percent capture rate of the growth in the Johnson County industrial submarket, as shown in Table 25. These capture rates will be used to estimate future demand for employment land. An adjustment is also applied to account for the single user/built to suit market.
### Table 24
#### City of Olathe New Office Space Capture, 2002-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Types</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Yearly Average</th>
<th>2002-2008 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Inventory</td>
<td>18,316,000</td>
<td>18,855,000</td>
<td>19,079,000</td>
<td>19,296,000</td>
<td>19,691,000</td>
<td>20,281,000</td>
<td>21,033,000</td>
<td>20,444,000</td>
<td>20,886,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Additions</td>
<td>468,000</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>224,000</td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td>395,000</td>
<td>590,000</td>
<td>752,000</td>
<td>617,000</td>
<td>455,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Area Inventory</td>
<td>41,891,000</td>
<td>43,079,000</td>
<td>43,415,000</td>
<td>44,161,000</td>
<td>45,077,000</td>
<td>45,446,000</td>
<td>46,511,000</td>
<td>20,060,000</td>
<td>31,237,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Additions</td>
<td>955,000</td>
<td>1,188,000</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>746,000</td>
<td>916,000</td>
<td>369,000</td>
<td>1,065,000</td>
<td>796,429</td>
<td>5,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Olathe Permitted Space</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>70,143</td>
<td>40,564</td>
<td>48,090</td>
<td>294,972</td>
<td>378,037</td>
<td>109,300</td>
<td>990,606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Johnson County Net Additions</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Metro Net Additions</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Speculative/Multi-Tenant Office Buildings over 10,000 square feet in size

Source: Colliers International; City of Olathe; Economic & Planning Systems

H:\18806-Olathe KS Comprehensive Plan\Models\18806-Office-Industrial Land Demand.xls\Office Capture Rate

### Table 25
#### City of Olathe New Industrial Space Capture, 2002-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Types</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Yearly Average</th>
<th>2002-2008 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Inventory</td>
<td>43,712,000</td>
<td>44,320,000</td>
<td>45,332,000</td>
<td>46,178,000</td>
<td>46,864,000</td>
<td>48,604,000</td>
<td>50,367,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Additions</td>
<td>1,068,000</td>
<td>608,000</td>
<td>1,012,000</td>
<td>846,000</td>
<td>686,000</td>
<td>1,740,000</td>
<td>1,763,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Area Inventory</td>
<td>171,268,000</td>
<td>172,468,000</td>
<td>174,251,000</td>
<td>176,379,000</td>
<td>177,921,000</td>
<td>180,697,000</td>
<td>183,876,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Additions</td>
<td>2,744,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,783,000</td>
<td>2,128,000</td>
<td>1,542,000</td>
<td>2,776,000</td>
<td>3,179,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Olathe Permitted Space</td>
<td>131,100</td>
<td>70,909</td>
<td>109,155</td>
<td>465,454</td>
<td>51,166</td>
<td>1,403,151</td>
<td>9,643</td>
<td>320,083</td>
<td>2,240,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Johnson County Net Additions</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Metro Net Additions</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Colliers International; City of Olathe; Economic & Planning Systems

H:\18806-Olathe KS Comprehensive Plan\Models\18806-Office-Industrial Land Demand.xls\Industrial Capture Rate
Land Demand Forecast

The demand for office and industrial land is based on expected employment growth in Johnson County and Olathe’s capture of the growth in the county.

Employment Forecast

The MARC 2030 employment forecast was judged to be reasonable for long term land use forecasting and planning. A long term forecast averages out shorter periods of growth and recession and reflects the average growth expected over a longer time frame. This employment forecast is used as the basis for estimating the demand for employment land for the 2030 planning horizon. Employment in Johnson County is expected to grow at 1.9 percent annually from 2000 to 2030. This growth rate will produce 232,000 new jobs in Johnson County between 2000 and 2030.

Office and Industrial Land Demand

In order to relate employment growth to the demand for office and industrial space, a ratio is calculated that represents square feet of office and industrial space per job in the County. Examining employment trends and the inventory of office and industrial space shows that there were an average of 50 square feet of office space per job and an average of 120 square feet of industrial space per job from 2001-2006, as shown in Table 26.

Table 26
Johnson County Square Feet per Employee Ratio
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Johnson County</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Inventory (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>17,848,000</td>
<td>18,316,000</td>
<td>18,855,000</td>
<td>19,079,000</td>
<td>19,296,000</td>
<td>19,691,000</td>
<td>18,847,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>373,890</td>
<td>379,810</td>
<td>373,450</td>
<td>384,110</td>
<td>393,910</td>
<td>404,590</td>
<td>383,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq. Ft./Total Jobs Ratio (Rounded)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Inventory (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>42,644,000</td>
<td>43,712,000</td>
<td>43,712,000</td>
<td>45,332,000</td>
<td>46,178,000</td>
<td>46,864,000</td>
<td>44,740,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>373,890</td>
<td>373,810</td>
<td>373,450</td>
<td>384,110</td>
<td>393,910</td>
<td>404,590</td>
<td>383,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq. Ft./Total Jobs Ratio (Rounded)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Economic and Planning Systems

H:\18806-Olathe KS Comprehensive Plan\Models\O\18806-Office-Industrial Land Demand.xls\Ratio 1 Adjust.
MARC forecasts an increase of over 231,600 jobs in Johnson County between 2007 and 2030. Applying the historic square feet per job ratios determined for office and industrial space results in estimated demand of over 11.5 million square feet of office space and 27.8 million square feet of industrial space in Johnson County by 2030, as shown in Table 27.

**Table 27**  
**Johnson County Office and Industrial Space Projection, 2007-2030**  
**Olathe Comprehensive Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment¹</td>
<td>411,019</td>
<td>487,210</td>
<td>590,731</td>
<td>642,695</td>
<td>231,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Sq. Ft. per Job</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Sq. Ft. per Job</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Demand (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>20,551,000</td>
<td>24,361,000</td>
<td>29,537,000</td>
<td>32,135,000</td>
<td>11,584,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Demand (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>49,322,000</td>
<td>58,465,000</td>
<td>70,888,000</td>
<td>77,123,000</td>
<td>27,801,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ 2007 Employment is estimated from 2006 BEA Total Employment grown forward one year at a historic growth rate of 1.6 percent annually.  
Source: MARC; Economic & Planning Systems

The estimated demand for new office space in Johnson County is based on the inventory of multi tenant office buildings larger than 10,000 square feet. Approximately 30 percent of the office market in Olathe is in single user buildings not included in the baseline inventory. Therefore the estimated demand for office space is inflated by 30 percent to account for single user buildings. As well, approximately 20 percent of the office space in Olathe is in buildings smaller than 10,000 square feet or publicly owned office buildings. To account for this space, the demand for office space in Olathe was inflated an additional 20 percent.

