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Project Introduction

The Client, Project Goal, Site Location, Area History, Neighborhood Character
The Client

• Brightmoor Alliance

  ➢ Established in 2000

  ➢ Collection of about 50 nonprofit organizations

  ➢ Main focus:

    ▪ Organize its resources to help restore the neighborhood so that it is not only functional and livable, but also vibrant and attractive
Project Goal

- Recommend compatible, phased-growth commercial redevelopment for Fenkell Avenue between Burt & Dacosta Streets

Source: Google Maps
Site Location

State of Michigan

City of Detroit

Source: ESRI
Site Location

Brightmoor Neighborhood

Fenkell Corridor Focus Area

Source: ESRI
Area History

• Neighborhood developed in 1921

• Annexed to Detroit in 1926

• Fenkell Avenue: Brightmoor’s commercial corridor
  ➢ Main thoroughfare connecting to major highways

1) Source: www.brightmooralliance.files.wordpress.com/
All other images) Source: Practicum Team
Neighborhood Character

Past

Present

Source: Google Maps

1) Source: www.brightmooralliance.files.wordpress.com
All other images) Source: Practicum Team
Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (S.W.O.T.) Analysis
STRENGTHS

• Gompers Elementary
• Brightmoor Community Center

Source: http://detroitk12.org/schools/gompers/

WEAKNESSES

• Poor infrastructure
• High vacancy rates

Source: Practicum Team
OPPORTUNITIES

• Urban agriculture
• Local grassroots art

THREATS

• Further decline of commercial corridor

Source: www.ecotrust.org
Source: Practicum Team
Source: Google Maps
Socioeconomic Profile

Total Population, Racial Composition, Household Income, Educational Attainment, Employment Status, Summary
Fenkell Corridor Focus Area Census Tracts

Source: ESRI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fenkell Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000</strong></td>
<td>9,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td>5,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Δ</strong></td>
<td>-41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000, 2010 U.S. Census
Racial Composition

Fenkell Corridor Focus Area
- White Alone: 2.9%
- Black or African American Alone: 6.7%
- Other Race: 90.4%

Brightmoor
- White Alone: 3.3%
- Black or African American Alone: 9.8%
- Other Race: 86.9%

Detroit
- White Alone: 6.2%
- Black or African American Alone: 11.6%
- Other Race: 82.2%

Michigan
- White Alone: 6.7%
- Black or African American Alone: 14.0%
- Other Race: 79.3%

Source: ACS 2008-2012 5-Year Estimate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income Distribution</th>
<th>Percent of Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $124,999</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ACS 2008-2012 5-Year Estimate
Educational Attainment, People 25 and Older

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less Than High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate (includes equivalency)</th>
<th>Some college</th>
<th>Bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Master's degree</th>
<th>Professional school / Doctorate degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fenkell Corridor Area</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brightmoor</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ACS 2008-2012 5-Year Estimate
Socioeconomic Summary

- Highest percentage of total population loss at 41%
- Largest racial group: African American at just over 90%
- Nearly 55% of household earn less than $20,000 annually
- Approximately 4% of residents earn Bachelor’s degrees
- 26% of residents did not receive a high school diploma
- Highest current unemployment: 18%
Market Analysis

Current Industry Profile, Industry Surpluses & Leakages
Current Industry Profile

- Retail Trade: 24.40%
- Finance, Insurance, Real Estate: 14.90%
- Services: 56.10%
- Other: 4.60%

Source: 2012 ESRI Business Segment Concentration
Industry Surpluses & Leakages

• **Surpluses**
  - Convenience stores
  - Gas stations
  - Liquor stores

• **Leakages:**
  - Grocery stores
  - Lawn / garden equipment and supplies stores
  - Used merchandise stores

Source: Practicum Team
Parcel Inventory Assessment

Assessment Tool, Findings, Parcel Inventory
Assessment Tool

• Example Vacant Parcel Score Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Parcel Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Assessment Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>Lot requires large landowner and government investments to be considered for economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>Lot generally in poor condition, requires significant landowner and government investment to be considered for economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>Lot in serviceable condition, needs minor landowner and government investment to be considered for economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 18</td>
<td>Lot in good condition, prime development potential. Requires little to no investment for economic development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Assessment Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>Completely unserviceable, recommend deconstruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>Structure requires significant investment to be serviceable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>Structure requires little to moderate investment to be serviceable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 18</td>
<td>Structure is ready to be utilized as is. No investment required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

Vacant Parcel Condition

Fenkell Avenue Parcel Map
Vacant Parcel Conditions
Total Score out of 100%

Fenkell Parcels  Structure In Use  Poor (1 - 50)  Fair (51 - 75)  Good (76 - 100)  Vacant Structure
Findings

Vacant Structure Condition

Fenkell Avenue Parcel Map
Vacant Structure Conditions
Total Score out of 100%

Fenkell Parcels: Structure In Use, Poor (1 - 33), Fair (34 - 66), Good (67 - 100), No Structure
## Parcel Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Vacant Parcel</th>
<th>Structure Not In Use</th>
<th>Structure In Use</th>
<th>Total Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>3 (8.3%)</td>
<td>17 (47%)</td>
<td>16 (44%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>16 (64%)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>14 (60.8%)</td>
<td>2 (8.7%)</td>
<td>7 (30.4%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>24 (82.8%)</td>
<td>4 (13.8%)</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6</td>
<td>16 (57.1%)</td>
<td>10 (35.7%)</td>
<td>2 (7.1%)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Corridor Recommendations

1 Year, 1-3 Years, 3-5 Years
## General Corridor Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>Low Cost</th>
<th>Medium Cost</th>
<th>High Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Non-structural blight removal  
• Minor façade improvements (paint/signage)  
• Inform community of development on corridor  
• Update existing bus signage | • Major façade improvements for existing businesses in use  
• Notify possible developers of structures ready for business | • Assisting local businesses with advertisement  
• Minor or targeted sidewalk improvements based on walking audit results |
Sidewalk Example

Source: Google Maps

Source: www.walklaurel.blogspot.com
### General Corridor Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-3 Years</th>
<th>Low Cost</th>
<th>Medium Cost</th>
<th>High Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|           | • Inform community of development on corridor  
            • Gateways to direct traffic into corridor | • Clear alleyways of debris and/or blight  
            • Supplement current businesses with advertising, signage, and general improvements | • Demolition/Structural blight removal  
            • Community land acquisition |
Gateway Example

Source: Google Maps

Source: www.urbanindy.com
## General Corridor Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-5 Years</th>
<th>Low Cost</th>
<th>Medium Cost</th>
<th>High Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3-5 Years** | • Inform community of development on corridor  
  • Present possible developers with parcel inventory data, funding sources, and economic analysis data | • Pedestrian safety signage/lighting  
  • Major sidewalk improvements focusing on total reconstruction | • Development of industries:  
  • Building materials and supply dealers, lawn and garden equipment and supplies, health and personal care, used merchandise, grocery/specialty food stores |

Low Cost  
Medium Cost  
High Cost
Sidewalk Lighting Example

Source: Google Maps

Source: www.parkwaymuseumsdistrictphiladelphia.org
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