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Executive Summary

Detroit CLICS (Commercial Land Inventory City Study) is a study of commercial land in the City of Detroit documenting the use, condition, and design of approximately one third of all commercially zoned parcels in the city. Detroit CLICS has two major objectives. (1) To better inform planning and zoning processes for commercial lands in the city so that the Zoning Ordinance (ZO) does not undermine the vision put forth in the city’s Master Plan (MP). (2) To share our data with interested stakeholders and governmental departments so that they may make more informed decisions with regard to planning and investment in commercial areas. As it stands, there are glaring inconsistencies between the MP and ZO. Furthermore, the city’s involvement in the Detroit Works Project (DWP) has increased the need for improved information and analysis regarding commercial areas throughout the city. This type of study has not been conducted in nearly three decades, so the Data analysis from CLICS can add valuable content to the discussions occurring through the Detroit Works Project as it investigates ways to restructure the city.

The CLICS data gathering process began with the creation of a methodology to ensure the survey was done in a consistent and meaningful manner. Survey geographies were chosen based on the priorities of the client- the City of Detroit Planning and Development Department. Data regarding design and condition was then collected for 9,536 parcels along commercial corridors. The data was then analyzed and recommendations were formed for a number of focus areas that were chosen based upon individuals’ knowledge and interests of the areas that they surveyed. This data analysis was used to formulate overall recommendations for the cities commercial areas as well as to create an enriched understanding of the relationship between the ZO, MP, and DWP.

While these results varied greatly, they are a critical component in the story of Detroit- a city built for over two million that today is home to just over 700,000 residents. Our study has revealed that vacancy, a lack of design consistency, and an over-abundance of surface parking lots plague Detroit’s commercial corridors, but it has also showed that the buildings on commercial parcels are in relatively good condition. Additionally, our study found that the predominance of B4 General Business District zoning is overwhelming in Detroit’s Zoning Ordinance. Ultimately, it is essential that the City of Detroit develop new planning strategies that confront issues of decline and one-size-fits-all zoning. Creating a unified vision for the ZO and MP that is consistent with DWP and confronts the realities of Detroit is the first necessary step if future planning is to be successful in this great American city.
Detroit CLICS (Commercial Land Inventory City Study) is a study of commercial land in the City of Detroit documenting the use, condition, and design of approximately one third of all commercially zoned parcels in the city. It is the first study of its kind conducted at this scale in twenty-eight years. The project was prompted by a lack of data pertaining to the use and condition of commercial parcels in the city, as well as inconsistencies between the use of many of these parcels, Detroit’s Zoning Ordinance, and the city’s current Master Plan.

Detroit CLICS developed through a partnership between the Department of Urban Studies and Planning (DUSP) at Wayne State University (WSU) and the City of Detroit’s Planning and Development Department (P&DD). Surveying was conducted by our team, a group 19 students in WSU’s DUSP Master of Urban Planning capstone course. Our analysis of the survey data and our recommendations to P&DD are found in this report.

Detroit CLICS focuses on priority areas identified by the City of Detroit P&DD, the Detroit Works Project, and our own areas of interest. The priority areas consist of:

- Traditional Main Street Overlay Areas
- Major Corridor Overlay Areas
- Major Thoroughfares
- Detroit Works Project short-term demonstration areas (New Center/North End, Hubbard Farms, and Bagley/Palmer Woods)

In addition to the city’s priorities, our survey teams selected areas based on local knowledge that we felt would create a richer database and might encourage new priorities for the city’s planning efforts. See Appendix A for more detailed information about the CLICS study area.

We developed our survey categories under the guidance of P&DD. These categories were coded into a smart phone application developed by Code for America. To our knowledge, this is the first time a survey of this type has been conducted using smart phone technology. The survey was conducted in June and July of 2012 by six teams, each composed of three students. Each team was assigned a specific geography. Using the smart phone application, teams drove their designated roads and inputted data for each commercial parcel in their assigned geography. Geographic Information System (GIS) software was used to perform analysis of the data and generate maps of survey areas.

Detroit CLICS has two major objectives:

- To better inform planning and zoning processes for commercial lands in the city so that zoning regulations do not undermine the vision put forth in the city’s Master Plan.
- To share our data with interested stakeholders, be they city departments, community groups, or developers, so that they may make more informed decisions with regard to planning and investment in commercial areas.

Our survey is not comprehensive, but our work has created a foundation that can be expanded upon by the city and community groups. We recommended plans of action within this report, based on our observations, both qualitative and quantitative, of the conditions and uses of commercial land in the CLICS survey area. We have provided specific recommendations for focus areas identified by survey groups (Chapter 3.6), as well as general recommendations for the entire survey area (Chapter 4). We hope our recommendations will increase the profile of commercial land planning in the City of Detroit.
2. An Overview of Detroit’s Master Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and Commercial Properties

2.1 A Brief History of Detroit’s Master Plan

The Master Plan (MP) for the City of Detroit began evolving during the 1940s with its foundations approved by the Mayor and City Council. During this period, the city experienced extensive growth and planned accordingly like many other cities around the country. In 1951, Detroit’s first MP, titled Plans for a Finer City, was published by the City Plan Commission. This plan would shape the city’s development for the next two decades. The public was consulted in the 1951 MP; however, local organizations led grassroots campaigns in the 1960s to engage the city and provide more insight for specific communities. These proactive organizations believed in their neighborhoods and delivered recommendations to the city compiled by private planning consulting firms. Those recommendations were later amended into the 1973 MP. Permitting public input and creating recommendations for the MP in collaboration with the City of Detroit was the start of a healthier dialogue between the city and its citizens. The public’s participation in the city’s planning process played an increasing role in the 1992 and 2009 MPs.

The 1973 MP included amendments to address community issues with the original 1951 MP, but it otherwise continued the original plan’s focus on growth management and residential development. Unfortunately, Detroit’s growth has not continued. The 1992 MP attempted to better reflect the current conditions in the city. The PDD decided to create a more comprehensive MP than its predecessors, dividing the city into nine sectors to better evaluate conditions and implement recommendations. In 2009, the city was again divided into ten neighborhood clusters to reflect approximately 100,000 residents in a specific region. The MP is not a static document. It has continued to be amended to furnish “a basic pattern for the guidance of normal change and growth (or decline) within the city’s legal and financial capacity.”

The current MP is based on the vision of the Land Use Task Force (LUTF) of 1994, but the initial version of the current MP was not submitted by PDD to City Council until 2004 and not adopted until July 2009.

---

1 Detroit Master Plan 1973, Page 7
2 Detroit Master Plan 1973, Page 7
3 Master Plan 2009, Page 1, Executive Summary
4 Detroit Master Plan 1973, Page 11
5 Detroit Master Plan of Policies 2009, Page 1
2.2 Detroit’s Zoning Ordinance

Detroit passed its first zoning ordinance on Christmas Eve, 1940 in the wake of the recent national housing market crisis and economic recession. Today, Detroit is facing more challenges than it was when its current Zoning Ordinance (ZO) went into effect on May 28, 2005. The ZO must be understood as a work in progress. The ability to adjust the ZO is vital to its effectiveness. The current ZO includes a process for making amendments to the ordinance and map. It states:

"Wherever it is deemed desirable in order to meet the public need, promote the general welfare, conform with good zoning practice, and adhere to the guiding principles and intent of the Master Plan and this zoning ordinance, after report thereon by the City Planning Commission and subject to the procedures set forth in this division, the City Council may amend, repeal, or add provisions in this zoning ordinance by passage of an ordinance."

The stated purpose of the ZO is “to guide and regulate the appropriate use or development of all land in a manner which will promote and protect the public health, safety, and general welfare.” As experience and knowledge expand, strategies to achieve this goal change to reflect the current conditions of the city. Detroit’s ZO, as it exists, represents the evolution of Euclidean style zoning – the predominant style in the United States – since the publication of the Standard Zoning Enabling Act in 1924. Euclid, Ohio pioneered restrictive zoning as a response to the negatives effects of increasing industrialization and urbanization; such as, the need to protect residential and commercial areas from the nuisances and health issues associated with industrialization.

The primary purpose of zoning is often to separate functionally incompatible uses, such as residential, commercial, and industrial. The Detroit ZO divides the city into 29 different zoning classifications, 17 of which are strictly residential, commercial, or industrial. The primary concern of planning in Detroit is no longer focused on the negative affect of industrial use on residential areas. Instead, the ZO needs to address issues related to vacant space, promote livability, and leverage the health of its more stable neighborhoods. As such, critics believe the continued focus on simply zoning for the separation of uses is overstated and do not reflect the current condition in many of Detroit’s neighborhoods.

1 Detroit Zoning Ordinance 2012, Page 52

2 Detroit Zoning Ordinance 2012, Page 1
The dominance of Single-Family Residential (R1) in Detroit is clear with a quick glance at the city’s zoning map. The city is largely composed of large blocks of single-family homes intersected by a grid of major roads zoned for General Business (B4). The prominence of low density residential also contributes to the city’s auto-oriented zoning. It is difficult for many residents to travel to a commercial area from their home without an automobile. There is a lack of mixed-use outside of the central business district. Detroit’s zoning tradition reflects dependence on the automobile. A majority of the city is zoned for single-family residential neighborhoods that resemble many suburban neighborhoods constructed in the same era.

Detroit’s ZO reflects a lack of focus or care. Seventy-six percent of the parcels surveyed by Detroit CLICS are zoned General Business (B4) despite the fact that the MP often has a much more specific vision for the areas containing those parcels. It is important for the city to consider the current condition of its commercial corridors and zone them in accordance with its MP. Accessibility to vibrant and functioning commercial corridors enhances quality of life. Though the MP guides the vision of the city, amending the ZO to conform to that vision is necessary for the city to develop in a more thoughtful way.

Table 1. Zoning Classifications in CLICS Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2-H</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4-H</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5-H</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD-H</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1-H</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3-H</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD2-H</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total: 100.0%
2.3 Detroit’s Current Master Plan

The MP’s future land use map does not address “small-scale” decisions for areas less than ten acres; such as the specific characteristics of residential development or the design of specific commercial and other non-residential uses. The MP is, instead, a broad illustration of how Detroit should grow within its boundaries. It is envisioned as a way to guide the broad strokes that shape the city’s “rational urban form” and to set the stage for infilling.\(^1\) The MP points to the City’s ZO as the primary tool used to specifically regulate the manner in which individual properties are used and to implement the policies recommended in the MP.\(^2\)

Detroit’s current MP offers policy suggestions that include city design, transportation, casinos, riverfront redevelopment, and retail along the city’s major thoroughfares. It also considers the importance of neighborhood commercial thoroughfares and the value of pedestrian oriented-development. The plan calls for mixed-use development, particularly in the city’s older areas, and recognizes the importance of regional mass transit and non-motorized routes.\(^3\) In support of its vision, the MP designates land use and transportation goals to guide development in each of the city’s ten neighborhood clusters.

A full list of the MP’s land use classifications is provided as Appendix C. It is helpful, however, to introduce the classifications most associated with CLICS survey area in greater detail.

\(^1\) Detroit Master Plan of Policies 2009, Page 7
\(^2\) Detroit Master Plan of Policies 2009, Page 8
\(^3\) Detroit Master Plan of Policies 2009, Executive Summary, Page 1
**Commercial Areas**

- **Major Commercial (CM)** - Area is unique to Detroit’s Downtown and New Center; envisioned to include high-density office buildings with ground floor retail. CM areas are generally located along mass transit routes, are serviced by parking on the street and in nearby structures, and are pedestrian-oriented.

- **Special Commercial (CS)** - Area is primarily in Detroit’s Downtown and New Center. CS areas include stadiums, theaters, convention centers, casinos, restaurants, bars and other attractions. CS areas should be easily accessible by mass transit, provide parking on the street and in structures, and pedestrian-oriented.

- **Retail Centers (CRC)** - Area is automobile-oriented and typically includes big box retail and grocery stores with adjacent parking lots.

- **Neighborhood Commercial (CN)** - Area is pedestrian-oriented with wide sidewalks and landscaped streetscapes. CN areas are usually identifiable by contiguous storefronts along main neighborhood streets; can also include institutional uses such as post offices and libraries.

