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Scope of Services

Determine “best use” for the Peacock Building Site located at 21035 & 21045 Van Dyke Avenue.

- Site Evaluation
- Demographic Analysis
- Market Study
- SWOT Analysis
- Best use Assessment
- Incubator Assessment
Study Area Location
Description of Surrounding Area
Site Description
## Socioeconomic profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000 U.S. Census</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Center Line</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Warren</th>
<th>Macomb County</th>
<th>Wayne County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>54,472</td>
<td>8,531</td>
<td>951,270</td>
<td>138,247</td>
<td>788,149</td>
<td>2,061,162</td>
<td>9,938,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Change (90-00)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Median)</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (High School+)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed Population (16+)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. Housing Value</td>
<td>$68,700</td>
<td>$104,800</td>
<td>$62,800</td>
<td>$115,400</td>
<td>$134,900</td>
<td>$96,200</td>
<td>$110,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. Household Income</td>
<td>$33,878</td>
<td>$31,677</td>
<td>$29,526</td>
<td>$44,626</td>
<td>$52,102</td>
<td>$40,776</td>
<td>$46,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Level</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Market Analysis

Methods

- **Commercial**
  - Spending Potential Index (SPI)
  - Market Potential Index (MPI)
  - Surplus/Leakage factor

- **Industrial**
  - County Business Patterns
  - Non-Employer Statistics
  - Detroit MSA Employment Forecasts
Market Analysis: Commercial

- Spending Potential Index (SPI):
  Point Scale=100 National Average
  Project area average = low 70s

- Market Potential Index (MPI):
  Point Scale=100 National Average

- Surplus/Leakage data given in ESRI illustrates:
  - 1.0 mile radius has a high leakage and low surplus factor
  - 3.0 and 5.0 mile radius low leakage and low surplus factor
  - Existing commercial serving study area residents, but not attracting outside consumers.
Market Analysis: Industrial

- Wholesale trade (18.5%)
- Manufacturing (15%)
- Information (14%)
- Healthcare and social assistance (13%)
- Management of companies and enterprises (9%)
- Transportation and Warehousing (7%)
- Accommodation and food services (4%)
- Retail trade (0.5%)

- Administrative, support, waste management, remediation services (10%)
- Real estate, rental and leasing (13%)
- Professional, scientific, and technical services (10.5%)
- Transportation and Warehousing (4%)
- Arts, entertainment, recreation (62%)
Strengths and Weaknesses

**Strengths**
- Location
- Access to highways
- Active community organizations
- Increase of household income in past 10 years
- Accessibility to wide range of consumers/users
- Increase in residential and nonresidential building permits

**Weaknesses**
- Parking
- Poverty higher in study area compared to City of Warren
- Numerous vacant buildings
- Traffic noise
- High rate of property crime in adjacent City of Detroit.
- Area consumers spend less than national average

VS.
Best Use Assessment

**Uses**
- Residential
- Commercial/Retail
- Industrial
- Community Resource/Third Place
- Open Space
- Office

**Criteria**
- Infrastructure
- Visibility
- Accessibility
- Strength of economic development
- Meets needs of demographic and market analysis
- Compatibility with surrounding land use
# Best Use Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Factors</th>
<th>Criteria Weights</th>
<th>Reasoning for Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low weight - funds available for renovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate weight - site needs adequate visibility for certain uses, but not all (retail v. residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate weight - uses require different types of accessibility such as sufficient parking, alley size for service/delivery trucks, ease of entrance/exit for customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of economic development in the Area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highest weight - it is a stated goal by the client and viewed as very important for the surrounding area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of socioeconomic profile and market study</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highest weight - community assessments depict existing conditions for the area and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding land use compatibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate weight - use option should merge with the existing characteristics of the area, but should be adaptable to the possibility of change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Best Use Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Site Use Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of economic development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets needs of socioeconomic profile</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding land use compatibility</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Use Assessment

1. Commercial/Retail
2. Community Resource Center/Third Place
3. Office
4. Residential
5. Industrial/Manufacturing
6. Open Space
Business Incubator

Commercial/Retail
Community Resource Center/Third Place

TechOne

Affinity Lab
Conclusion

Assessments show
– No evidence in support of a need for specific goods or services
– Potential to serve a large number of consumers

Best use
– Commercial/Retail
– Community Resource/Third Place
Recommended Actions

- Conduct financial feasibility study for rehabilitation and use of the building
- Hold a community visioning session
- Target developing businesses or organizations for potential partnerships for an incubator
- Contact local religious and community organizations for possible assistance
- Follow V-8 Corridor Design Guidelines for renovations
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