To estimate Olathe’s potential share of office and industrial development, a capture 30 percent for office and industrial space is applied, as estimated earlier in this section. Once the estimated 30 percent capture rate for new office space is applied, there is an estimated demand for almost 5.2 million square feet of additional office space in Olathe by 2030, as shown in Table 28. Using an average figure of 7,460 square feet of development per acre based on existing office development in the City of Olathe, and adding 50 percent for planning flexibility, office land demand is estimated at 1,050 additional acres by 2030.

Using the 30 percent capture rate for industrial space, the estimated additional industrial demand in Olathe is 8.3 million square feet by 2030. Using an average figure of 7,898 square feet of development per acre for industrial development and adding 50 percent for planning flexibility, the estimated industrial land demand is expected to be 1,500 new acres by 2030.

For land planning, the “new demand” columns on the right hand side of the table represent the amount of new development forecast. These figures should be used in land use planning, rather than the cumulative numbers by year.
Table 28
Olathe Office and Industrial Land Demand Capture, 2007-2030
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Office Estimated Inventory (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>20,551,000</td>
<td>24,361,000</td>
<td>29,537,000</td>
<td>32,135,000</td>
<td>11,584,000</td>
<td>503,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Office Demand (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>6,165,300</td>
<td>7,308,300</td>
<td>8,861,100</td>
<td>9,640,500</td>
<td>3,475,200</td>
<td>151,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+30% for Build to Suite/Single User Buildings</td>
<td>1,850,000</td>
<td>2,192,000</td>
<td>2,658,000</td>
<td>2,892,000</td>
<td>1,042,000</td>
<td>45,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+20% for Other Buildings not in Inventory</td>
<td>1,233,000</td>
<td>1,462,000</td>
<td>1,772,000</td>
<td>1,928,000</td>
<td>695,000</td>
<td>30,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Olathe Office Demand</td>
<td>9,248,300</td>
<td>10,962,300</td>
<td>13,291,100</td>
<td>14,460,500</td>
<td>5,212,200</td>
<td>226,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Avg. Sq. Ft. per Acre</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Office Land Demand (Acres)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Olathe Office Land Demand (+50%)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Industrial Demand (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>49,322,000</td>
<td>58,465,000</td>
<td>70,888,000</td>
<td>77,123,000</td>
<td>27,801,000</td>
<td>1,208,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Capture Rate of Industrial Demand</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Industrial Demand (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>14,796,600</td>
<td>17,539,500</td>
<td>21,266,400</td>
<td>23,136,900</td>
<td>8,340,300</td>
<td>362,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Average Sq. Ft. per Acre</td>
<td>7,898</td>
<td>7,898</td>
<td>7,898</td>
<td>7,898</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Industrial Land Demand (Acres)</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Olathe Industrial Land Demand (+50%)</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 50% increase to allow for changes in demand and to accommodate planning flexibility

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
H:\18806-Olathe KS Comprehensive Plan\Model\[18806-O Basic Office Industrial Land Demand 04-05-10.xls\]Ratio 1 Adjust Capture
5. **Retail Land Demand**

This section examines retail and commercial development trends and future demand for retail and commercial space. First, retail development patterns in Olathe are summarized followed by an analysis of retail expenditure potential. Next, the supportable retail space is estimated based on the growth of the City’s population and related household expenditures. Finally, retail land demand is estimated from 2007 to 2030 based on the projected market demand for retail space.

**Olathe Trade Area**

Retail businesses derive their sales from local area residents, residents of the larger region, and visitors including both tourists and business travelers. The Urban Land Institute (ULI) defines a trade area as the geographic area from which a retail facility consistently draws most of its customers. The actual boundaries of a trade area are arbitrary but are based on logical jurisdictional or geographic boundaries. The focus of this analysis is to estimate the retail demand supported by the anticipated growth in the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the City boundaries define the retail trade area.

This analysis estimates the market potentials for three retail scales or formats: neighborhood/community retail, regional retail and shoppers goods, and Downtown retail. These retail store types and development formats are described below.

**Retail Definitions**

The retail market is segmented into store groupings based on shopping and trade area characteristics listed below.

- **Convenience Goods** – This category includes supermarkets and convenience stores, as well as liquor, drug, and other specialty food stores. These stores generally sell frequently purchased, low cost items with little product differentiation. The primary locations for convenience goods stores are the supermarket-anchored neighborhood shopping centers and smaller convenience centers, as these items are most often bought close to home.

- **Shoppers Goods** – This category includes general merchandise, apparel, furniture, appliance, and specialty goods stores. Large stores selling shoppers goods include traditional department stores, as well as discount department stores. The product lines of these stores are generally more expensive, less frequently purchased items. In general, people are more likely to comparison shop for shopper’s goods, and are often more willing to travel farther to buy them. The primary locations for regional shopper’s goods are traditional downtown shopping districts, regional shopping centers, free-standing discount department and membership warehouse stores, and power centers dominated by mass merchandise tenants.

- **Eating and Drinking Establishments** – This category includes restaurants, such as conventional sit-down and fast food, and bars. Businesses in this category exhibit some of the characteristics of convenience stores in that many restaurant expenditures are made frequently at establishments close to home and on a frequent basis. However, some higher quality restaurants, more unique in the marketplace, can have a regional draw.
• **Building Materials/Nurseries** – This category is made up of stores selling lumber, paint, glass, hardware, plants and garden supplies, and other retail items related to home improvement. Home improvement centers, such as Home Depot and Lowe’s, are the largest stores in this category.

**Retail Development Formats**

The store groupings described above do not translate directly into specific land use or zoning designations. Retail development typically occurs when several compatible and complementary store types can be attracted to a project. As a result, several fairly standard retail development formats have emerged. The various retail formats can be categorized as follows:

• **Neighborhood Center** – This category refers to supermarket-anchored shopping centers ranging from 80,000 to 150,000 square feet that generally contain a mix of convenience goods and personal services. Neighborhood centers typically contain a small mix of convenience-oriented ancillary retail stores such as drugstores, dry cleaning, video stores, and restaurants. This format typically requires a population density of 20,000 people in a two-mile radius.

