



City of Kansas City, Missouri

Docket Memo

Ordinance/Resolution #

Submitted Department/Preparer: Parks and Recreation

Docket memos are required on all ordinances initiated by a Department Director. More information can be found in [Administrative Regulation \(AR\) 4-1](#).

Executive Summary

Request approval and recommend that the City Council enact an election ordinance that would present to the voters of Kansas City, Missouri on an August 8, 2023 or November 7, 2023 ballot, a question about whether 5.399 acres of park property generally located between N. Oak Trafficway and N. Holmes at 32nd Terrace be removed from the Parks System of the City of Kansas City, Missouri and empowering the City to convey said real property

Discussion

City Charter Section 1004(b) reads: "If any property is determined by the Board of Parks and Recreation Commissioners to be no longer necessary or appropriate for park, parkway, or boulevard use, such property may be removed from the park system by a vote of the people."

Kansas City Parks and Recreation acquired an unnamed parkland in 1957 when the Kansas City annexed land north of the Missouri River. No improvements have been made to the property, not are there any plans for developing this park area. The Board of Parks and Recreation Commissioners has identified this land as being appropriate to decommission.

This tract is located in the Southeast Quarter of Section 11, Township 50 North, Range 33 West, in Kansas City, Clay County, Missouri, being more particularly described as follows: SEC 11-50-33 SE1/4 BRAECKLEING'S SUBDIVISION PT LTS 6 & 15 BEG 120'N OF NW COR N HOLMES & NEW 32ND ST, N450, W655, NW632, S100,SE TO POB.

Fiscal Impact

1. Is this legislation included in the adopted budget? Yes No
2. What is the funding source?
N/A
3. How does the legislation affect the current fiscal year?
N/A
4. Does the legislation have fiscal impact in future fiscal years? Please notate the difference between one-time and recurring costs.
N/A
5. Does the legislation generate revenue, leverage outside funding, or deliver a return on investment?
N/A

City of Kansas City, Missouri

Docket Memo



Office of Management and Budget Review (OMB Staff will complete this section.)

1. This legislation is supported by the general fund. Yes No
2. This fund has a structural imbalance. Yes No

Additional Discussion (if needed)

Click or tap here to enter text.

Citywide Business Plan (CWBP) Impact

View the [FY23 Citywide Business Plan](#)

Which CWBP goal is most impacted by this legislation?

Infrastructure and Accessibility

Which objectives are impacted by this legislation (select all that apply):

- Enhance the City's connectivity, resiliency, and equity through a safe, efficient, convenient, inclusive, accessible, sustainable and better connected multi-modal transportation system
- Develop environmentally sound and sustainable infrastructure strategies that improve quality of life and foster economic growth
- Increase and support local workforce development and minority, women, and locally-owned businesses
- Engage in efforts to strategically invest in the City's infrastructure and explore emerging technologies

Prior Legislation

On December 13, 2022 the Board of Parks and Recreation Commissioners approved the removal of certain property from the Park System via Park Board Resolution No. 32061

Service Level Impacts

This legislation will have no service level impact. The land is currently unimproved and is not programmed for recreational use.

City of Kansas City, Missouri

Docket Memo



Other Impacts

1. What will be the potential health impacts to any affected groups?
N/A
2. How have those groups been engaged and involved in the development of this ordinance?
N/A – Voters will have opportunity to vote on this question of include on the ballot. City Planning and Development was engaged in meetings on the benefits of surplussing the land.
3. How does this legislation contribute to a sustainable Kansas City?
This legislation allows for a more economical development of unused land.
4. Does the ordinance/resolution include Civil Rights antidiscrimination requirements in compliance with the Code of Ordinances (Chapter 38, titled “Civil Rights”)?
N/A
5. Has the ordinance/resolution been submitted for review of economic equity & inclusion requirements in compliance with the Code of Ordinances (Chapter 3, titled “Contracts and Leases”)?
N/A