- **Thoroughfare Commercial (CT)** - Area is similar to CN areas, but located along larger thoroughfares and thus more amendable to high traffic volumes and auto-oriented development.\(^4\)

---

**Mixed Use Areas, Town Centers**

In addition to the five classifications specific to commercial areas, the MP includes areas designated as mixed use. **Mixed Residential-Commercial areas (MRC)** are typically located along major thoroughfares, transportation nodes and gateways into the city.

A **Mixed-Town Center (MTC)** is a major center of activity with an emphasis on pedestrian-oriented development. MTCs are similar to CN areas in the sense that both are envisioned to include wide sidewalks, consistent building facades, street-front access to retail and landscaped streetscapes, but MTCs are associated with incentives or penalties to compel developers to improve the landscaping and façade of a structure to bring a building in line with design guidelines.\(^1\)

---

\(^4\) Detroit Master Plan of Policies 2009, Page 61-62

\(^1\) Detroit Master Plan of Policies 2009, page 63
Transportation Classifications

It is also useful to note the MP’s four classifications related to street type. The MP divides the city’s roads into Freeways (TF), Major Thoroughfares (TM), Secondary Thoroughfares (TS) and Local Streets (TL). Ideally, a commercial area’s classification will correlate with the classification of the roadway traversing it. Many of the city’s commercial areas may also be located along Mass Transit Routes (TMT). Structures around TMTs are ideally high density and mixed use. Finally, there are also designated Truck Routes (TTR) in the MP. The desirability of being located along a TTR or a TMT will vary depending on the individual needs of a specific business or service; however, it is likely pedestrian activity will be more much prominent – and enjoyable – along TMTs as opposed to TTRs.¹

¹ Detroit Master Plan of Policies 2009, page 65-66
2.4 Recommendations in the Master Plan Related to the Zoning Ordinance

The MP does not have the authority to guarantee the implementation of its suggested policies. The process of applying the MP to actual conditions in Detroit is left to the city’s ZO. The MP, however, does provide recommendations as to how zoning should be used and what goals it should advance. The MP calls for zoning that alleviates land use conflicts by strengthening and enforcing buffers between residential, commercial and industrial areas; developing and enforcing design guidelines to improve commercial areas; strengthening regulations protecting residential areas from industrial uses, traffic, noise and emissions.

The MP also suggests zoning remain flexible enough to accommodate diverse uses in commercial areas. The goal is to encourage mixed-use development, such as lofts and live-work environments, to allow agriculture and passive recreation areas in residential, commercial and industrial areas with significant amounts of vacant land, and to consider performance standards in high density areas to help improve lighting, air quality, noise levels and traffic. Finally, the MP envisions zoning that offers incentives for high density, mixed-use development along transit corridors (TMT), incentives to encourage additional green space, as well as incentives to encourage public art.1

1 Detroit Master Plan of Policies 2009, Page 58-59
2.5 The Master Plan’s Vision for City’s Retail Corridors

In addition to general suggestions related to zoning, the current MP proposes solutions to issues often found in the city’s commercial corridors. Again, the MP does not have the authority to enforce these suggestions. As a result, many are focused on recommending ways the city can direct resources and staff to help retail areas address individual issues:

**Issue One:** The physical state of Detroit’s commercial corridors – The MP suggests that, “while many of the city’s commercial areas contain viable businesses,”1 a lack of accessibility and the generally poor appearance of many commercial parcels discourage customers and new business owners from utilizing a commercial area.

The MP recommends the removal of graffiti and blight, the development of design guidelines for façade and landscape, as well as streetscape improvements for targeted commercial areas. The MP also suggests assisting ethnic retail districts attract visitors and capitalize on the potential for tourism. It also encourages the development of transit and pedestrian links between business districts, efforts to minimize parking issues on surrounding residential areas, and the development of funding strategies for improvement districts.

**Issue Two:** The potential for land use conflicts between the businesses that line a commercial corridor and the surrounding residential area - The MP expresses concern that issues between different areas can “aggravate community relations and impair the development of a livable community and a vibrant business environment.” 2

The MP recommends zoning to control the number of establishments that serve liquor, eliminate the impact of adult-oriented businesses on surrounding residential areas, schools and institutions, as well as encouraging buffering requirements to control the impact of commercial sectors on residential areas.

**Issue Three:** The harm of real and perceived crime on local business attraction and retention – The MP suggests even the perception of crime can discourage new businesses and customers from visiting a commercial area.

The MP recommends commercial centers to establish local crime watch efforts with local police and residents as well as the promotion of crime prevention through urban design.

The MP proposes supporting local businesses by strategically allocating city staff and resources to assist local business owners, encouraging local colleges and universities to offer career training services, supporting community-based entrepreneurial programs and targeting assistance to support minority and women owned businesses. The MP also suggests utilizing tax and other incentives to attract businesses and strengthen existing business in targeted areas, as well as the development of promotional material to advertise specific commercial areas as a whole. Finally, the MP encourages the continued examination and use of new methods to continue improving the city’s neighborhoods.

1. Detroit Master Plan of Policies 2009, Page 52
2. Detroit Master Plan of Policies 2009, Page 53
3. CLICS Survey Methodology

The survey area included every commercially zoned parcel within the city limits of Detroit but was narrowed down to priority areas determined by PDD and areas of interest by survey teams due to time constraints. This section will discuss the criteria considered when deciding which parcels to survey, how that determination was made, the materials and applications used to conduct the survey, the procedure created to collect and display the survey data. It will also share the challenges and limitations we encountered collecting and analyzing our data. The purpose of this section is to ensure transparency between those who collected the data and those utilizing the data; also, to provide a guide for other public, private and nonprofit entities that may have an interest in conducting a similar land use survey.

Figure 1. Building on W. Warren in "Demolish" Condition
3.1 Focus of Study: Commercial Land in the City of Detroit

WSU students enrolled in the 2012 MUP Capstone Course acted as consultants to the City of Detroit in order to inventory the use of each parcel of land along the city’s main commercial corridors. Students also considered the condition of the land or any structures on each parcel. Students met with faculty from the WSU DUSP, as well as city planners and representatives of local organizations to develop a working definition of commercial land use.

Given a sixteen week timeline to complete the survey and report, priority areas were chosen by the class to be completed. The class chose to complete a survey of each parcel located on Michigan Avenue, Gratiot Avenue, Grand River Avenue, Jefferson Avenue and Woodward Avenue.

Five main commercial corridors were chosen as obvious starting points. Additional corridors were assigned to survey teams that completed their respective corridor early. For a full description of the CLICS survey area, see Appendix B. Each commercial corridor studied contains parcels with residential uses, industrial uses, parking lots, empty lots, etc. Not all of the land that lies on commercial corridors is zoned for commercial use. Nevertheless, all of the land along commercial corridors in the CLICS area was surveyed.

CLICS Survey Methodology
3.2 Survey Technology

The materials used to complete the survey consisted of the Code for America (CFA) Neighborhood Data Collector survey application, smart phones, automobiles, Microsoft Office, and Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

Survey data on individual parcels was inputed into the smart phone application developed by CFA, which utilized the City Assessor’s GIS parcel shape file.

The survey was primarily conducted by driving through designated geographies. The CFA application allowed survey teams to view a map of Detroit with the commercial parcels highlighted. Individual parcels could then be selected on a smart phone. When a parcel was selected, a drop down menu would appear allowing a coder to record the use and condition of each parcel. Microsoft Office and GIS were used to process, analyze, and display the data collected. In some cases, the land was surveyed manually using paper maps and the data was later entered through the CFA website. CFA employees attended class sessions and accompanied survey teams on trial runs, and CFA was available throughout the project to provide technical support.
3.3 Survey Categories

Survey categories were created by WSU capstone students in consultation with PDD. CFA designed an application that allowed coders to locate their present location on a map, select an individual parcel and code the parcel accordingly. When a parcel was selected, a drop down menu would appear with a list of options (a full list of the survey hierarchy is available in Appendix B). These options included:

- What is on site
- What the land is used for
- Whether or not it is occupied
- Whether the land is automobile or pedestrian oriented
- The condition of the property
- The general condition of the property

The application also allowed coders to identify parcels with residential space above the ground floor uses and allowed them to add additional land uses if an individual parcel consisted of “multiple codes.” The survey application allowed the for the imputation of quite specific data. For example, clicking on the “retail” option would bring up an additional menu enabling the coder to identify the specific type of retail uses existing on the parcel (auto parts, grocery store, hardware store, etc.).
3.4 Survey Procedure

Survey teams consisted of three people: a driver and two coders. Teams were designated priority areas to survey. Areas varied in size and design, but were each quite expansive. Automobiles were necessary to conduct the survey at this scale, though some parcels were surveyed on foot when this method proved more efficient. Driving (or walking) along the roads of designation areas, two coders used the CFA application on personal smart phones to code parcels outlined on a map. Using street addresses and intersections to help identify the parcels, coders could select the parcel and record findings directly through the CFA application. The survey teams averaged 66.7 parcels per hour per car in the early stages of surveying, but the pace quickened to 90-100 parcels per hour per car as teams became practiced. Signage, local knowledge, architectural design, and product or service display helped us determine the use(s) of a parcel. Accessory uses, for example, a convenience store at a gas station were not surveyed, though multiple businesses on one parcel (often found within strip malls) were surveyed as multiple-codes.

After a parcel was coded, the data instantly uploaded to an online database. From there it was downloaded, analyzed, and prepared for presentation by a designated team that specialized in Microsoft Excel and GIS.

Figure 3. Good Condition, Pedestrian-Oriented Buildings in W. Vernor TMS Area
3.5 Challenges and Limitations

While conducting the survey, each team encountered various issues with the application technology. The bullet points below highlight some of the recurring issues that the survey teams faced.

**Smart Phone Application Issues**
- Issues included not being able to track survey progress, the satellite image failing to display, definitions not being included on the menu, and difficulty recording the design of a building (e.g., auto/pedestrian orientation, residential above, condition). We promptly alerted CFA of issues with the application, who would correct the issue within 24-48 hours, but we still had to correct several parcels’ data regarding design by using the street view function of Google Maps.
- Additional data errors (that were eventually corrected) were due to multiple entries from recent exported files, upload errors, application glitches, multi-code discrepancies.

**Data Collection**
- The number of parcels in a given area is often inconsistent with the size of its current development (e.g., strip malls, national chain pharmacies and, large condominiums). In other words, a single building could include multiple parcels. We coded each individual parcel as the same use, which has somewhat skewed our data. For example, if a new pharmacy was constructed on four parcels that were not consolidated, it is likely represented as four pharmacies (one for each parcel), as opposed to a single business.
- Mismatches occurred between parcel information supplied by the City and CFA.
- We were very conservative in when we recommended a building for demolition. This accounts for the low number of buildings recommended for demolition in our results. It is likely more buildings should be condemned rather than rehabilitated, but it is difficult to make this judgment when only viewing the exterior of buildings from a car.
- Our survey did not catalog parking lots that were secondary uses on commercial parcels, so the actual number of parking lots in the City’s commercial corridors is likely higher than the already significant amount surveyed.
- Condition of empty lots was determined quite subjectively. A lot that was strewn with debris might be considered in poor condition, as might an overgrown lot, which, after being mowed, could be considered in good condition.
- Our survey is only a reflection of commercial activity and use at the time each area was surveyed. It is possible certain corridors are more active at night or on days when we did not survey (e.g., Sunday). It was difficult to confidently categorize some parcels as vacant given the activity (or lack thereof) in the one particular moment it was surveyed.
Surveying Without a Smartphone – Mazumder’s Method

Most survey data was gathered using the methodology based on the applications developed by CFA. However, the application is not currently compatible with Microsoft Windows Mobile Operating Systems. Consequently, one survey team found itself without a working smartphone for several days. In response, they created a hybrid data collection system.

This system, called Mazumder’s Method, is based on manually combining Google Earth maps with the parcel maps from the City of Detroit before recording and inputting data. The process involves four steps:

1. Prior to surveying, the team printed out the selected survey areas/streets from Google Streets (often taping the pieces of paper together so they visually mirrored the desired travel route of that day’s survey).
2. The city parcel outlines were hand drawn onto the printouts and the parcel numbers written in, with the help of both Google Earth map and online map from CFA.
3. Handwritten notes were made in a notebook during actual surveying indicating each numbered parcel’s category definitions.
4. After an area was surveyed the hand written data was input into the CFA database.