• **Community Center** – This category, anchored by a discount supercenter, is the modern replacement of the traditional community center featuring a supermarket and small department store. Community centers are generally around 300,000 square feet total, including a supercenter of 100,000 square feet or greater plus ancillary retail space. Community centers generally serve a three- to five-mile trade area.

• **Power Center** – This category refers to large, open strip centers with three to five mid-box or big-box tenants as anchors. These anchors can account for as much as 75 percent of the gross leasable area in the center, with other small to mid-sized retailers integrated as ancillary space. Power Centers range from 300,000 to over 1.0 million square feet of space.

• **Lifestyle Center** – This category refers to more upscale, specialty retail centers featuring a “main street“ concept in an open-air configuration. Lifestyle centers are generally between 300,000 and 500,000 square feet and include specialty retail tenants, upscale or “trendy” eating establishments, and often entertainment or civic components. One or more department stores may be included as anchors, but these are generally smaller than full-size stores. More recently, a hybrid of lifestyle and power centers has emerged. These typically range from 600,000 to 1.0 million square feet. This hybrid center is beginning to replace the traditional enclosed regional mall.

• **Regional Mall** – This category refers to large-scale, enclosed or semi-enclosed malls anchored by four or more department stores with a high concentration of inline shops. As a result of the concentration of department stores and diversity of tenants, these malls serve a larger regional role than power centers. Regional malls range in size, but are generally around 1.0 million square feet in gross leasable area and serve a trade area of five to fifteen miles or beyond depending on population density. Due to a number of factors, few new regional malls are currently being built, and a greater number of existing malls are being redeveloped as lifestyle centers.
Downtown Retail

Some suburban communities have been able to maintain strong downtown retail conditions despite competition from suburban style retail development, reflected in the retail prototypes described above. Downtown retail in a smaller town setting such as Olathe is often characterized by a mix of eating and drinking establishments, specialty/miscellaneous retail (galleries, jewelers), and some shoppers goods (apparel, home furnishings, books, and music). Downtown retail is ‘un-anchored’ compared to the suburban retail model, but successful downtowns amass enough contiguous individual businesses so that the business district itself is the anchor.

Establishing new downtown retail is challenging because it is difficult to attract a significant amount of new retail without a strong anchor. Also, the quality or attractiveness of the downtown setting is critical to developing successful downtown retail. Therefore there is a ‘chicken and egg’ problem in that retailers may not be willing to locate downtown before investments are made to improve the downtown experience (public spaces, building renovations, etc.), and the public may not be willing to invest in a downtown if it sees no viable business activity. Generally, a combination of land use policies, public investment and incentives, public-private development partnerships, and private sector pioneers are required to revitalize downtowns.
Retail Development Patterns

The existing retail inventory in Olathe is important to consider, as the distribution of stores and retail centers affect future retail development opportunities due to the competitive nature of retail development. An inventory of major shopping centers in Olathe is summarized below in Table 29 and mapped in Figure 12. There are approximately 4.5 million square feet of regional retail development in Olathe, including the 1.1 million square foot Great Mall of the Great Plains. Community shopping centers comprise approximately 2.2 million square feet. In total, there are approximately 8.3 million square feet of retail in Olathe. Retail development is concentrated along major arterials near their junctions with I-35. The City’s largest agglomerations of retail are at I-35 and 119th Street, along 135th Street, and near the Great Mall of the Great Plains in south Olathe. Retail development is weighted to the east of I-35 while there is less retail west of I-35.

Table 29
Major Shopping Centers
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olathe Retail Centers</th>
<th>GLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Retail Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Mall of the Great Plains</td>
<td>1,162,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Gateway/Entertainment District</td>
<td>678,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Station</td>
<td>657,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge Plaza</td>
<td>376,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate Retail Center</td>
<td>355,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Pointe</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Bob Marketplace</td>
<td>323,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alden Center</td>
<td>320,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Landing</td>
<td>315,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,537,400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Shopping Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Park</td>
<td>259,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>226,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossroads</td>
<td>205,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Village</td>
<td>205,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Square</td>
<td>151,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Square</td>
<td>150,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowland Commons</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Square</td>
<td>137,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Market</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebud Plaza</td>
<td>132,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plaza</td>
<td>123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119th Plaza</td>
<td>113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Gate</td>
<td>110,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeview Marketplace</td>
<td>105,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,199,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,266,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Olathe, Economic & Planning Systems
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Olathe’s retail centers are typically anchored by one or two major retailers in the following categories; grocery stores, discount department/supercenters, warehouse clubs, and home improvement centers. Olathe has seven grocery stores, five discount department/supercenters, no warehouse clubs and four home improvement centers, as shown in Table 30. The locations of these major tenants are illustrated at the end of this chapter in Figures 13 through 16. Olathe does not have a warehouse club (e.g. Costco or Sam’s). From a perspective of the City’s fiscal health, the inventory of these major anchors is important as they are large sales tax generators, and Olathe competes with surrounding jurisdictions to attract major retailers.

Comparing the retail center anchors in Olathe to the surrounding communities of Overland Park and Lenexa shows that Olathe has been competitive in attracting most of the typical discount retail anchors. The seven supermarkets would serve approximately 42,000 households, as grocers size stores for approximately 6,000 households. Absent supercenters, Olathe’s grocery demand would appear well balanced. Olathe also has three supercenters that have large grocery sections, indicating that the City may be slightly over supplied in the grocery category. The store coverage in the supercenter category appears adequate for the existing population. Olathe is therefore capturing at least 85 to 90 percent of convenience goods expenditures. Any leakage is primarily in the natural/specialty foods category, as there is a Whole Foods in Overland Park.
There are no warehouse clubs in Olathe; however Lenexa and Overland Park each have two stores in this category. Olathe is therefore experiencing some leakage in this category. However, these stores have some overlap with supercenters and other general merchandise stores indicating that Olathe’s overall capture of general merchandise expenditures is still fairly high, estimated at approximately 70 percent.

Olathe has four home improvement centers, which is a large share of this market. These stores likely draw customers from Overland Park, Lenexa, and more rural Johnson County communities.

Table 30
Olathe Area Retail Anchor Inventory
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Types</th>
<th># of Stores</th>
<th>Lenexa/Overland Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Olathe</td>
<td>Overland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen House Supermarket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hy-Vee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Chopper</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Foods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Department Stores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal-Mart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kmart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal-Mart Supercenter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse Clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam’s Club</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Improvement Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Depot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
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Total Personal Income (TPI)

Retail expenditures in the trade area are estimated from total personal income (TPI). TPI is calculated by multiplying the population or number of households within a defined geographic area by the per capita income or average household income for the area. In this case, existing and future households for the City of Olathe are multiplied by average household income for the City of Olathe. As of 2008, there were almost 44,000 households in Olathe with an average household income of nearly $84,000, as shown in Table 31. This results in a TPI of $3.5 billion. In 2030, TPI for the City of Olathe is projected to be almost $5.3 billion, an increase of $1.8 billion.

