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Introduction

• Who we are
  o Practicum students – Capstone course in Urban & Regional Planning at Michigan State University

• Client
  o Genesee County Metropolitan Planning Commission (GCMPC)

• Who
  o Genesee County & GCMPC
    • Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) of U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
      o Community development in the Beecher Neighborhood
    • NSP 1 & 3 funding provides neighborhood revitalization opportunity

• What
  o GCMPC requests:
    • Land use analysis of Beecher Neighborhood
    • Innovative reuse ideas for vacant or abandoned parcels
Location

- Beecher Site is located in the eastern-central portion of the lower peninsula of the State of Michigan.
- Beecher Site is adjacent to 3 different municipalities: the City of Flint (to south), Mt. Morris Township (to north) and Genesee Township (to east).
Community Highlights

• History
  o Development of Beecher Site began in the 1920s
  o Flint F5 tornado on June 8, 1953
  o Many residents worked for General Motors before facilities closed in 2006
Character

- Total Population: 3,038
  - 48% female
  - 52% male
- Detached homes with an average year built of 1967
- Beecher Community School District
Site Profile

Socio-Economic Profile
School Performance
Socio-Economic Profile

- Population
  - Declining since 2000s (largest)
  - Projected to continue into 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Beecher Site Population Total</th>
<th>% Δ</th>
<th>Mount Morris Twp Population Total</th>
<th>% Δ</th>
<th>Genesee County Population Total</th>
<th>% Δ</th>
<th>State of Michigan Population Total</th>
<th>% Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23,725</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>436,141</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9,938,444</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>-9.99%</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>-6.43%</td>
<td>424,800</td>
<td>-2.60%</td>
<td>10,104,633</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,893</td>
<td>-4.77%</td>
<td>21,427</td>
<td>-3.48%</td>
<td>414,605</td>
<td>-2.40%</td>
<td>10,039,343</td>
<td>-0.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census of Population and Housing; ESRI forecasts for 2010 and 2015
Socio-Economic Profile

Beecher Age Distribution

Age Group
- 85+
- 75 - 84
- 65 - 74
- 55 - 64
- 45 - 54
- 35 - 44
- 25 - 34
- 15 - 24
- 10 - 14
- 5 - 9

Percent
- 2015
- 2010
- 2000
Socio-Economic Profile

Beecher Site Race/Ethnicity Composition 2010

- White Alone: 46.7%
- Black Alone: 42.5%
- American Indian Alone: 3.6%
- Asian or Pacific Isl. Alone: 1.4%
- Some Other Race Alone: 5.8%
- Two or More Races: 7.6%
- Hispanic Origin: 0.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census of Population and Housing; ESRI forecasts for 2010 and 2015
Socio-Economic Profile

2010 Educational Attainment for Pop. 25+

- Graduate/Professional Degree
- Bachelor's Degree
- Associate Degree
- Some College, No Degree
- High School Graduate
- 9th to 12th Grade, No Diploma
- Less than 9th Grade

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census of Population and Housing; ESRI forecasts for 2010 and 2015
Socio-Economic Profile

2010 - 2015 Unemployment Rate

- **Beecher Site**: 37.4% (2010), 32.0% (2015)
- **Mount Morris Twp**: 24.0% (2010), 20.0% (2015)
- **Genesee County**: 18.7% (2010), 15.3% (2015)
- **State of Michigan**: 16.0% (2010), 13.0% (2015)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census of Population and Housing; ESRI forecasts for 2010 and 2015
Socio-Economic Profile

2010 Household Income

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census of Population and Housing; ESRI forecasts for 2010 and 2015
School Performance

Dropout Rate 2006-2009

- Beecher Community School District
- State

2006-07: 30.25%, 15.09%
2007-08: 35.27%, 14.19%
2008-09: 24.74%, 11.33%

Site Factors

- Zoning & Land Use
- Community Amenities
- Transportation

Market Profile: SPI
Zoning

Land Use

Source: Mount Morris Township

Source: Generated from Genesee County GIS data
Community Amenities

- Establishments which serve a specific purpose other than commercial development
  - 23 educational related parcels
  - 6 civic related parcels
  - 1 healthcare related parcel
  - 25 religious related parcels

Source: Generated from Genesee County GIS data
Transportation

- Infrastructure
  - Close proximity to I-75, I-475, M-54, and CSX rail
  - Main thoroughfares are Carpenter, Coldwater, Saginaw, and Detroit Street

- Commuting Patterns & Public Transportation
  - Primary mode of transportation is personal vehicle
  - Demand for public transit
  - Public transit provided by Flint MTA
  - 84% increase in ridership from 2003 to 2008
  - 4 of 14 routes serve Beecher Site
Market Profile

• A market profile analysis was conducted to assess the potential for commercial development in the area
  o Spending Potential Index (SPI)
  o Surplus/Leakage Factor
Table 3.5.1 Average Spending Potential Index
Source: ESRI, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beecher Site</th>
<th>Mount Morris Twp</th>
<th>Genesee County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 Consumer Spending</td>
<td>Average Spent</td>
<td>SPI</td>
<td>Average Spent</td>
<td>SPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$2,605</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$3,480</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surplus/Leakage Factor

5 Mile radius; Source: ESRI, 2010
Market Profile - Summary

- There is a slight potential for commercial development in Beecher Site
- Sectors indicating opportunity for redevelopment are:
  - Furniture stores
  - Home furnishing stores
  - Electronic & appliance stores
  - Department stores
Land Use Analysis