This multi-step process was more time consuming than the mobile coding process, but the on-street windshield coding was quicker, and was easily done by two people. Mazumder’s Method can be used by any group that wants to do the kind of parcel surveying done by the CLICS survey teams but do not have access to a smartphone.
Issue with Data Collected

In both the mobile coding and Mazumder’s Method approaches, the data collected was not “clean.” In order to be processed, it needed to be saved as a DBF file that allows text to be saved as data. Though the CSV format, in which the exported data were stored, is a common form of data storage, it was far more difficult to work with text variables in this format as CSV files do not recognize text variables. Consequently, CVS stores all fields as quantitative data unless they are clearly qualitative (e.g. Parcel IDs were stored as quantitative even though they contained elements of text, and were entered as such in GIS). Further development of this application and how data are stored and retrieved should store the data gathered from these surveys into a DBF format rather than a CSV.

Survey teams also experienced significant issues of incompatibility between the different shape-files provided by the city to the CLICS GIS team. CLICS requested this information in order to incorporate the current land use along with the city’s zoning map and master plan. The shape-file provided, however, was inconsistent with the shape-file used to develop the application (which was based on data from the Assessor’s Office). This issue significantly delayed both the processing and analysis of the data collected. When using this application in future studies, it is essential for all parties to ensure that the data used to develop the application is the same that is forwarded to the group gathering and analyzing the data.
4. CLICS Survey Findings

The following is a descriptive summary of results found by Detroit CLICS. The results are categorized by the city as a whole and by geography; traditional main streets, Detroit Works Demonstration Areas, major corridors, and major thoroughfares. Geography boundaries are defined in the methodology (Chapter 2). Notable features identified geography are indicated below and a summary of total results can be found in Appendix E.
4.1 Findings for CLICS Area

A total of 9,538 commercial parcels were sampled for this survey, which accounts for roughly a third of all commercial parcels in the City of Detroit (table x). A majority of parcels had a standing building with a single business onsite, 57.3 percent (5,468). A fifth (1,891) of parcels are parking lots and 17.9 percent (1,711) are empty lots. The remaining parcels are identified as multiple codes or parks. Of the parcels with buildings we surveyed, a quarter (1,477) are classified as probably vacant or vacant/abandoned. Just over half of the parcels (54 percent, 5,147) either contain no buildings or contain a building that is either probably vacant or vacant/abandoned. A majority of parcels with buildings are occupied or probably occupied (62.1 percent, 3,642 and 12.7 percent, 747, respectively). This figure does not account for a nominal number of businesses that operate on parking lots or empty lots (ex. paid parking, cell phone tower, and billboard).

A majority of parcels are in good condition (65.1 percent, 6,214). An even greater number of buildings with a single business on site or that are multi-coded buildings are in good condition (71.7 percent, 3,923 and 78.4 percent, 312, respectively). Additionally, a majority of parking lots and parks are in good condition (76 percent, 1,441 and 79.7 percent, 51, respectively).

Parcels with empty lots had the greatest percentage in fair and poor condition (35.8 percent, 613 and 31.6 percent, 540). A small number of structures, both multi-code and one business, need to demolished, 1.5 percent (86) and nearly a fifth are in fair condition (1,135). In addition, 1.3 percent (75) of buildings are fire damaged and 4.4 percent (256) are vacant, open, and dangerous. These results show that a majority of buildings are in good condition or require only moderate repairs.

The number of uses exceeds the number of parcels within our survey, since multi code recorded multiple uses within a single parcel. Accounting for multi code buildings, there are a total of 10,074 uses of which 55 percent (5,537) are in buildings with known uses. A majority of buildings with known uses are retail and service (30 percent, 1,659 and 32.1 percent, 1,775, respectively).

A quarter of parcels with a building on-site are auto-oriented (1,465) and the remainder are pedestrian-oriented.

Table 3. Use by Type: CLICS Area

Figure 4. CLICS Study Area
4.2 Findings for Detroit Works Project Demonstration Areas

Slightly more than a quarter of parcels (2,545) surveyed are located in the Detroit Works Project Demonstration Areas (Table 5). A majority of the parcels had a building on site, 62.2 percent (1,582). Nearly an equal number of parcels are parking lots, (18.6 percent, 473) and empty lots (18.1 percent, 461). Compared to the total survey results, there are fewer probably vacant and vacant/abandoned parcels with a building in the DWP demonstration areas (17.8 percent, 282). Additionally, just less than half of parcels have no building or a building that is probably vacant or vacant/abandoned. Three-quarters of buildings are occupied (1,189) which is more than 10 percent higher than overall results.

Nearly 70 percent of parcels are in good condition (1,772). A majority of parcels with a building on site are in good condition (79.8 percent, 1,263). Parcels with a park or parking-lot also are most often in good condition (75.9 percent, 22 and 75.7 percent, 358, respectively). Parcels with empty lots had the highest percentage of both fair and poor condition (38.6, 178, percent and 32 percent, 148, respectively). A small number of buildings on parcels are in poor condition or in need of demolition (5.1 percent, 80 and 1.6 percent, 26, respectively). Only 1.8 percent (28) of buildings is fire damaged and 2.6 percent (41) are vacant, open, and dangerous.

There are a total of 2,732 uses when multi-coded buildings are broken down by use. Due to limitations in our data only the first two uses could be extracted for multi-use, accounting for 97 percent (2,650) of all uses. There are a total of 1,541 first two known uses, excluding parking, parks, and empty lots. Of these, the most prevalent use is residential, 30 percent (463) which is 20 percent higher than overall results. In addition, 25.8 percent (398) are service and 22.6 percent (348) are retail. A majority of service uses are unknown, 29.4 percent (117) and nearly a fifth of services are salon and motor-vehicle services (19.6 percent, 78, and 18.8 percent, 75, respectively). Roughly half of retail uses are other (178) and 12.6 percent (44) are grocery stores.
4.3 Findings for Traditional Main Street Overlay Areas

There are 2,321 parcels surveyed in the main street overlay area (Table 6). The parcels in this area account for 24.3 of all parcels surveyed. A majority of parcels have a building on the site, including a building with one use and multi-coded, 57.9 percent (1,344). The percentage of parking lots in the traditional main street overlay is roughly 10 percent higher than overall areas at 29.6 percent (687). Furthermore, the area has a 6 percent lower percentage of empty lots than overall areas at 11.4 percent (264). Parcels with buildings on site had a probably vacant and vacant/abandoned of 22.6 percent (304). More than half of the parcels (1,281) contain no building or have a building that is probably or vacant/abandoned. A majority of parcels with a building are occupied or probably occupied (68.5 percent, 921 and 8.9 percent, 119, respectively).

A majority of parcels are in good condition (73.7 percent, 1,710), which is 8 percent higher than overall areas. More than three quarters of parcels with a single business or that are multi-coded are in good condition (76.1 percent, 100 and 76.3 percent, 923, respectively). Parcels with a park or parking lot have a higher percentage of good condition than overall areas (92.3 percent, 24 and 85.4 percent, 587, respectively).

Parcels with empty lots are mostly in fair or poor condition (31.4 percent, 83 and 27.7 percent, 73). Less than one percent of parcels with buildings, both multi-code and one business need to be demolished (0.7 percent, 9) and 16.4 percent (220) are in fair condition. Additionally, 0.5 percent (7) of parcels with buildings are fire damaged and 2.3 percent (31) are vacant, opened, and dangerous.

There are a total of 2,544 uses when accounting for multi-coded buildings. The first two uses were extracted, which is 95.9 percent (2,439) of total uses. There are 1,304 first two known uses, excluding parks, empty lots and parking lots. Of these retail and service are the most frequent use (27.8 percent, 363 and 31.4 percent, 409, respectively).

A majority of parcels with buildings are pedestrian-oriented, 81 percent (1,088) and 19 percent (256) are auto-oriented.

Table 6. Site by Type - Traditional Main Street Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>Parcel (qty)</th>
<th>Parcel (pct)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty-Lot</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-Code</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels With Buildings</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking-Lot</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Findings for Major Corridor Overlay Areas

There are 4,762 parcels surveyed in the major corridor overlay area (Table 7). The parcels surveyed from this area account for nearly half of all parcels surveyed. A majority of the parcels have a building on site 60 percent (2858). Additionally, 23.3 percent (1,110) of parcels are parking lots and 16.17 percent are empty lots (770). Slightly more than a quarter of parcels (740) with buildings are probably vacant or vacant/abandoned. More than half of parcels either contain no building or have a building that is probably vacant or vacant/abandoned (2,644). A majority of buildings are occupied or probably occupied (59.5 percent, 1,701 and 14.6 percent, 417 respectively). These figures are similar to results found for the entire study area.

A majority of parcels with buildings, parks and parking lots are in good condition. Parcels with a building and single business have a slightly lower percentage (67.4 percent, 1,789) of good condition than overall results. Multi-coded buildings on parcels are in good condition more frequently than a single business (78.3 percent, 159). Additionally, parks and parking lots are most often in good condition (75 percent, 18 and 76.3 percent, 847, respectively).

Parcels with empty lots are most often in fair or poor condition (38.2 percent, 294 and 30 percent, 231, respectively). Parcels with a building, both multi code and one business, need to be demolished 1.2 percent (34), and 23 percent (656) are in fair condition. Furthermore, 0.9 (25) percent are fire damaged and 5 percent (142) are vacant, open, and dangerous.

There are a total of 5,103 uses accounted in all of the surveyed parcels in major corridor overlay areas. The following data represents 96.6 percent of the total uses found in this area, accounting for only the first two uses in multi-coded buildings. There are 3,022 first, two known uses, excluding parks, empty lots, and parking lots. Of these, retail and service are the most frequent use (32.4 percent, 841 and 35.2 percent, 916, respectively).
4.5 Findings for Major Thoroughfare Areas

There are 484 parcels surveyed in the major thoroughfares area (Table 8), accounting for 5.1 percent of all parcels surveyed. Three quarters of parcels have a parcel with a building (362), which is more than 10 percent higher than overall results. Major thoroughfares also have a lower percentage of parking lots and empty lots than the overall areas (12.8 percent, 58, and 12 percent, 62, respectively). Of the parcels with buildings, 30.1 percent (109) are probably vacant or vacant/abandoned. Nearly half of parcels either have no building or have a building that is probably vacant or vacant/abandoned. A majority of parcels with buildings are occupied or probably occupied (47.8 percent, 173 and 22.1 percent, 80, respectively).

A majority of parcels are in good condition (70.5 percent, 341) which is 5 percent higher than overall areas. A greater proportion of buildings with a single business or that are multi-coded are in good condition (74.9 percent, 254 and 87 percent, 20, respectively). All parks are in good condition (2) and 77.4 percent (48) of parking lots are also in good condition.

Parcels with empty-lots have the highest percentage of fair and poor condition (58.6 percent, 34 and 12.1 percent, 7, respectively). Only one parcel with a building needs to be demolished and 19.1 percent (69) are in fair condition. Additionally, 1.4 percent (5) of buildings are fire damaged and 2.5 percent (9) are vacant, open, and dangerous.

There are a total of x uses, when including multi-coded buildings. The first two uses are extracted, which accounts for x percent of all uses (498). There are a total of 309 first two known uses, excluding parks, parking-lots, and empty lots. Of these, service and retail are the most frequent use (28.5 percent, 88 and 35.6 percent, 110, respectively).

There are 484 parcels surveyed in the major thoroughfares area (Table 8), accounting for 5.1 percent of all parcels surveyed. Three quarters of parcels have a parcel with a building (362), which is more than 10 percent higher than overall results. Major thoroughfares also have a lower percentage of parking lots and empty lots than the overall areas (12.8 percent, 58, and 12 percent, 62, respectively). Of the parcels with buildings, 30.1 percent (109) are probably vacant or vacant/abandoned. Nearly half of parcels either have no building or have a building that is probably vacant or vacant/abandoned. A majority of parcels with buildings are occupied or probably occupied (47.8 percent, 173 and 22.1 percent, 80, respectively).