Table 31
Olathe Total Personal Income, 2008-2030
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Unit Forecast</td>
<td>44,207</td>
<td>45,047</td>
<td>49,247</td>
<td>55,057</td>
<td>66,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Vacancy</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>41,997</td>
<td>42,795</td>
<td>46,785</td>
<td>52,304</td>
<td>63,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average HH Income ¹</td>
<td>$83,958</td>
<td>$83,958</td>
<td>$83,958</td>
<td>$83,958</td>
<td>$83,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personal Income ($000s)</td>
<td>$3,525,955</td>
<td>$3,592,953</td>
<td>$3,927,946</td>
<td>$4,391,352</td>
<td>$5,318,164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas, Economic & Planning Systems
Retail Sales Potential

Retail expenditures in the trade area are estimated by applying the percent of income spent by retail store category, as determined by the U.S. Census of Retail Trade state-level data for Kansas, to the calculated trade area TPI. The result is the dollar amount that trade area residents are expected to spend regardless of location, as shown in Table 32. Households spend approximately 34.8 percent of their income in these retail categories.

Table 32
Olathe Retail Sales Potential, 2008-2030
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Percent of TPI</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Olathe, TPI (000s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,525,955</td>
<td>$3,592,953</td>
<td>$4,391,352</td>
<td>$5,318,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods (000s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>$217,987</td>
<td>$222,129</td>
<td>$271,489</td>
<td>$328,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer, Wine, &amp; Liquor Stores</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$24,441</td>
<td>$24,905</td>
<td>$30,439</td>
<td>$36,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>$84,635</td>
<td>$86,243</td>
<td>$105,408</td>
<td>$127,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Convenience Goods</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>$327,062</td>
<td>$333,277</td>
<td>$407,335</td>
<td>$493,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopper's Goods (000s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Department Stores</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>$46,197</td>
<td>$47,075</td>
<td>$57,536</td>
<td>$69,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Department Stores</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>$88,303</td>
<td>$89,981</td>
<td>$109,975</td>
<td>$133,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse Clubs, Supercenters, &amp; Other GM</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>$179,156</td>
<td>$182,561</td>
<td>$223,128</td>
<td>$270,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Merchandise</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>$313,657</td>
<td>$319,617</td>
<td>$390,639</td>
<td>$473,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Shopper's Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Accessories</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>$72,102</td>
<td>$73,473</td>
<td>$89,799</td>
<td>$108,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Home Furnishings</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>$48,234</td>
<td>$49,150</td>
<td>$60,072</td>
<td>$72,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; Appliances</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>$44,255</td>
<td>$45,096</td>
<td>$55,117</td>
<td>$66,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, &amp; Music Stores</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>$42,779</td>
<td>$43,592</td>
<td>$53,279</td>
<td>$64,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Retail</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>$50,354</td>
<td>$51,311</td>
<td>$62,713</td>
<td>$76,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>$257,725</td>
<td>$262,623</td>
<td>$320,980</td>
<td>$388,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating and Drinking (000s)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>$174,106</td>
<td>$177,414</td>
<td>$216,838</td>
<td>$262,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material &amp; Garden (000s)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>$152,829</td>
<td>$155,733</td>
<td>$190,339</td>
<td>$230,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail Goods (000s)</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>$1,225,379</td>
<td>$1,248,663</td>
<td>$1,526,131</td>
<td>$1,848,228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2002 Census of Retail Trade (Kansas), Economic & Planning Systems

Olathe’s total retail expenditure potential in 2008 was $1.2 billion based on an average of 34.8 percent of income spent on retail. Convenience goods and general merchandise each make up about one quarter of retail purchases. Total retail expenditures are expected to grow to $1.85 billion in 2030 based on population and household growth forecasts.
Supportable Retail Space

Supportable retail space is estimated by dividing retail sales potential by industry averages for sales per square foot. These sales per square foot factors range from $250 per square foot in some shoppers goods categories to approximately $450 per square foot in supermarkets, as shown in Table 33. The demand estimates assume 100 percent local capture of expenditures (no leakage or inflow of expenditures) for planning purposes, which isolates the expenditure potential and demand generated by Olathe residents.

The analysis focuses on the growth in retail demand shown on the right hand side of the table. By 2030, the growth in Olathe household expenditures supports an additional 2.16 million square feet of retail space. This does not translate directly into square feet of retail development, however. Some store categories require minimum thresholds of demand to justify new stores, and the demand figures should be allocated to different land use or development formats.

Demand by Store Category

Convenience Goods

By 2030, Olathe is estimated to support an additional 674,000 square feet of convenience goods space including 247,000 square feet in supermarkets. This is equivalent to four to five new full service supermarkets. New supermarkets would likely trigger development of new community shopping centers, ranging from approximately 100,000 to 150,000 square feet.

General Merchandise

Demand in the general merchandise category is estimated to support 466,000 square feet, including 94,000 square feet in the department store category, 129,000 square feet in the discount department store category, and 243,000 square feet in the warehouse club/supercenter category. This indicates that in the next 20 to 25 years, Olathe could support an additional department store, which could be a component of the repositioning or redevelopment of the Great Mall of the Great Plains. The department store, combined with the significant amount of demand in the other shoppers goods category suggests that a larger ‘lifestyle’ type retail project could be supported in the future. This would help Olathe capture expenditure leakage in the higher end retail categories that are present in Overland Park. Again, this could be a new project or part of a reconfigured Great Mall of the Great Plains.

An additional discount department store, such as a Target or Wal-Mart is also likely in Olathe. The demand in the discount department store and warehouse/supercenter category suggests that a warehouse club is a likely opportunity, plus a supercenter or large discount department store such as SuperTarget.