Housing Stock
Land Inventory
Parcel Condition Map
Housing Stock

- **Housing Tenure**: Vacancy rates are an important marker of a region’s economic status
Land Inventory

- **Occupied:**
  - Possessing one or more man-made structures on the parcel

- **Vacant:**
  - An empty parcel of land with no man-made structures present

- **Abandoned:**
  - A parcel of land which appears to have been previously occupied but has since fallen into disrepair; a parcel of land which contains unkept structures or yards; a parcel of land which contains a partially or completely destroyed structure, by fire, water or Act of God
## Land Inventory Count

Table 4.2.1 Beecher Site Inventory Count
Source: Team Genesee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Temporal sampling
Parcel Inventory Regions

Inventory Regions 1, 2, & 3

- Greatest proportion of occupied parcels

Table 4.2.1 Region 1 Count
Source: Team Genesee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.2 Region 2 Count
Source: Team Genesee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.3 Region 3 Count
Source: Team Genesee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcel Inventory II
Inventory Regions 4, 5, & 6

Trends
• Majority of vacant & abandoned parcels cluster together
• Abandonment along thoroughfares trickles into adjacent collector streets
Parcel Inventory III

Inventory Regions 7, 8, 9

Trends

- Greatest proportion of abandonments; less clustered
- Abandoned parcels facing outside Beecher Site tend to be adjacent
  to other abandoned parcels

Table 4.2.7 Region 7 Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Team Genesee

---

Table 4.2.8 Region 8 Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Team Genesee

---

Table 4.2.9 Region 9 Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Team Genesee
Demolition Criteria
Example I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Door</th>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Siding</th>
<th>Lot &amp; Driveway</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Good Condition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Door</th>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Siding</th>
<th>Lot &amp; Driveway</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fair Condition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Door</th>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Siding</th>
<th>Lot &amp; Driveway</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poor Condition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcel Condition Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Team Genesee, March 2012

- Renovation
- Error
Trends
• Overall habitable condition
Trends

• Abandonments tend to cluster around parcels in poor condition

Table 5.4.4 Region 4 Count
Source: Team Genesee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.5 Region 5 Count
Source: Team Genesee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>~100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4.6 Region 6 Count
Source: Team Genesee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>~100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends

- Abandoned commercial & public parcels tend to be in Good or Fair condition
- Areas with small parcel sizes have more abandoned parcels in Fair or Poor Condition

Table 5.4.7 Region 7 Count
Source: Team Genesee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4.8 Region 8 Count
Source: Team Genesee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4.9 Region 9 Count
Source: Team Genesee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.4.2 Abandoned Parcel Condition

Source: Team Genesee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study

Four Case Studies
Case Study

• Voluntary Associates in Grand Boulevard
  o Identify community leaders and encourage local involvement

• Toronto’s Abandonment for Affordable Housing
  o Eliminate abandonment and blight and provide affordable housing

• Sideyard Expansion in Detroit, Michigan
  o Results in safer and better neighborhoods

• The Church Brew Works (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania)
  o Keep historical integrity, associated savings, potential property value growth, school performance improvement and lower crime rate
Recommendations

Scenario 1: Preservation
Scenario 2: Growth
## Recommendations

### Scenario 1: Preservation
- Focus on preservation and a no population growth land use approach
- Assumes regional conditions and local trends are not likely to change
- Parcel by parcel basis
- Six land use activities:
  - Infill housing
  - Blotting
  - Commercial
  - Adaptive reuse
  - Public transit infrastructure
  - Green Space

### Scenario 2: Growth
- Focus on a general redevelopment land use approach
- Assumes regional economic growth and current decline in population will reverse
- Parcel by parcel basis
- Six land use activities:
  - Infill housing
  - Blotting
  - Commercial
  - Adaptive reuse
  - Public transit infrastructure
  - Green Space
# Recommendations

**Scenario 1: Preservation**

Criteria: *Infill Housing*

- Property is abandoned AND,
- Property is zoned residential AND,
- Abandonment and vacancy concentration of less than 3 parcels AND,
- Unable to apply other land use activities AND,
- When other land use activities are possible they reduce abandonment and vacancy concentration to less than 3 parcels.

**Scenario 2: Growth**

Criteria: *Infill Housing*

- Property is abandoned AND,
- Property is zoned residential AND,
- Unable to apply other land use activities.
## Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 1: Preservation</th>
<th>Scenario 2: Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria:</strong> Blotting</td>
<td><strong>Criteria:</strong> Blotting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Property is vacant AND,</td>
<td>• Property is vacant AND,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Property is zoned residential AND,</td>
<td>• Property is zoned residential AND,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Property shares 75% right and left common boundary with receiver AND,</td>
<td>• Property shares 75% right and left common boundary with receiver AND,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receiver is limited to 1 blotting activity AND,</td>
<td>• Receiver is limited to 1 blotting activity AND,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Property is less than twice the size of receiver parcel</td>
<td>• Property is less than twice the size of receiver parcel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blotting applied if infill housing occurs first and meets criteria.
Recommendations

Scenario 1: Preservation
Criteria: **Green Space**
- No proposed land use activities are applicable AND,
- Green Space takes precedence over infill housing and blotting if adjacent to 3 Green Space designated parcels AND,
- Green Space takes precedence over infill housing and blotting if property is adjacent to a dead-end

Scenario 2: Growth
Criteria: **Green Space**
- No proposed land use activities are applicable AND,
- Green Space takes precedence over infill housing and blotting if property is adjacent to a dead-end
Beecher Scenario Plan 2
Recommendation Maps

Scenario 1: Preservation

Scenario 2: Growth