A majority of parcels with buildings are pedestrian-oriented, 73.5 percent (266) and 26.5 percent (96) are auto-oriented.
5. CLICS Focus Areas

This section examines quantitative as well as qualitative characteristics of 10 focus areas in the City. The focus areas surveyed were selected based on the data collected along the city’s main commercial corridors, thoroughfares and its traditional main street areas, as well as the personal interests of each survey team. The focus areas consist of: East Warren Business District, West Warren (Greenfield to Rouge Park), Gratiot Avenue/Eastern Market District, a more detailed look at Grand River Avenue (Meyer to West Grand Boulevard), Chaldean Town (7 Mile from Woodward Avenue to John R), Conant (Hamtramck to Outer Drive), Livernois (8 Mile to the Lodge Freeway), Michigan Avenue, Midtown/New Center Detroit Works Demonstration Area, and West Vernor Highway. This section will provide a closer analysis of the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of these focus areas, such as aspects of design, activity, and traffic. It will also propose specific recommendations for each section.
5.1 East Warren Business District

East Warren Business District (EWBD) is a major corridor along Warren Avenue west from Devonshire to Detroit’s border with Grosse Pointe Farms (Grosse Pointe) at the intersection of Warren and Mack Avenue. We surveyed 216 parcels in the EWBD. The EWBD corridor’s parcels are in good condition. Nearly 84 percent of the parcels are in good condition. Less than one percent of the parcels are categorized in poor condition. 61 percent (131) of the buildings in the corridor appear to be occupied or probably occupied. Conversely, 26 percent (57) of the parcels appear to be vacant or probably vacant. This is in line with the vacancy rate for the total parcels surveyed in major corridors throughout the city.

The buildings along the EWBD provide a variety of retail and service options. A plurality of the corridor’s storefronts, nearly 34 percent, offers a service; including legal and medical offices, automotive repair, barbers. 23 percent of the occupied businesses in the EWBD are retail; including bike shops, hardware stores, grocers. Less than 3 percent (6) of the parcels surveyed are liquor stores. Diversity of use is a feature throughout the EWBD. However, the quality of corridor’s structures, it’s landscaping and the number of professional services offered increase as the corridor approaches Grosse Pointe.
The EWBD’s proximity to Grosse Pointe likely contributes to the corridor’s relatively high levels of activity and occupancy. It may also help account for the diversity of commercial uses; particularly the increase in professional services available in the eastern part of the EWBD. The area of Warren in Grosse Pointe, immediately across the border with Detroit, is similar in design to the EWBD. Buildings are generally no more than two stories. There are restaurants and small retail fronted by sidewalks with planter boxes and shaded by trees. It does, however, become noticeably better maintained and active. Storefronts are well landscaped; there is pedestrian activity around sidewalk patios. The EWBD can draw from this activity. The commercial areas along Warren in Grosse Pointe can contribute to the critical mass of shoppers crucial to the success of any commercial area.

The effect of Grosse Pointe is apparent in the stretch of the EWBD close to its border. The western part of the EWBD includes storefronts that are clearly vacant and stretches of inactivity; however, it is secure and has not been vandalized. The parcels generally are in good condition, but the eastern portion of the EWBD would benefit from efforts to improve landscaping and the façade of its structures. Despite the pedestrian orientation of much of the EWBD, pedestrian activity is fairly light along the corridor. There is a fairly high level of automobile traffic along Warren.

There is currently no need for additional parking in the EWBD as drivers can easily find a space along the street and in the corridor’s ample off street parking; nearly 11 percent of the parcels surveyed in the EWBD are exclusively used for parking.

Nearly 97 percent (210) of the parcels surveyed in the EWBD fall within an area classified in Detroit’s Master Plan as Neighborhood Commercial (CN). Four are classified as Low Density Residential (RL) and one is designated Recreation (PRC). Likewise, 93 percent (202) of the parcels are zoned B4. B4 zoning comfortably allows the commercial activity of the EWBD’s storefronts. In fact, it is an unnecessarily intense zoning classification for an area envisioned by the MP – and in reality – as a neighborhood shopping area. This is emphasized by the number of pedestrian-oriented structures in the EWBD. Over 70 percent (157) of the corridor’s buildings are pedestrian-oriented.
**Recommendations**

The EWBD is a relatively healthy corridor, but it still struggles with vacancy and would benefit from improvements to its landscaping, lighting, and the façade of its structures. The DWP has targeted the area surrounding the EWBD as an area for investment (table X.). Efforts to encourage new business along in the EWBD will be more successful if the city is able to market the corridor as an attractive and safe shopping destination. The city should target the EWBD for improvements such as flower boxes, benches, incentives to improve building facades, lighting and signage.

Improvements to Warren Avenue itself can also have an impact. Currently, the street is designed for higher levels of automotive traffic than necessary. Reducing the number of automotive lanes in favor of bike lanes and better-defined street parking will encourage biking in the area, particularly given the EWBD’s location along a major corridor between Grosse Pointe and Midtown Detroit. Better defined parking along the street and the slower traffic speeds associated with fewer automotive lanes, will also work to slow the traffic through the EWBD. This not only makes the area more pedestrian-friendly, but also gives passing drivers an improved chance of noticing the businesses along the corridor and then being able to park to visit.

It is important for the City of Detroit to ensure the ZO helps ensure the MP’s vision of the EWBD. The DWP has designated the area surrounding the EWBD as a place the City of Detroit should target for investment. Incentives to attract businesses to the EWBD’s useable vacant space will clearly be beneficial to the corridor. A concern, however, is that the city’s current ZO has much of the corridor zoned B4. This is an unnecessarily intense classification for an area envisioned in the MP as a Neighborhood Commercial area. Unless its zoning is reduced, the EWBD could develop in a way that ruins the desired pedestrian-oriented, neighborhood feel. It is suggested that the city consider rezoning much of the area as Neighborhood and Local Business (B2).
5.2 West Warren Focus Area

This stretch of West Warren Avenue is located on the peninsula of Detroit that juts into Dearborn and Dearborn Heights. The commercial strip along this stretch of West Warren is contiguous between Dearborn and Detroit. General conditions (aesthetics, façades, and sidewalks) change when Warren transitions between Dearborn and Detroit, becoming less orderly as you move into the city.

The Dearborn stretch appears better maintained, though the core character of both areas is similar. Despite its noticeable lack of maintenance, 89.1 percent of West Warren’s commercial buildings in Detroit were found to be in good condition, and 79.6 percent of commercial buildings are occupied or probably occupied. 82.4 percent of parcels containing buildings surveyed in this area are pedestrian-oriented in design. The area originally developed in a pedestrian-oriented manner, but new construction often takes the form of auto-oriented strip malls, likely due to the fact that all 272 commercial parcels along this stretch of West Warren are zoned as General Business (B4).
This zoning is contradictory to the MP’s designation of the area as Neighborhood Commercial area. The zoning ordinance deems B4 zoning as appropriate for business and commercial uses typically found on a major thoroughfare (e.g., automobile oriented commercial uses). A neighborhood commercial district, as defined by the MP, however, “generally consist of a large collection of contiguous storefronts along a street or streets” and is “pedestrian oriented.” For the MP’s recommendations to be truly actionable, the zoning of West Warren needs to be changed, ideally to Local Business and Residential District (B2).

The pedestrian-orientation of the area is undermined by the prevalence of surface parking lots. Existing businesses have seen fit to convert vacant parcels into parking lots to better accommodate customers. This survey area has relatively few empty lots when compared to the entire CLICS survey area (3.9 percent vs. 17.7 percent of parcels), though it has a slightly higher proportion of parking lots (21.1 percent vs. 19.6 percent). A significant number of parcels contained parking lots as ancillary uses to commercial buildings, even if the building themselves were pedestrian oriented, but these ancillary parking lots were not included in our totals.

The roadway throughout this section of West Warren generally consists of four lanes of traffic with ill-defined parking in the right lanes. Crosswalks lack striping and signals. The sidewalks are mostly in poor condition, as are the areas between sidewalks and roadways.

The presence of second story residential units is greater along this stretch of West Warren than on many of the areas in our survey (17.5 percent of buildings on West Warren have the potential for residential units above ground floor commercial uses, whereas only 11.3 percent of buildings in the entire CLICS survey area had second story residential). To enhance the area’s main street feel, the city should adopt policies that encourage the development of second story residential units above ground floor retail shops.
Recommendations

Based on our qualitative observations and data collection along West Warren, we have formulated some general recommendations for strengthening the commercial district in the area. Like in Dearborn, the commercial strip in Detroit is populated with a variety of ethnic businesses. Arabic script is found on business signage up and down the street. As West Warren is home to a concentration ethnic retailer and the surrounding neighborhoods are home to a significant immigrant population that is primarily Arab, the city could promote the area as an ethnic neighborhood destination much like Mexican Town. Efforts should be made, in coordination with the city of Dearborn, to attract non-residents to neighborhood businesses.

Indeed, better coordination of planning efforts with the city of Dearborn would promote the attractiveness and coherence of the commercial district that is contiguous between both municipalities. An example of this could be the installation of pedestrian oriented lighting in the Detroit section that is similar to that which exists in Dearborn. Rezoning to B2 would better align development in the Detroit section with that in Dearborn, which is zoned as a Community Business District. With such good overall building conditions in the area, West Warren would benefit from façade improvement programs, which are recommended in the current MP.

Lastly, if parking were better defined on the street with striping and signage, the perceived need for surface lots might be reduced and the pedestrian orientation of structures would be enhanced. This would also help to calm automobile traffic on West Warren, which appeared to exceed speed limits and make it difficult for pedestrians to cross the street.
5.3 Gratiot Corridor (I-75 to 8 Mile)/ Eastern Market

Within the Gratiot corridor, 792 commercial parcels were surveyed between I-375 and Eight Mile Road. 38 percent (302) of the parcels with buildings were classified as occupied or probably occupied. Roughly 22 percent (174) of the commercial buildings are vacant or possibly vacant. 54 percent (431) of the parcels appeared to be in good condition. 16 percent (125) of the parcels were listed in poor condition. Only nine of the parcels are recommended for demolition.

The area surveyed in the Eastern Market District is spatially compact, with only 48 commercial parcels, intermixed with industrial parcels. The specified streets surveyed in the area of Eastern Market include Russell, Division, Wilkins, Winder, Adelaide, South Gratiot, Riopelle, Alfred, Market, Orleans, and Service. 83 percent of the buildings were occupied and 6 percent were probably occupied. No poor or demolished commercial buildings remain, which is not surprising. Eastern Market attracts about 45,000 visitors every Saturday during the growing season, is the site of many popular restaurants and shops, and has just received $10 million from the US Department of Transportation to make vital improvements. 79 percent of the buildings in the district are considered pedestrian-oriented, while only 20 percent of the commercial buildings are auto-oriented.

Table 11. Gratiot and Eastern Market - Occupancy and Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occupied</th>
<th>Probably Occupied</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demolish</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The specified streets surveyed in the Eastern Market included numerous shopping options for customers. About 60 percent (29) of the buildings are coded as retail. Only 10 percent (5) of the buildings were identified as restaurants in the specified district within the Eastern Market. Over the past few years, Eastern Market has seen significant investment, which has strengthened its core by providing a variety of options for visitors. The district has many assets; however one visual piece that is missing is lack of green space. The district suffers one setback, which is the difficulty of connectivity from almost all methods of transportation. It is awkwardly jammed between Gratiot and I-75, while the Dequindre Cut ends prematurely without any safe access for cyclists or pedestrians to enter the market. Providing bike lanes within Eastern Market would allow cyclists an opportunity to have a great experience without having to compete with vehicles.

Gratiot near I-75 and the I-375 interchange could also use an easier form of connectivity. The traffic and street signage are clustered together which can create a bottleneck and can become very confusing. Clear and concise signage illustrating to traffic how to properly enter the market off of Gratiot and I-75 may alleviate traffic congestion and create a better flow of traffic within the district.
The Gratiot corridor and Eastern Market district have their share of planning issues, but they also have some great qualities. These qualities consist of new developments, mixed use commercial units, unique characteristics surrounding the commercial units. The corridor provides a lot in terms of transportation as a major thoroughfare in Detroit, a connection to I-94, I-375, Coleman A Young airport, and the Dequindre Cut. A new development is being built at Gratiot and French Rd. The façade of the buildings are well kept as you travel towards the Eastern Market area. There is also decorative lighting located on numerous buildings throughout the Gratiot corridor.

In addition to the diverse food markets located in the EMD, the Gratiot corridor offers grocery markets. Save-Mart is located on Gratiot at East Grand Blvd. Farmer Johns Market is located on Gratiot and Harper. Mike’s Fresh Market is located on Gratiot and Lappin. Providing pocket parks with satellite markets would transform the area into a better food corridor.