Eating and Drinking

Eating and drinking space demand is estimated at 295,000 square feet by 2030. These businesses would locate in shopping centers, as freestanding businesses, in a downtown setting, or in a larger regional retail or lifestyle project.
**Building Material and Garden**

The 2008 demand figures indicate that Olathe supports 510,000 square feet in this category, which is well covered by the four home improvement centers and other miscellaneous hardware stores. A fifth home improvement center is possible, and would more likely locate west of I-35 or further south in areas yet to be annexed or developed.
Table 33
Olathe Potential Supportable Retail Square Footage, 2007-2030
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Sales Per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Supportable Space</th>
<th>New Retail Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>484,000</td>
<td>494,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer, Wine, &amp; Liquor Stores</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>339,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Convenience Goods</td>
<td>$1,327,000</td>
<td>1,352,000</td>
<td>1,652,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopper's Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Department Stores</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Department Stores</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>252,000</td>
<td>257,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse Clubs, Supercenters, &amp; Other GM</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>478,000</td>
<td>487,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Merchandise</td>
<td>$915,000</td>
<td>932,000</td>
<td>1,139,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Shopper's Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Accessories</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>206,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Home Furnishings</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td>197,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; Appliances</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, &amp; Music Stores</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>171,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Retail</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$919,000</td>
<td>936,000</td>
<td>1,145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating and Drinking</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>591,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material &amp; Garden</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>519,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail Goods</td>
<td>$4,251,000</td>
<td>4,330,000</td>
<td>5,293,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2002 Census of Retail Trade (Kansas), Economic & Planning Systems
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Supply and Demand Comparison

Olathe currently has 4.73 million square feet of retail space dedicated to retail goods in traditional store categories analyzed, as shown in Table 34, which is approximately 474,000 more square feet than the estimated demand for space based on Olathe’s population. Some of this additional supply of retail space is supported by inflow of retail sales from neighboring cities and unincorporated areas.

The Convenience Goods store category appears to have a lack of supply of retail space with only 774,000 square feet of occupied space, but a demand for almost 1.3 million square feet. Considering the current configuration of supercenters like Wal-Mart and Target, which include significant grocery sections, a significant portion of grocery sales are likely made in these supercenters and not in traditional grocery stores. The Other Convenience Stores category includes Convenience/Gas Stations, Beer, Wine and Liquor stores, and Health and Personal Care stores. The lack of convenience goods oriented space, like the grocery space, can most likely be attributed to the purchasing of convenience items at supercenter stores by Olathe residents.

General Merchandise store category includes traditional department stores, discount department stores, supercenters and warehouse clubs. Olathe has an estimated over supply of general merchandise space of 200,000 square feet. However, as mentioned above, it is likely that the supercenters that fall in this category likely account for a significant portion of convenience and grocery sales. These stores also likely draw some inflow from exurban Johnson County communities. Olathe has no warehouse clubs and likely leaks retail sales in this general merchandise sub-category.

The Other Shoppers Goods category would appear to have and over supply of approximately 800,000 square feet. However this analysis is not accounting for the inflow of sales from surrounding communities. For example, Bass Pro Shops is in the Sporting Goods, Hobby, Books, and Music category and is a one-in-the-market store which attracts significant sales inflows. Olathe also has a large amount of square footage in the Furniture and Home Furnishings category, which is also attracting sales inflows.

The remaining store categories of Eating and Drinking space and Building Materials and Garden Centers are estimated to have an adequate amount of space present in Olathe to serve the demand of the residents.
### Table 34
Comparison of Supportable Retail Space and Supply
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Supportable 2008 (Demand)</th>
<th>Existing Occupied Space (Supply)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convenience Goods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets</td>
<td>484,000</td>
<td>431,000</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Convenience Stores</td>
<td>843,000</td>
<td>343,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Convenience Goods</strong></td>
<td>1,327,000</td>
<td>774,000</td>
<td>553,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shopper's Goods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Merchandise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Department Stores</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Department Stores/Warehouse Clubs</td>
<td>730,000</td>
<td>938,000</td>
<td>208,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Merchandise</strong></td>
<td>915,000</td>
<td>1,118,000</td>
<td>203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Shopper's Goods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Accessories</td>
<td>206,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Home Furnishings</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td>519,000</td>
<td>326,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; Appliances</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, &amp; Music Stores</td>
<td>171,000</td>
<td>376,000</td>
<td>205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Retail</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>414,000</td>
<td>213,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>919,000</td>
<td>1,709,000</td>
<td>790,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Shopper's Goods</strong></td>
<td>1,834,000</td>
<td>2,827,000</td>
<td>993,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eating and Drinking</strong></td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>616,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Material &amp; Garden</strong></td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>508,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Retail Goods</strong></td>
<td>4,251,000</td>
<td>4,725,000</td>
<td>474,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2002 Census of Retail Trade (Kansas), City of Olathe, Economic & Planning Systems
Other General Commercial and Vacant Space

While it appears that Olathe has an adequate supply of retail space to serve its demand and attract an inflow retail sales in traditional store categories, there is a significant over supply of retail/general commercial space in Olathe. According to the Johnson County Appraiser, there are currently 8.3 million square feet of total retail oriented space in Olathe, as shown in Table 35. Colliers, Turley, Martin and Tucker (Colliers) estimated the percentage of vacant retail space in the South Johnson County submarket, which includes Olathe, as 10.7 percent at the end of 2008. The Colliers data does not include retail centers built before 1980 or smaller than 40,000 square feet, therefore it is likely the retail vacancy in Olathe is higher than 10.7 percent, especially for older or small retail centers.

The estimated amount of vacant retail space in Olathe is therefore at least 900,000 square feet, which means there is an estimated 7.4 million square feet of occupied retail space in Olathe. Almost 5 million square feet, or 64 percent, of the occupied space in Olathe is occupied by retail stores that sell retail goods in traditional store formats and are not service, maintenance, or automobile oriented. Automobile Sales, Services, or part sales related space occupies 12 percent of the retail/commercial space in Olathe. The remaining 25 percent of space, or 1.8 million square feet, is occupied by a wide-variety including service oriented retail spaces such as banks, insurance offices, law offices, health clubs, and other similar uses.

Table 35
Olathe Occupied Commercial Space Inventory, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Retail Space</td>
<td>8,326,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Johnson County Vacancy</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Retail Space</td>
<td>7,435,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupied Retail Space</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Goods Oriented Space</td>
<td>4,725,000</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Sales and Service Related Space</td>
<td>864,000</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Retail/Commercial Space</td>
<td>1,846,000</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,435,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Johnson County Appraiser, Economic & Planning Systems
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To estimate the land demand for retail, the above analysis is considered along with a final allocation of demand by format to address land planning for community/neighborhood retail, regional/comparison shopper’s goods, and downtown retail. The estimated retail space is based of a demand analysis for retail goods. An estimated 35 percent of all commercial/retail space in Olathe consists of miscellaneous service or automobile oriented tenants, rather than the traditional retail store categories. Therefore, the retail land demand forecast has been inflated to include this additional 35 percent of space for automobile and service oriented users. A planning factor of 50 percent is also included for increased land use and market flexibility.

Community/Neighborhood Retail

The majority of convenience goods stores locate in community/neighborhood centers, estimated at 75 percent, as shown in Table 36. Approximately half of general merchandise, 10 percent of other shoppers goods, and 45 percent of eating and drinking are also allocated to this development type. This results in almost one million square feet of space, or about six new community shopping centers by 2030. As shown, this would require approximately 125 acres for traditional suburban style development. Adding a factor for land use planning flexibility and market competition results in approximately 250 acres of community/neighborhood center retail land demand.

Regional Retail

Regional retail development occurs in large increments triggered by attracting an anchor store. For example, a new SuperTarget (175,000 square feet) could trigger development of a larger power center of approximately 300,000 square feet requiring approximately 35 acres. Alternatively, supercenters and warehouse clubs may choose a freestanding location, resulting in more but smaller sites. Based on the demand analysis, the anchor tenant opportunities suggest that two to four large shopping center/power center sites should be expected by 2030. Also, the plan should accommodate for a future major lifestyle retail project. This could be a greenfield project or part of a redevelopment effort in the vicinity of the Great Mall of the Great Plains. As shown, the 310 acres of estimated land demand would be adequate to accommodate these uses.

Downtown Retail

Downtown retail is estimated to capture 5 percent of convenience goods, such as a convenience store, health and beauty supply store, or a small specialty/gourmet foods store for example. Ten percent of other shopper’s goods, and 10 percent of eating and drinking are also allocated to downtown resulting in a total potential of 110,000 square feet. However, creating a significant retail and entertainment node downtown will require the development of a catalyst project(s) that would help make downtown Olathe a destination for shopping and entertainment. A catalyst project may involve public/civic uses, financial incentives, and public-private partnerships to develop public-owned land in the downtown core. Downtown densities are expected to be higher than suburban retail densities, as downtown retail is often developed as part of mixed use projects.
### Table 36
**Olathe Commercial Land Area Requirements, 2008-2030**

#### Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>% of Space by Retail Format</th>
<th>2008-2020</th>
<th>2020-2030</th>
<th>2008-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Convenience Goods</td>
<td>75% 5% 20%</td>
<td>243,750 16,250 69,800</td>
<td>261,750 17,450 69,800</td>
<td>505,500 33,700 139,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopper's Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>50% 0% 50%</td>
<td>112,000 0 112,000</td>
<td>121,000 0 121,000</td>
<td>233,000 0 233,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Shoppers Goods</td>
<td>10% 10% 80%</td>
<td>22,600 22,600 180,800</td>
<td>24,100 24,100 192,800</td>
<td>46,700 46,700 373,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Shopper's Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td>134,600 22,600 292,800</td>
<td>145,100 24,100 313,800</td>
<td>279,700 46,700 606,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating and Drinking</td>
<td>45% 10% 45%</td>
<td>64,350 14,300 64,350</td>
<td>68,400 15,200 68,400</td>
<td>132,750 29,500 132,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material &amp; Garden</td>
<td>0% 0% 100%</td>
<td>0 0 124,000</td>
<td>0 0 135,000</td>
<td>0 0 259,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail Goods Space (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>442,700 53,150 550,950</td>
<td>475,250 56,750 587,000</td>
<td>917,950 109,900 1,137,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Average Sq. Ft. per Acre</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,344 7,344 7,344</td>
<td>7,344 7,344 7,344</td>
<td>7,344 7,344 7,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail Land Demand (Acres)</td>
<td>60 7 75</td>
<td>65 8 80</td>
<td>125 15 155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Commercial Land Demand (+35%)</td>
<td>81 10 101</td>
<td>87 10 108</td>
<td>169 20 209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Demand (+50%)</td>
<td>120 10 150</td>
<td>130 20 160</td>
<td>250 30 310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 35% increase to account for general commercial, automobile, and service uses that locate in retail space
2. 50% increase to allow for changes in retail and to accommodate planning flexibility

Source: Economic & Planning Systems
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Olathe Area Home Improvement Centers
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[Map showing the location of home improvement centers in Olathe, Kansas.]
6. **FUTURE LAND USE AND FUTURE DEMAND COMPARISON**

This Chapter provides a comparison of the 2030 land demand forecasts to the Comprehensive Plan land use designations (full buildout of the City) to ensure that the Plan allocates sufficient land to accommodate the next 20 years of growth. First, the Plan's land use designations are aggregated into major land use categories. Then total buildout capacity is estimated using the future land use densities. Buildout capacity is compared to the 2030 forecasts in the last step.

**Future Land Use**

From the future land use map acreages have been calculated for each land use designation in the Plan. The largest land use designation is the Conventional Neighborhood category with 21,309 acres or 36 percent of all land, as shown in **Table 37**. The Greenway/Open Space designation is the second largest with 25 percent of the land. Land designated for Employment and Industrial uses are 6 percent and 7 percent, respectively, of future land use in Olathe.

**Table 37**

**Future Land Use by Acre**  
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Greenway</td>
<td>8,677</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Greenway</td>
<td>5,809</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Corridor</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center / Downtown District</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development District</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial Center</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial Center</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial Center</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Residential Neighborhood</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Neighborhood</td>
<td>21,309</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation / Cluster Neighborhood</td>
<td>4,871</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>58,798</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several of the proposed land use categories allow for a mixture of uses. The mixture of uses by acre in each category, estimated by City staff and EDAW|AECOM, is shown in Tables 38 and 39. These factors were used to estimate the City’s total buildout capacity in Table 40 for comparison to the 2030 forecast figures.

Table 38
Future Land Use Allocations (Percentages)
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Commercial Corridor</th>
<th>Urban Center / Downtown</th>
<th>Transit-Oriented Development Center</th>
<th>Regional Commercial Center</th>
<th>Community Commercial Center</th>
<th>Neighborhood Commercial Center</th>
<th>Central Business District</th>
<th>Mixed Use Residential Neighborhood</th>
<th>Conservation / Green Neighborhood</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39
Future Land Use Allocations (Acres)
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Commercial Corridor</th>
<th>Urban Center / Downtown</th>
<th>Transit-Oriented Development Center</th>
<th>Regional Commercial Center</th>
<th>Community Commercial Center</th>
<th>Neighborhood Commercial Center</th>
<th>Central Business District</th>
<th>Mixed Use Residential Neighborhood</th>
<th>Conservation / Green Neighborhood</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>13,638</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>13,638</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3,084</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>3,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>21,309</td>
<td>4,871</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>3,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. Final Report
Future Land Use and Demand Comparison

The future land use map is compared to the land demand forecasts for 2030 in Table 40, accounting for mixing employment and commercial uses in the mixed use land use areas. It also summarizes the estimated buildout capacity of Olathe under the new future land use (FLU) categories. At the forecasted absorption rates, the City has approximately 80 years of supply in commercial/retail land. The office land supply is estimated at about 60 years, while the industrial land supply is approximately 35 to 40 years. The supply of residential land is estimated to last approximately 50 years.