**Recommendations**

Looking at the entire Gratiot corridor and Eastern Market, the traffic patterns may not currently require six lanes of traffic. It may be beneficial to the corridor as a whole to look into closing one lane of traffic each way, create a designated bus lane and bicycle lanes.

There are many opportunities to demolish residential homes behind Gratiot to create parking lots off of Gratiot to reduce traffic complications. Providing lots behind buildings would clear reduce the amount of traffic. Heavier mass transit for the corridor would prove more options for transportation, especially near the City Airport at Conner. It would also be beneficial to concentrate on new developments at major intersections, such as Vandyke, Seven Mile, Eight Mile and the Edsel Ford Freeway.

![Businesses in the Eastern Market](image-url)
5.4 Chaldean Town

Along 7 Mile Road from Woodward to John R is a commercial strip that runs through an area known as Chaldean Town; historically a place where Chaldean immigrants have settled. When one drives down this Traditional Main Street, the Arabic writing on the businesses and the existence of the Arab American and Chaldean Council (ACC) are the only indicators this may be an ethnic enclave. Furthermore, the lack of activity of this commercial corridor make these indicators seem more like relics of the past.

The design of the buildings through Chaldean Town is predominantly pedestrian-oriented, making up 48 out of the 62 buildings surveyed. Pedestrian traffic, however, is low along the corridor. This is often the case in even the more vibrant commercial districts of Detroit, but many of the businesses surveyed are vacant. Many of the buildings are in poor condition. In fact, Chaldean Town has twice the vacancy rate than the total parcels surveyed (23 percent vacant, 23 percent probably vacant; 13 percent vacant and 12 percent probably vacant). Likewise the conditions of the buildings are worse off than the city average. In the city as a whole, only about 7 percent of parcels with buildings are in poor condition. In Chaldean Town 23 percent of the buildings are in poor condition.
Recommendations

With easy access off the 7 Mile exit from I-75, functioning industrial along the train tracks at the eastern edge of the area, a prominent residential neighborhood (Palmer Woods) directly across Woodward, and an authentic ethnic identity, it is to ignore this commercial corridor. The higher percentage of parcels with buildings gives the area potential as the backbone of a commercial area (assuming buildings surveyed as in poor condition can be restored). Attracting businesses to this strip and reducing vacancy and blight needs to be priority. Therefore, at this point, it may not be appropriate to change the current zoning in a manner that would make it more restrictive. What is more important is to ensure that new developments in the area maintain the pedestrian-oriented functionality of the area. Businesses change much more fluidly than buildings. Providing incentives for new immigrants to open businesses in the area could help to maintain the area’s authenticity and lower vacancy. Additionally, blighted buildings could be sites of community art projects that improve the aesthetic and highlight the character of the neighborhood. Filling empty lots with community gardens made available to neighborhood residents could bring people from the neighborhood to this traditional main street.

Figure 16. Commercial Uses on 7 Mile (Chaldean Town)
Ultimately, Chaldean Town has the pedestrian design and remnants of an authentic neighborhood identity that could support a vibrant commercial district. However, the vacancy and blight greatly undermine these qualities. It is important to pursue solutions that will work to enhance these fading characteristics before the area no longer has a leg to stand on.

Although the relatively new and nicely landscaped ACC building may act as an anchor for the Chaldean neighborhood, it seems to be an oasis in the desert.

Although the MP mostly calls for approximately 80 percent of the area to be CN, the great majority of the parcels – 93 percent - are zoned B4. It is difficult to determine if this is the result or a symptom of an area seemingly losing its neighborhood identity, but moving forward the city must decide on what its vision for Chaldean Town is. If the city decides the area is stable it should change the zoning to B2 to reflect their image as expressed in the MP. However, in a struggling area it is understandably difficult to make zoning any more restrictive than is necessary.
5.5 Grand River Focus Area

The Grand River Focus Area (Grand River FA) consists of Grand River Avenue running east west between the endpoints of Meyer and West Grand Boulevard. Throughout the segment of Grand River from Meyer to West Grand Blvd is where we surveyed the highest levels of vacancy of the Grand River corridor. With ample amounts of vacant space, this area has become a target of pollution due to debris and garbage. Strips of weeds and untreated lawns add to the overall unattractive of the area and make it difficult to encourage new businesses to invest in this area. Pedestrian orientation accounts for slightly half (51 percent) of the FA’s design, contributing to increased walkability for commuters of the low dense residential area.

Decent sidewalks provide for typical interactions along this focus area, but seem to become more active nearing the intersection of Myers and Grand River. Although this may be the least productive segment of the corridor, the Grand River FA remains vibrant with a majority of the parcels containing buildings providing retail services (27 percent). The service and retail uses are pretty much evenly distributed throughout categories, perhaps slightly skewed towards automobile sales, parts and repair. These viable businesses, however, are forced to contend with the presence of extreme vacancy and empty lots; large belts of inactivity.
A total of 398 parcels were surveyed within the Grand River FA. Slightly more than half (53 percent) of the surveyed parcels do not have a building. The majority of these lots are composed of empty lots (72 percent), while 27 percent are developed parking lots. Within this area there is one park accounting for less than 1 percent of total parcels. To add to this fact, there are almost as many empty lots (38 percent of the entire focus area) as there are parcels with buildings (45 percent). Of the parcels containing buildings 42 percent appear to be vacant, 14 percent appear to be vacant-open-and-dangerous, less than 1 percent contain fire damage or have been recommended for demolition. Some vacant buildings appear to be vandalized or tagged by graffiti. Optimistically 46 percent of the parcels appear to be in good condition with 32 percent being noted as fair condition, 19 percent in poor condition, and less than 1 percent in need of demolition. The parcels remaining in good condition could benefit from landscaping and façade improvements.

Also, 66 parcels (16 percent) are classified as “Mixed-Town Centers” within the Grand River FA while it is pretty inconceivable that these mixed town centers meet the bar. There is an urgent need to capitalize on such mixed town centers to attract the general population, as well as provide for the needs of the people. In addition, 19 percent of the buildings are used for religious purposes, which is a strong symbol of unity for the communities. Furthermore, some of the 65 parcels classified as “Mixed-Town Centers” in the Master Plan seem to be dependent upon places of worship.
Recommendations

To mend the gap between the zoning and the land use guide for this focus area, the city must tackle the task of filling in the unoccupied empty lots to further advance the 324 parcels (81 percent) as classified “Thoroughfare Commercial” uses. In compliance with the zoning, 92 percent of the Grand River FA is zoned B4, permitting commercial pursuit along the Grand River corridor. However, with many vacant parcels and empty lots consuming the area, it is evident our inventory provides a clear need for conformity between the city’s zoning and the land use guide. At large, this area is nothing more than a shopping district spaced out by more than a few empty lots and abandoned buildings. The DDA could capitalize on this opportunity to coordinate with local businesses to develop pocket parks where unoccupied vacant lots exist. By seeking private support from local businesses, community development corporations alongside the DDA could transform these impaired areas to enhance the aesthetics of the focus area, also increasing the presence of “Mixed-Town Centers”. Typically created for this sole purpose, pocket parks transform vacant unoccupied land into vibrant areas of greenery, and outdoor community gathering without large-scale redevelopment.
5.6 The Avenue of Fashion: Livernois (McNichols to 8 Mile)

Encompassing the University of Detroit Mercy, Livernois bound between McNichols and 8 mile has been coined The Avenue of Fashion (Livernois between 7 and 8 mile). Both are potential assets to the corridor and may have an impact on its future success. This focus area neighbors the Bagley community, to the West, as well as sustainable residential neighborhoods, such as Sherwood Forest and the University District, to the East.

Most of the businesses in this focus area (78.9 percent) were pedestrian oriented in design. The streetscape and infrastructure is congruent with the pedestrian design of the buildings. Traffic islands reduce the speed on this part of the corridor to 30 miles per hour. Cross walks are not as far apart as those in more auto-oriented corridors such as 8 mile, which supports pedestrian activity as well. Worth mentioning is the presence of a metered lot which encourages visitors to park and walk to their destination which increases the likelihood that they will stop in other businesses while in transit. There is less commercial density between 6 and 7 mile.

Figure 21. Site by Type and Vacancy on Livernois
The University of Detroit Mercy is predominantly a commuter college, interaction with the neighboring community could increase livability for students that reside on or near campus. The private school is gated off from the community, which is a clear sign of its detachment from the surrounding neighborhood and its amenities. Residential homes in neighborhoods surrounding the campus are relatively large and appear well kept, which could be a great option for off-campus student housing. Low-rise attached commercial property between 7 and 8 mile have the potential to be mixed-use developments with residential units above the ground floor.

The sentiment that any development is good development can diminish the identity of the Avenue of Fashion. Nearly, 56 percent of the commercial parcels with buildings were vacant and an additional 15 percent were possibly vacant. While these rates are high, there is an opportunity to strategically attract future development in order to remain consistent as a retail-focused corridor. During our observation, the corridor seemed to have an abundance of hair and nail salons. In the entire two-mile strip 26 parcels were coded as containing these services.
Recommendations

While some services are useful, for this strip to maintain its retail identity, the zoning ordinance should support retail development first. Currently 68 percent of the commercial parcels in this area are zoned B2: Local Business and Residential District. According to the zoning ordinance the B2 designation is for “[A District that] provides the day-to-day consumer goods and services required to serve a small residential area.” If the goal for this area is to be a retail destination, it would service the local residential area but would also seek to attract business from outside the local area. We feel that a more appropriate designation would be B3: Shopping District which currently only makes up 8.6 percent of the parcels. This classification should not only be used for shopping centers and strip malls but for areas that have a retail focus. This would give the City the opportunity to be selective with development on this strip and make retail the primary use over.

Of the commercial parcels that contained buildings, 12 out of 303 had residential above the first floor. Adjustments to the zoning ordinance could increase density and as a result encourage development of residential units above the commercial parcels. Before increasing residential properties in this area place-making efforts are needed to create an environment that will retain commuting students and turn them into residents. Lastly, the Livernois Focus Area lacks a presence of ownership in the corridor. While this area may be on the radar of the City and local business organizations, the formation of a visible business association or organization designated solely to business development in this area would create a sense of ownership in the corridor. Displaying a strong presence in the corridor could be accomplished through marketing efforts such as banners that welcome visitors to the Avenue of Fashion and marketing materials in storefronts.
5.7 New Center/North End

The Midtown/New Center Area, in addition to one of Detroit Works! Project (DPW) demonstration areas, includes Woodward Avenue, Grand Blvd., and the North End/Virginia Park DWP area. Woodward Avenue was surveyed from South of Highland Park, to North of I-75. Grand Blvd. was surveyed from Grand River/Linwood on the west to Oakland on the east. North End/Virginia Park DWP area, includes commercial corridors along Linwood Avenue, Rosa Parks Boulevard, Second Avenue, and Oakland Avenue, in addition to elements of the corridors previously listed.

The New Center area includes a high number of pedestrian-oriented parcels (550+). It is at odds with the high # of parcels zoned B4 (778). The general business does not have the restrictions and codes that might help to promote a more pedestrian-oriented neighborhood. There is also a significant amount of residential, which makes the case for potential rezoning, but would need further examination. There are relatively few VOD (28/1228) on commercial parcels (2.3 percent). Nineteen (1.6 percent) of the commercial parcels had low fire damage. Both VOD and low fire damage could be explained by the concentrated attention and efforts of CDCs and the City to continue to improve and strengthen commercial opportunities in this area.

![Figure 24. Oakland Ave. - Site by Type and Condition](image)

Table 15. New Center/North End - Condition and Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel (cty)</td>
<td>Parcel (pot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolish</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel (cty)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel (pot)</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 25. Parking Lots in New Center](image)
Recommendations

Parking is the main concern in the New Center Area; the built environment is interrupted by this issue. Fortunately, the property conditions are generally good in the New Center area. There is also good potential for reinforcing mixed-use/pedestrian oriented at W. Grand/Woodward intersection, as for repurposing parking lots in New Center to generate infill development focused on mixed-use and retail/service sectors that could take advantage of built environment.