The Plan designates extensive areas for employment development along key corridors such as K-10/College Boulevard and K-7, and the K-7/I-35 area. These areas are strategically located along major regional access roadways and are ideal for high visibility corporate sites. It is an important strategic decision to ensure sufficient land capacity in these locations in order to be competitive for regional employment growth. However, considering the areas of underperforming, obsolete, and vacant retail, the City could consider reducing the amount of retail in the Plan and/or future zoning as part of a strategy to redirect retail growth to redevelopment areas. This should be done strategically to ensure that locations for new regional retail projects (e.g. a lifestyle center or "town center" project, or power centers) are reserved in the path of growth, surrounded by a large enough trade area (housing), or located such that they could capture sales leakage to adjacent communities.

Table 40
Future Land Use and Demand Comparison
Olathe Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Retail</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>3,236</td>
<td>2,831</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>10,415</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>16,565</td>
<td>24,806</td>
<td>14,391</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Olathe, Economic & Planning Systems
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Plan Olathe proposes a number of “Big Ideas” aimed at improving the quality of development in Olathe and to improve the overall quality of life and attractiveness of the community. From an economic perspective, all of these proposed policies and investments would help Olathe continue to compete for economic and residential growth in the Kansas City metro area. A summary of the economic implications of key policies and investments is provided in this section.

**Quality of Life and Economic Competitiveness**

Quality of life has a broad meaning in urban planning and economic development. It refers to the livability of an area as defined by numerous community characteristics and indicators such as public safety, quality of educational opportunities, entertainment and cultural amenities, as well as environmental quality and access to open space, parks, and recreation opportunities. While the value of quality of life it is not typically quantified, high quality of life correlates with positive economic growth.

Metropolitan areas in the U.S. are transitioning from heavy industry and manufacturing towards more knowledge-based industries and ‘footloose industries’ whose profits are not tied to their locations. These industries rely less on access to raw materials, heavy infrastructure, and energy supplies, and more on skilled labor. As a result, attracting a skilled and talented labor pool is key to economic development for knowledge-based industries. A city’s success in economic development, especially in high-tech, R&D, and other footloose industries, is therefore tied to its ability to attract and retain highly educated professional employees and entrepreneurs. As other sectors of the economy become more dependent on technology and knowledge, attracting and retaining these skilled employees will become increasingly important.

Knowledge workers often have more flexibility than others in choosing where to live, and quality of life is often a major factor in their decisions. As a result, businesses sometimes need to seek out high-amenity locations to satisfy their labor force requirements. Wages for knowledge professionals are often determined at the national level and do not vary significantly across metropolitan areas or individual cities. Professionals therefore include quality of life factors in choosing between locations and job opportunities. These location decisions are self reinforcing, as the continued location of knowledge based firms attracts additional knowledge workers. Knowledge workers are then often involved in their communities to maintain and improve quality of life through advocating for policies to improve schools, to invest in additional community amenities, and to mitigate the negative impacts of rapid growth.
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Quality of life can also reduce a company’s costs by decreasing employee turnover and even directly lowering wages. High quality of life leads to lower employee absenteeism, better loyalty, higher productivity, and lower health care costs.\(^5\) Workers are also willing to accept lower wages and higher housing costs in return for a higher quality of life. Amenity-poor locations must compensate for the lower quality of life with higher wages and lower real estate costs.\(^6\)

- A 1991 study of 174 Colorado companies that chose to relocate to Colorado found that among businesses of 40 people or less, 26 percent stated open space and recreation opportunities as the primary reason for their relocation decision.\(^7\)

- A 2003 study analyzed the effect between proximity to national parks, lakeshores, seashores, and recreation areas on the 90 largest metropolitan areas. Its results indicate that individuals are willing to take a 4.0 percent pay cut to work in an area with these amenities located 100 miles closer.\(^8\)

- Highly skilled workers are more willing to pay for improvements to public schools and parks.\(^9\)

- A USDA study focused on natural amenities such as a favorable climate, topographic variation, and water features showed that areas with a higher concentration of natural amenities achieved higher population growth rates from 1970 to 1996 than less scenic areas.\(^10\)

- A 1998 report by the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City found that the most scenic rural areas experienced growth in non-farm self-employment (sole proprietors) of nearly 4 percent per year while the least scenic areas grew at half that rate.\(^11\)

Much of the existing economic research on the relationships between economic development and quality of life relates more to the residential and household amenity factors that drive location decisions, rather than workplace amenities that drive more site-specific business locations. Some researchers suggest that nearby workplace amenities also play a roll in business location decisions. Workplace amenities include a mix of supportive businesses, including restaurants, retail, entertainment, and services that support a busy professional lifestyle. This mix of
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businesses and development is also attractive to businesses that need to entertain clients in high quality restaurants, clubs, or sports/entertainment venues.\textsuperscript{12} This desire for a diverse mix of supporting businesses and services indicates that mixed use and more urban settings may be more attractive to some firms and their employees.

**Parks, Open Space, and Recreation**

Plan Olathe proposes extensive new areas of greenways, parks, and multi-use paths (bicycle and pedestrian). These types of natural and open space amenities have been shown to have positive impacts on real property values and public health.

Land that is protected from development, either for recreational use, habitat conservation, or natural resource protection such as water, has a tangible value that is hard to measure. One of the primary benefits of open space and conservation lands is increased quality of life. While the value of quality of life is not often quantified, quality of life has a direct link to economic development and community vitality that can be measured in other ways.

It has been well established that proximity to open lands and conservation areas enhances property values.\textsuperscript{13} The “proximate principal” describes the correlation between higher property values and proximity to open lands, natural areas, and parks.

- A 2001 study of 16,747 single family homes in Portland, Oregon found that homes within 1,500 feet of a natural park supported a 16 percent premium in value.\textsuperscript{14}
- Conversion of one acre of developable pasture land in Maryland to conservation land increased the average value of the adjacent neighborhood residential properties by $3,307.\textsuperscript{15}
- A 2001 study in Lawrence, Kansas demonstrated a 9 percent premium for houses adjacent to undeveloped prairie land.\textsuperscript{16}

Although less research has been conducted on community-wide benefits as a result of open space purchases, the following studies found a positive correlation.