Rosa Parks is an area that could benefit from redevelopment. The planning potential is significant. The empty lots on the east side are in good condition. They are fairly well-maintained and free of dumping. The area already has a large shopping center, and is close to new condo developments and senior housing, plus a new community center and park/community land. The street could also provide commercial corridor to service Boston-Edison and help stabilize intervening neighborhoods. The corridor could benefit from its location within/near the boundaries of Live Midtown.

Oakland Avenue has significant disinvestment. There were 102 out of 200 parcels in poor/demolish condition, which is by far most significant concentration in demonstration area.

There were high incidence of vacant lots, and, as noted previously, maintenance was worse than Rosa Parks. Existing businesses are somewhat diverse, but widely scattered around the corridor and heavily surrounded by vacant lots. It appears to have very limited commercial demand or viability when compared with other corridors in the demonstration area. A deemphasizing of Oakland in future seems to make sense, given limited city resources and low density and deteriorated condition of both business and residential establishments.
5.8 Michigan Avenue/Vernor

The Michigan Avenue/Vernor focus area covers four major locations: Michigan Ave. from I-75 to the east and Wyoming to the west, Vernor Highway from 16th to the east and Woodmere to the west, Lawndale from Ford St. to the south and Vernor Highway to the north and Springwells from Ford St. to the south and Vernor Highway to the north. Similarly, each of the streets had a large number of parcels that were pedestrian oriented. The major corridors also have a relatively large portion of parcels that were classified as “residential above”. There were a significant number of empty/vacant lots along Michigan Ave. The commercial properties were densely packed along Vernor Highway. In summary, the commercial parcels were recorded as lots (parking or empty), retail, restaurants/bars and service, based on observation.

The corridors could be classified as transit oriented, mixed use communities, especially Vernor Hwy. In fact, a large portion of the individual parcels are mixed use as many structures consist of residential above. Each corridor has sidewalks, public and transit routes. Michigan Ave. contains bike lanes, giving local residents a variety of transit options to choose from.

Vernor Highway is made distinctive by the ethnic restaurants, businesses, and bars. The area is pedestrian orientated, except for the split at Waterman Street, where there is a lull in commercial activity. Along Vernor was a full range of commercial businesses, including grocery, pharmacy, restaurants, automotive, retail shops, etc. The community is ethnically and religiously diverse, and many of the businesses along the Vernor Hwy. are small, locally owned businesses giving the community a sense of place and identity that may not exist anywhere else throughout the city.

Figure 27. Michigan Avenue - Site Conditions
Recommendations

Based on observations, there are some recommendations for the Vernor/Michigan Ave. area. These include enforcing certain regulations related to land use and zoning. Regulations that encourage, maintain, enhance the current mix of commercial and residential uses, the existing condition of multiple transit options, and the ability of small scale entrepreneurs to open businesses would improve the area as a whole.

Figure 28. Vernor/Springwells - Design
5.10 Master Plan, Zoning, and Detroit Works Project in Light of Findings

The CLICS survey collected data regarding the current conditions of commercial parcels in the City of Detroit. This is necessary to begin tackling the daunting task of addressing the disconnect between the ZO and the MP. Throughout the surveyed commercial areas, the most glaring inconsistency is the large number of parcels designated by the MP as Neighborhood Commercial (CN), yet merely zoned as General Business (B4).

Table # illustrates how 3,662 of the 9,538 parcels surveyed are designated CN by the MP. CN areas are likely best represented by a Local Business and Residential (B2) or Shopping District (B3) zoning classification. Our findings, however, show 76 percent (2,893) of the CN parcels surveyed are currently zoned B4.

In order to amend the ZO in a manner that supports the vision of the MP, parcels that are designated as CN should be rezoned either B2 or B3. However, common knowledge often suggests high levels of vacancy in much of the city – including many areas designated as CN – make it difficult to recommend more restrictive zoning. The need to attract new business, in any form, has complicated attempts to align Detroit’s ZO and MP.
6. Recommendations

Issue:

The Detroit Works Project (DWP) categorized the entire city into four market types; steady, distressed, transitional, and varied. DWP identified three Demonstration Areas, (Bagley, North End, and Southwest), using the different market types. The level of service concentration that each area will receive is based on the market type that it has been assigned and will be lowest in distressed markets, which are characterized by “long term physical decline, near absence of market activity, and high vacancy rates” (Detroit Works Project). Our study reveals that economic vitality exists in areas that DWP has classified as distressed. For instance, commercial parcels along Gratiot Avenue are not represented by “near absence of market activity.” In contrast, Gratiot had a higher percentage of parcels with buildings than overall areas in our survey. The majority of which are in good condition, and either probably occupied or occupied (60.9 percent, 333, and 69.4 percent, 379 respectively). Since this area is classified as a distressed market, DWP indicates a low concentration of services dedicated to improving commercial corridors (http://detroitworksproject.com/wp-content/uploads/pdf/DWP.MarketDescrip2.pdf).

Recommendations:

A. Re-evaluate market areas based on current commercial conditions.
   - CLICS data should be used to verify the condition of commercial areas prior to determining the level of services offered in neighboring residential areas.
   - Reclassify commercial areas that may be economically viable such as Gratiot Avenue, which is currently classified as a distressed market area, however our results indicates otherwise.

Issue:

More than half of the surveyed parcels have no building (park, parking lot, empty lot) or have a building that is probably vacant or vacant/abandoned (54 percent, 5,147). Additionally, 1.3 percent (75) of buildings are fire damaged and 4.4 percent (256) are vacant, open, and dangerous. These parcels tend to have no operable business on-site and are limited in use.

Recommendations:

A. Down-zone unviable or under-developed commercial areas where there is a higher concentration of vacancy or absence of buildings.
   - Down-zoning reduces the density or permitted use of a site and results in a less intensive use. Resources should be targeted toward areas possessing greater economic viability.
   - An area that would be well suited for down-zoning would be Grand River, between Meyer and Grand Boulevard. This area had a prevalence of vacant lots and buildings that are in demolish condition (Appendix z- map of GR-demolish)

B. Due to the prevalence of vacant property, commercial areas that are economically unviable should be downzoned to open space or parks.
C. **Target demolition of commercial buildings** that are vacant, open and dangerous, fire-damaged, and in demolish condition, as defined by our survey. Data from our survey geographically locates commercial buildings in the worst condition.

- Prioritize demolition, in areas where clusters of buildings have high occupancy and are in good condition. Demolition of these structures will have a positive impact on the surrounding businesses and neighbourhood. It will help remove illicit activity that often occurs within and around these structures. After demolition has been completed, work with the County and State Land Banks to encourage adjacent property owners to purchase the vacant parcel(s).

- In economically distressed or high vacancy areas, the city should acquire the recently demolished parcels to restrict new development unless a market study has been completed to encourage rehabilitation of neighboring structures.

- Define the Southwest Demonstration Area and similar commercial areas as a top priority. Southwest has a substantial number of occupied buildings and businesses that would benefit from the removal of a small number buildings that were classified in demolish condition.

D. **Encourage investment, development and rehabilitation efforts in areas** where there was a higher prevalence of buildings in good and fair condition, with low vacancy rates.

- It is essential to preserve these areas to prevent them from reaching a threshold of underdevelopment.

- These areas could benefit from establishing business organizations that are mandated to attract and retain businesses and economic development, promote, and beautify their district.

E. **Enforce city codes using an updated, more focused, zoning ordinance.**

- Designate a city department responsible for enforcing city codes and zoning ordinances and make contact information available to the public.

- Create a simple, user friendly online reporting tool to encourage business owners to file complaints about violations occurring in their commercial area.

- Ensure businesses are aware of general violations during the permitting process and through the online reporting tool.
Issue:

While the majority of parcels that contained structures are pedestrian-oriented in their design (75.3 percent), streetscape and public infrastructure do not always promote or encourage pedestrian traffic. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention cited the environment as a major cause of obesity including accessibility to environments that encourage physical activity (CDC, 2012). Pedestrian-oriented design was defined by our study as buildings situated on the lot line or a slight setback but do not contain parking between the building and the sidewalk. An important feature of pedestrian-oriented design is that the front façade has an entrance facing the street or sidewalk and the entrance is accessible from the sidewalk.

Recommendations:

A. Crosswalk Enhancements

• Longer crossing lights, countdown signals, and crosswalk buttons can enhance pedestrian safety when crossing busy commercial corridors such as Woodward Avenue or Gratiot Avenue while using existing infrastructure such as islands (Sustainable Mobility Initiatives for Local Environment (SMILE), 2004). Time lights to reduce traffic speeds and improve the safety of pedestrians.

• Woodward Avenue in Ferndale, MI is an example of a high traffic corridor, which through strategic streetscape principals has created a more walkable environment for its pedestrian-oriented buildings. Traffic lanes are reduced by constructing a wider island and a parking lane. All crosswalks are located away from the edge of the traffic island, which makes street crossing safer. There are artistic fixtures and informative plaques in the traffic islands which increases aesthetic properties and enhances the pedestrian’s experience. Speed limits are reduced to 30-35 miles per hour.

B. More Frequent Bus stops

• Addressing the design and conditions of bus stops by taking measures such as improving lighting and seating will encourage walking and public transit use (SMILE, 2004).

C. Design aesthetics

• Address sidewalk pavement hazards by adopting and enforcing standardization so that pavements and sidewalks make walking convenient, safe, and accessible for all pedestrians. (SMILE, 2004).

• Create design standards that require new developments to follow pedestrian-oriented design in corridors that currently support it; and address deterrence to walkability concerns in corridors that do not currently support pedestrian-oriented design.

D. Community Awareness

• Bringing community awareness to the health benefits of walking through the use of neighborhood campaigns will encourage support of alternatives to motorized transportation.
Issue:

Due to a lack of stringent regulations, auto-oriented parcels are placed intermittently throughout commercial areas. The placement of auto-oriented parcels and pedestrian-oriented parcels haphazardly along commercial corridors creates disconnected development. In these areas, especially where vacancy is high, design regulations may be more important than restricting the type of business use. Typically buildings last a lot longer than the businesses that inhabit them; therefore it is essential to enforce consistent design standards to protect the character of these commercial areas moving into the future.

Recommendations:

A. Establish design regulations that designate commercial areas as either pedestrian-oriented or auto-oriented to encourage development and create a uniform streetscape.

B. Designate Traditional Main Streets and similar areas as pedestrian-oriented.

C. Designate corridors with high prevalence of auto-dependent development and high traffic as such.

- West Davison is an example of a mostly auto-oriented commercial corridor. Many businesses on this corridor are setback with parking lots in the front. Both the Jefferies Freeway and John C. Lodge Freeway exit onto West Davison, creating high volumes of fast traffic into this corridor (Appendix F). New construction also appears to be in the form of strip malls that are auto-dependent. Since this area is increasingly auto-dependent, design standards should be geared toward the auto, opposed to being distributed randomly along side pedestrian-oriented buildings.

D. Establish form-based codes in commercial neighborhoods (as defined by the MP), Traditional Main Streets and special areas such as Midtown and Downtown.

- Improve the ‘sense of place’ of an area by promoting and regulating pedestrian-orientation, walkability, density, mixed use, streetscapes, signage, etc.

- Establish simple design requirements that developers can easily adhere to and which provide a more attractive option than dealing with traditional zoning options.

- Do not limit the use of particular businesses, such as auto-related. Instead, ensure that they adhere to design standards.
**Issue:**

While buildings occupied nearly 61.5 percent of the parcels zoned for commercial use, about 19.3 percent of these parcels were occupied by parking and another 17.5 percent were empty lots. The majority of the parking lots surveyed were for public use and do not collect revenue. The data does not distinguish between open parking lots that were adjacent to businesses and those that were free standing.

**Recommendations:**

A. *Increase the amount of taxes paid toward parking lots, since they are currently taxed less than an operating business.*

- Create a parking threshold so that only lots with a particular square footage or space are obliged to the tax.

B. *Place a moratorium on parking lots and structures in areas that have an abundance of parking until additional information or a market study can be completed.*

- Evaluate the necessity of parking in areas with ‘too many’ spaces. If the evaluation reveals an abundance of parking, establish strategies to limit additional spaces.
- Develop and refine a plan specifically for parking that can be implemented both city-wide and on a local scale.

C. *Set guidelines that limits the number and placement of parking spaces for new development.*

- In pedestrian-oriented areas create metered lots or structures where people can safely park cars and walk along the corridor. This would limit the amount of on-site parking required for each business and increase pedestrian activity.

- Set a parking maximum for a single building or an entire block. The maximum would prevent the excess of parking, where it is already available.
- Require new development to have parking lots located at the rear of their structure.
Recommendations:

A. Work with neighborhood stakeholders to establish feasible planning objectives and strategies for commercial areas on a local scale.

- Neighborhood stakeholders have insight into the vitality of their commercial areas and can analyze CLICS results in the context of their own neighborhood.
- Stakeholders and the city can work together from their findings and determine how best to plan their neighborhood.
- Engage local stakeholders to establish community support and align objectives to proposed changes to the zoning or master plan.

- Gather socio-economic data, market conditions, and shared neighborhood perspectives to better understand the context of planning commercial use on a local scale.
- Distribute CLICS results to interested community organizations and stakeholders and encourage informed decision making in regards to investment and planning commercial areas.
- Use CLICS to guide current and proposed initiatives initiated by stakeholders.
- Assist interested community organizations to extract and analyze CLICS data on a refined scale.
Issue:

CLICS is a point-in-time sample of nearly one-third of all commercial parcels within the city, and is limited to prioritized geographies, as detailed above. The limitations are listed in 3. Survey Methodology.

Recommendations:

A. Do a complete analysis as it is necessary to continue the survey and complete the remaining parcels.

- This can be achieved by engaging local organizations including chambers of commerce and business associations. This data will assist local organizations in characterizing the commercial property in their neighborhood and planning accordingly. This could serve as an incentive for organizations to survey remaining commercial properties and update results over time.

B. The database can remain up-to-date by obtaining specific information such as use and condition as new businesses occupy the commercial spaces.

C. Expand on the preliminary smartphone application developed by Code for America and create the potential for the application to be used on a much larger scale.

- In order to make the application more user-friendly and easily accessible it needs to be refined to address our limitations and other problems that occurred during our survey.

- Code for America has the capacity to digitize paper survey results, which were unavailable for our sample. Local organizations may benefit from paper surveys when smartphones are not available.
7. Conclusion

The Detroit CLICS survey provides a foundation for City of Detroit to build upon as it continues to improve its understanding of its commercial corridors.

Empty Parcels and Building Condition

Vacancy is the biggest impediment to development in many of Detroit’s commercial corridors. More than half of surveyed parcels have no building (e.g. an empty lot, a park, a parking lot) or have a building that is probably vacant or vacant/abandoned (57.3 percent, 5,468). Additionally, 1.3 percent (75) of the buildings is fire damaged and 4.4 percent (256) are vacant, open and dangerous. These parcels tend to have no operable business on site and are limited use. Despite these challenges, the majority (71.7 percent or 3,923) of the buildings were categorized as being in good condition. Buildings categorized as having multiple codes were even more likely to be in good condition (78.4 percent or 312). Our survey suggests that many commercial buildings have the potential to be rehabilitated and marketed for new businesses. Stretches of parcels that we categorized as empty lots, however, present a challenge to revitalization in many corridors. Any efforts to revitalize a commercial area must first involve a plan to improve the condition of vacant lots, streetscape and building facades.

The Need for Consistent Design

75 percent (4,401) of the parcels surveyed for this report have buildings that are pedestrian-oriented. However, many of the streets dissecting the city’s commercial corridors have been allowed to develop in a way that does not encourage pedestrian traffic. Streets that include more automotive lanes than necessary or that lack adequate pedestrian crossings or signage are detrimental to the sense of place that is a vital in attracting shoppers to an area. In addition, many of the areas surveyed have auto-oriented parcels scattered randomly throughout an otherwise pedestrian-oriented area. This interferes with a corridor’s overall walkability and discourages pedestrian activity. It is strongly suggested that the city work to ensure areas envisioned as pedestrian-oriented are designed as such. Likewise, the city should avoid spending resources on efforts to promote pedestrian-activity in an area that is already dominated by auto-oriented development.
**Major Corridors**

Nearly half (4,762) of the parcels surveyed are in a major commercial corridor. 60 percent (2,858) of the parcels in these areas have a building on site. This is slightly a higher percentage than the one associated with our survey as a whole. Similarly, a slightly higher percentage of parcels along main commercial corridors (23.3 percent or 1,110) are parking lots. The percentage of parcels that are empty lots is lower than the average survey total (16.17 percent or 770). Still, vacancy is an issue in major corridors, with a little more than a quarter of the buildings surveyed (740) categorized as probably vacant or vacant/abandoned. Combined, 2,644 parcels in major corridors have a building that is probably vacant or vacant/abandoned, or no building at all. These figures are similar to results found for the entire study area. The city’s major corridors have a higher percentage of parcels with buildings, but vacancy is still significant.

**Findings Related to the Detroit Works Project**

25 percent (2,545) of the parcels surveyed by Detroit CLICS are located in Detroit Works Project (DWP) Demonstration Areas. Generally, the parcels in DWP areas are in better condition than parcels in other areas surveyed. Parcels in DWP areas were also more likely to be categorized as residential; 30 percent compared to 7.6 percent of the total parcels surveyed. This feature makes Demonstration Areas uniquely suited for mixed-use zoning and development guidelines. We also found, however, that the current condition of a commercial corridor does not always reflect the condition of the surrounding residential areas.

The focus areas surveyed, particularly those on the city’s east side, help paint a more nuanced picture of vacancy than the one currently promoted by the DWP. There are residential areas surrounding Gratiot, for example, that have been designated as mostly vacant by the DWP, yet include stretches of fairly established commercial activity. This suggests efforts to encourage residents to move from the area around Gratiot to a denser part of the city will inevitably contribute to the loss of active business areas. There has been an understandable focus on the incentives and needs associated with encouraging residents to move from mostly vacant to denser parts of the city. The DWP needs to consider similar incentives to help businesses move to denser areas, particularly if it is a current business in an area of the city otherwise slated for disinvestment.
Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance

Detroit’s current MP clearly offers a vision that includes commercial areas of varying density, traffic and range of services offered. It includes suggestions to improve the streetscape and façade of its commercial corridors, as well as efforts to improve the security and vitality of pedestrian-oriented retail sectors. The MP recognizes certain commercial areas should remain neighborhood-focused, while others need to accommodate traffic volumes and density associated with being regional destinations. The plan often expresses support for pedestrian and transit oriented development. Many of the current MP’s suggestions, however, fail to adequately reflect the current condition of Detroit’s neighborhoods.

Each of the MP’s 10 Neighborhood Clusters is meant to represent 100,000 residents. These clusters are largely based on the city’s population in 1990 (1 million). The reliance on outdated census data threatens the MP’s ability to offer realistic proposals to address community needs. In addition, the description of activity and opportunity in each cluster is often overly optimistic. Residential development is a prominent theme; whether infill single-family housing on the east side or the proposed renovation of riverfront warehouses into trendy lofts. The MP presents a strategy of growth, including the seemingly assured redevelopment of Michigan Central Depot and the - now demolished – Tiger Stadium. As such, it may discourage the difficult and creative work required to develop a plan to help stabilize and revitalize neighborhoods unlikely to experience growth. The old strategies no longer apply and the MP needs to demonstrate a willingness to address challenges associated with the delivery of services amongst decline and vacancy.

The city’s current ZO is also flawed, particularly in terms of its ability to shape development as envisioned in Detroit’s current MP. 76 percent of the parcels surveyed are zoned General Business (B4). This suggests the city has been relying on B4 as a catch-all classification for the city’s commercial corridors instead of tailoring of its ordinances to fit the needs of individual areas. The ZO is intended to provide the detailed rules required to promote development that is in-line with the broader vision of the city’s MP. Currently, Detroit’s ZO does not currently provide this detail for a great majority of the city’s commercial parcels. This makes it nearly impossible for the city to enforce its MP.

It would be too simple to suggest the City of Detroit downzone all of its B4 areas to less intense classifications (such as B2 or B3). There are commercial corridors that should be zoned B4. There are commercial corridors that may no longer be zoned commercial at all. It is important for the city and community organizations to consider the realistic long-term viability of an area before committing limited resources and energy to the revival of a commercial area. The vacant stretches between commercial strips on some portions of Grand River, for example, can be rezoned as Parks or Recreation space (PR) in order to encourage community gardens, recreation space or passive natural space on parcels that are currently not a priority for new development. Portions of Oakland also present areas that could be downzoned to PR. It is recommended that the city promote additional surveys to more accurately shape its ZO and MP to fit current conditions.

Conclusion
Beyond Detroit CLICS

It is crucial to consider the health of the surrounding neighborhoods, which is something this survey was unable to do. We hope this report acts as a foundation. We believe the city and its community stakeholders can use the findings of our survey to shape better plans for commercial corridors. We also hope the methods of Detroit CLICS will encourage additional surveying to complete the work we started and ensure it is updated.

This long-term approach will require effort, but it will also provide a better understanding of the condition of city neighborhoods, making it easier to shape plans for commercial areas. The city is encouraged to work with neighborhood partners not only in the development of long-term goals, but to help residents continue the surveying method developed by Detroit CLICS. Involving residents in the surveying process will help the city collect the data required for thoughtful plans. It will also promote a better understanding of the health and potential of neighborhoods. Residents that are informed and involved in the planning process are also more likely to understand and support the city’s goals.
## Appendix A - CLICS Study Area

### A1. CLICS Study Area

### A2. Traditional Main Street Study Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Seven Mile</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting West Seven Mile Road at the four (4) corners of John R Avenue and the center line of Woodward Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand River</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Grand River Avenue between the center line of Woodmont Avenue and the zoning lots at the four (4) corners of Evergreen Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagley/Varnum</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Bagley Avenue between the center line of 10th Street and the center line of 24th Street, and all zoning lots abutting West Varnum Highway between the center line of Newark Avenue and the center line of Clark Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livernois/West McNichols</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Livernois Avenue between the center line of the John C. Lodge Freeway and the center line of St. Martins Avenue, and all zoning lots abutting West McNichols Road between the center line of Lawton Avenue and the zoning lots at the four (4) corners of Wyoming Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward Avenue</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Woodward Avenue between the center line of the Fisher Freeway (I-75) and the city limits of Highland Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Boulevard</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting West Grand Boulevard/East Grand Boulevard between the center line of Linwood and the Chrysler Freeway (I-75).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Avenue</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Michigan Avenue between the John C. Lodge freeway (M-10) and the zoning lots at the four (4) corners of Vinewood Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varnum/Springwells</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting West Varnum Highway between the center line of Clark Street and the zoning lots at the four (4) corners of Woodward Avenue, and all zoning lots abutting Springwells Avenue between the four (4) corners of West Varnum Highway and the four (4) corners of the Fisher Freeway (I-75) service drives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A3. Detroit Works Study Areas

**Detroit Works Project Demonstration Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bagley</td>
<td>This area is generally bounded to the north by Eight Mile Road, to the east by Woodward Avenue, to the south by McNichols, and to the west by Wyandotte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Center/North End</td>
<td>This area is generally bounded to the north by Boston Boulevard and Holbrook, to the east by I-75, to the south by West Grand Boulevard, the rail road and I-94, and to the west by Linwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>This area is generally bounded to the north by Vernor and Toledo, to the east and south by I-75, and to the west by Woodmere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A4. Major Corridor Study Areas

**Detroit Corridor Overlay Areas (includes Gateway Thoroughfare area)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eight Mile Road</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Eight Mile Road within the City of Detroit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dyke Road</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Van Dyke from Eight Mile to W. McNichols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand River</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Grand River between the Chrysler Freeway (I-75) and Woodmont, and between Evergreen and the City limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratiot Avenue</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Gratiot Avenue from Chrysler Freeway to Eight Mile Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Avenue</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Michigan Avenue between Vinewood Avenue and the Wyoming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield Road</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Greenfield Road from the Jeffries Freeway (I-96) to the City of limit with the City of Dearborn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward Avenue</td>
<td>All zoning lots abutting Woodward Avenue between West McNichols and West Eight Mile Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A5. Major Thoroughfare Study Areas

**Major Thoroughfares**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thoroughfare</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Warren Business District</td>
<td>East Warren from Devonshire to Mack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Davison Business District</td>
<td>W. Davison Ave. from Rosa Parks Blvd. to Dexter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy-Southfield Business District</td>
<td>Joy Rd. from Southfield Fwy. to Evergreen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A6. Additional Survey Areas