- A 1996 analysis of Boulder, Colorado open space purchases found that the 15,000 acres purchased between 1981 and 1995 led to an overall increase of 3.75 percent in the City’s real


estate values. Importantly, the study controlled for changes in employment, rents, the housing stock, as well as vacancies and mortgage rates\textsuperscript{17} to isolate the effect of increased open space.

- A 1971 study of 15 parkland acquisitions in Pennsylvania Townships by Pennsylvania State Parks compared changes in property values to Townships without parkland. The study reported that Townships with newly acquired parkland experienced a 6 percent increase in land value in the five years after acquisition.\textsuperscript{18}

Expanding open space and recreation opportunities and integrating bicycle paths as transportation options will also improve the health of Olatheans. Approximately two-thirds of American adults are overweight or obese. Children who commute to school by cycling or walking gain two to three fewer pounds per year than children who go to school using motorized transportation.\textsuperscript{19} The larger development pattern of a community also affects public health. People who live in mixed use neighborhoods with a variety of transportation options have lower body mass than those who live in exclusively residential neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{20}

**Future Transit Opportunities**

Plan Olathe anticipates future transit service, consisting of a potential regional rail connection to other areas of the metro area, and expanded local transit service, potentially a bus rapid transit (BRT) system. Broadly, the economic benefits of transit improvements consist of increased mobility and labor force access; reduced congestion; travel time savings; air quality improvements; reduced fossil fuel consumption; reduced carbon and other tailpipe emissions; and improved quality of life flowing from these other benefits.

Depending on the destinations and frequency of service, fixed rail transit has been demonstrated to have direct positive real estate development impacts. With more frequent service to more attractive destinations (e.g., major employment centers and shopping and entertainment districts) the development impacts are greater. The development impacts of rail transit generally occur within reasonable walking distance, ¼ to ½ mile, of a transit station. There have been numerous studies that have quantified the real estate impacts of transit\textsuperscript{21}, with some key examples summarized below.
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\textsuperscript{20} “Can Urban Design Make you Fat? Researchers study the link between obesity and the urban environment” Science Daily, February 2006.

• In suburban and southeast Denver, Colorado, office buildings with direct access to light rail stations have lower vacanies and higher rents than buildings without direct light rail access. New buildings with direct access to light rail stations were leasing up much faster than new buildings further away from stations. Major corporate tenants were willing to pay more in rent for light rail access.\(^22\)

• Residential properties within ¼ mile of a Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) light rail station increased in value by 32 percent from 1997 to 2001, compared to 19.5 percent in a control group without DART station access. Office buildings within ¼ mile of a station showed 14 percent value premium over buildings without DART access.\(^23\)

• Since 1999, the total value of real estate development attributable to the presence of a DART station is estimated at $4.3 billion.\(^24\)

• In the Silicon Valley, commercial properties within ¼ mile of a commuter rail station had a $25 per square foot value premium over comparable properties away from stations.\(^25\)

• Portland, Oregon is one of the most often cited examples of the economic and environmental benefits of transit. Through aggressive investments in bus, light rail, and streetcar systems, vehicle miles traveled per capita has declined by 6 percent since 1990, in contrast to the average for U.S. cities which has grown by 10 percent.\(^26\) Since 1997, 55 percent of all development within Portland’s central business district has occurred within one block of the streetcar line. Three and a half billion dollars of investment has occurred within ¼ mile of the streetcar.\(^27\) However, Portland also has strong regional growth management policies and policies that favor infill and redevelopment, which may increase the impact of transit investments compared to other regions.

In North America the economic impacts of BRT have not been proven, other than potential travel times savings, reduced congestion, and reduced carbon emissions compared to single occupancy vehicles. Rubber tired transit does not convey the same sense of permanence and investor confidence that is perceived from fixed rail investments. Nevertheless, the increased mobility and equity in transportation choice are economic benefits that will be realized from any transit system improvements.
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\(^{24}\) Ibid.


Downtown Reinvestment

Downtown Olathe is part of Olathe’s front door along the West Santa Fe Street Corridor (West 135th Street). Downtown has suffered from a lack of private investment and increased competition from suburban retail development. As a result, there is a large amount of vacant ground floor retail space along Cherry and Chestnut Streets and Kansas Avenue. Residential conditions surrounding Downtown have also degraded over the years, although there are some signs of reinvestment exhibited by renovations to older homes.

The Envision Olathe Downtown Plan (2003) recommended a number of capital projects to improve the infrastructure and create a better pedestrian environment. These include Santa Fe Street streetscaping (underway), BNSF east track grade separation (completed), and a new parking structure (completed). The City has made good progress on the recommendations identified in the Downtown Plan, however private investment has not yet returned to Downtown. This suggests a need for more aggressive strategies, additional public investment, and a policy to direct retail and commercial growth to existing commercial centers, including Downtown. This report has shown that the demographics of Olathe can support approximately 125,000 square feet of new retail development in Downtown over the next 25 years. However, without a strong commitment by the City to invest in public amenities and to aggressively incentivize redevelopment, this development potential will not be realized.

The experience of numerous downtowns and central city locations around the country has shown that a few well-targeted catalyst projects, public-private development projects, and infrastructure investments can trigger a cascading effect of additional redevelopment activity. Over time these initial investments are repaid with an overall increase in property values, economic activity, and the associated tax revenues.

Having a vibrant commercial area with a mix of diverse businesses, restaurants, and services is also important to the skilled workforce that is crucial to economic growth. Busy professionals enjoy having a mix of services and retail opportunities close to their place of work, as a time saver and as a lifestyle amenity.

Residential property values have been shown to be related to the quality of a commercial corridor, where homes closer to high quality commercial corridors command higher prices than those near low quality corridors.28 “High quality” corridors were generally areas with low vacancies and a walkable pedestrian environment. Low quality commercial corridors were generally more automobile oriented, with wide cross-section streets, few if any pedestrian or bicycle access amenities, and higher vacancies. Homes located within ¼ mile of high quality corridors values had a 23 percent value premium associated with proximity to the commercial corridor.

The same study also found that investments in neighborhood greening, such as streetscaping and tree planting, pocket parks, and median plantings resulted in 28 percent gains in comparable home values. Homes located in business improvement districts (BIDs) were found to be worth 30 percent more than homes not in a BID.