**Additional Survey Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Jefferson Avenue</td>
<td>East Jefferson Ave. from I-375 to Mt. Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Warren Avenue</td>
<td>Woodward to Dearborn Border, Greenfield to Rouge Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livernois</td>
<td>John Kronk to W. Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>8 Mile Road to McNichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mile Road</td>
<td>John R to I-75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B - Methodology

### CLICS Survey Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On-Site</th>
<th>Residential Above</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Building(s)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a. Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parking Lot</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>b. Probably Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Empty Lot</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>c. Probably Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>d. Vacant/Abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multiple Codes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>b. Service</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Retail</td>
<td>Hardware Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gas Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Grocery Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Health/Personal Care Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Liquor Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Motor Vehicle Sales and Parts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Check Cashing/Payday Loan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bank without Drive-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bank with Drive-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hair, Barber or Nail Salon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hotel/Motel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Motor Vehicle Repair/Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- General Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adult Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Medical/Dental Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dry Cleaner/ Laundromat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Restaurant or Bar</td>
<td>Restaurant with Drive-Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Restaurant without Drive-Through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bar/Pub/Brewery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c. Office</th>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Religious or Institutional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Demolish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vacant, Open and Dangerous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fire Damage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design</td>
<td>Auto-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pedestrian-oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLICS Survey Definitions

1. On Site
   a. **Building(s):** (LEAP) There is a building structure or multiple structures on the site. The business occupies one or more building/s. Do not consider sheds, trailers, garages, or other auxiliary buildings if they are secondary uses. Implies one use.
      - Structure – poured foundation with standing walls (at least two).
      - Auxiliary – a structure that is not used as primary commercial use.
   b. **Parking Lot:** (LEAP) Site is covered with cement, asphalt, gravel, and/or pavement. Parking looks organized and managed, may or may not have ingress, lighting, striping, or fencing. Most likely located next to, or near to an existing business or structure. May or may not include a structure or garage (above or below ground parking). Visual Cues: cars in lot, signage (e.g. parking, pricing, attendee), parking blocks, and/or vehicle gate.
   c. **Empty Lot:** (LEAP) Land (may or may not be fenced) without a building. Cars may be parked on the lot, however, there is no indication of a legal or permanent parking lot (no consistent paving, cement, or gravel, and there are no clearly identified parking spaces). May or may not have auxiliary structure (see definition above) or foundation.
   d. **Park:** A space used for recreation. May or may not include furniture/structures/facilities for recreation and enjoyment, grassy areas, pavement, and public art.
   e. **Multiple Codes:** A parcel with a building/s that contains two or more uses as defined below.

2. Use
   a. **Retail:** A business where products/goods are sold to customers. Includes (but not limited to): hardware store, gas station, grocery store, health/personal care, liquor store and motor vehicle sales and parts. Visual cues: merchandise, cash register, grocery bags, merchandise pricing, and signage.
      i. **Hardware Store:** A store that sells products used to construct or repair a project. Visual cues: signage for hardware, wood, tools, and similar items.
      ii. **Gas Station:** A station that sells fuel for motor vehicles. May or may not also sell food, general merchandise, tobacco, or car products as an accessory to the business. If a restaurant or repair shop is present, code as gas station, not multiple codes. Visual Cues: fuel stations/pumps, and signage.
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iii. **Grocery Store**: A store that sells groceries, produce, and other commodities for human consumption and usage. Products may or may not include, cleaning supplies, and health products, but groceries are the primary commodities sold. **Visual Cues**: Shopping carts, signage, and produce.

iv. **Health/Personal Care Store**: Includes pharmacies, drug stores, cosmetics/beauty supply stores, and perfume stores, optical goods stores, and health food supplement stores. **Visual Cues**: signage includes R, and advertisements for above products.

v. **Liquor Store**: A store that specializes in the sale of alcoholic beverages including beer, wine, and liquor. **Visual Cues**: signage for beer, liquor, wine, and often includes lotto, cigarette, and foods; high foot and auto-traffic, and late hours of operation.

vi. **Motor Vehicle Sales and Parts**: An establishment that sells automotive vehicles and/or products and accessories related to automotive vehicles. **Visual Cues**: products or signage including tires, oil or car parts, and/or cars for sale on lot.

vii. **Other Retail**: Retail shops that do not fit into the above categories, such as: furniture, clothing, electronics, cell phone, book, jewelry, and dollar stores. **Visual Cues**: signage for product sales, business name, and product for sale in windows.

b. **Service**: A business where an intangible commodity (performance of any duties or work) is sold or traded to customers. Includes (but not limited to): check cashing/payday loan, bank, hair/barber/nail salon, hotel/motel, motor vehicle repair/service, entertainment, medical/dental services, and dry cleaners/laundromats. **Visual Cues**: Advertisement for a service, price of service, most likely does not have merchandise displayed in window.

i. **Check Cashing/Payday Loan**: An establishment that offers financial services in cashing checks of various types and payday loan advancement. If alcohol is sold on premises, use should be characterized as "liquor store." **Visual Cues**: signage for check cashing, payday loans, instant cash/money, no credit check, western union, and money gram.

ii. **Bank without Drive Through**: A business establishment where money is kept for saving or commercial purposes or is invested, supplied for loans, or exchanged from established records of deposit without a drive through service. **Visual Cues**: signage, and ATM.

iii. **Bank with Drive Through**: An establishment defined as a bank, but includes a drive-thru service to conduct business. **Visual Cues**: signage, ATM, and paved drive for drive-up/through banking.

iv. **Hair, Barber, or Nail Salon**: An establishment that provides care for hair, nail, or cosmetic appearance. **Visual Cues**: signage for hair care/braiding/cuts, nails, shampoo, cut, and pricing for services.

v. **Hotel/Motel**: An establishment that provides short term lodging as the primary service. **Visual Cues**: multiple doors with room numbers, check-in office, and vacancy sign.

vi. **Motor Vehicle Repair/Service**: An establishment that repairs or services vehicles. Does not include scrap/junk yards. **Visual Cues**: commercial garage doors, car lifts, tow trucks, and damaged vehicles.

vii. **General Entertainment**: An establishment that provides a performance, event or activity for the consumer and generally includes an admission fee. May include: bowling alleys, movie theaters, casinos, night clubs, and concert halls. Only open when entertainment is offered. **Visual Cues**: entrances with multiple doors and ticket sales counter.


viii. **Adult Entertainment**: An establishment where exhibitions, performances, and/or dances emphasize sexuality. **Visual cues**: windowless, ‘gentlemen’s club’ or ‘women’s club’ signage, and valet parking.

ix. **Medical/Dental Services**: An establishment which has a licensed practitioner who provides medical services of various types. Includes: medical, dental, chiropractic, veterinary services, and dialysis. **Visual Cues**: signage listing services and practitioners.

x. **Dry Cleaners/Laundromat**: A business that cleans or presses garments, fabrics, draperies, etc. with chemicals rather than with water or provides facilities for patrons to clean garments or fabrics typically including washers and dryers. **Visual Cues**: signage including wash, dry, coin/card-operated, machines, fluff, fold, shirt service, and laundry.

xi. **Other Services**: Services that have not been defined in the above categories. Includes (but not limited to): childcare, cleaning, construction, carpentry, funeral homes, and shoe-repair.

c. **Restaurant/Bar**: A business establishment where food/meals are prepared and served to customers for consumption on the premises or as carry out. Alcoholic beverages may or may not be sold. **Visual Cues**: signage, table(s), bar with stools, and outdoor seating.

i. **Restaurant with Drive Through**: An establishment where meals are served to customers through a window while the driver remains in the vehicle. May include: Coney Island, fast-food, and coffee shops.

ii. **Restaurant without Drive Through**: An establishment where meals are served to customers for consumption. Access is gained via pedestrian entrance to restaurant with hospitality service offered inside. Includes: take-out and sit-down.

iii. **Bar/Pub/Brewery**: An establishment where the primary function is the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages, although food may also be purchased. Establishments may manufacture alcohol on premises. **Visual Cues**: signage that includes the word bar, pub, or brewery in and advertisement for alcoholic beverage sales.

d. **Office**: A business setting used primarily for bureaucratic or professional work. Includes (but not limited to): law firms, real-estate companies, insurance companies, and accounting. It does not include health services (e.g. doctor and dental offices), institutions, or government uses. **Visual Cues**: office directory signage, office setting, desks, office supplies, lack of advertisement for merchandise sold on location.

e. **Industrial**: A facility or plant that manufactures or stores a product/good. Includes: manufacturing, warehouses, junk/scrap yards, and factories. **Visual Cues**: signage, trucks for shipping product, smoke stacks, overhead doors for shipping, and large industrial bays (use previous knowledge of industrial architecture).

f. **Religious or Institutional**:

---
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Religious – A facility dedicated to the practice of religion. May include: churches, synagogues, and mosques. Visual Cues: signage (church, God, Christ, spiritual, COGIC, Kingdom, synagogue), artwork (e.g. crosses, stars, moons, religious figures, etc.), architecture (steeples, domes, grand entrances), stained glass windows, Hebrew or Arabic script.


g. **Residential**: A structure where persons reside that is owned, leased or rented. Includes: houses, apartments, townhomes, and condos. Visual Cues: signage, mailbox(es), drapery, and household items.

h. **Unknown**: Cannot tell from façade or signage what primary use is.

3. Residential Above: A multi-story building with upper stories that could potentially be residential. If it looks like someone could possibly live there (even if you are unsure), code as “residential above.” Visual Cues: signage, upper-story windows display drapery, and household items.

4. Building Occupancy (Only record occupancy for buildings, not lots or parking)
   a. **Occupied**: (LEAP) Common characteristics are lighting, open/closed signs, well-kept façade and signage, and visible activity. Maintenance and high visibility of people activity. Check for clues.

   b. **Probably Occupied**: (LEAP) Same as above, but there are a few signs of non-maintenance. Leaning to occupied but there are doubts.

   c. **Probably Vacant**: (LEAP) Same as below, but some counter signs of activity or a few positive signs of maintenance. Leaning to abandoned or vacant but there are doubts.

   d. **Vacant/Abandoned**: (LEAP) Common characteristics are unoccupied structures, neglected facades, eviction notices, empty interiors, substantial physical or structural damages, extensive security measures, uncut or tall grass, weeds, scrub trees, trash or debris accumulated over time.

5. **Condition**
   a. **Good**: (LEAP) Buildings are clean, structurally sound, well-kept, free of graffiti, and secured. No more than two minor repairs (some paint needed). Lots are actively used and well maintained, grass cut low, and landscaping/gardens present.
a. **Fair**: (LEAP) Building requires three or more minor repairs (or one major repair). Structurally sound and can still be rehabilitated fairly inexpensively (repair door, window, porch). Lot is less well maintained, but still attended. Parking lot may have small amounts of debris or grass on it.

b. **Poor**: (LEAP) Only a few signs of maintenance. May not be structurally sound, major repairs needed (broken windows, missing door, broken façade, porch missing, poor roof condition) Building needs major repairs. Lot has few signs of maintenance, grass or trees are tall. Parking lot may be significantly cracked or has debris or weeds on it.

c. **Demolish**: (LEAP) Building needs to be demolished, may pose safety risks. Not structurally sound (major fire damage, roof caved in, leaning structure). Dumping or large amounts of debris present.

2. **Vacant, Open and Dangerous**: (LEAP) Structure has an open point of entry on any floor, e.g. a broken or missing window or door. The structure may be unstable and dangerous.

3. **Fire Damage**: (LEAP) Showing signs that flammable building material burned. Results in a need for restoration or demolition. **Visual Cues**: soot around windows or doors, holes in roof, and water damage from fire-fighting.

4. **Design**
   a. **Auto-Oriented**: The scale, orientation, and design of the building are geared toward the automobile. Features may or may not include: parking is located between the building and the sidewalk; entrance is not directly accessible from the sidewalk; large blank walls without windows or doors facing the street; the presence of drive-through, service lanes, or other auto-oriented design is dominant.
   
   b. **Pedestrian-Oriented**: The scale, orientation, and design of the building are geared toward the pedestrian. Features may or may not include: building situated on the lot line or a slight setback (but does not contain parking between the building and the sidewalk); front façade has an entrance facing the street/sidewalk; entrance is accessible from the sidewalk; windows and doors are transparent so pedestrians can see inside the building.
CLICS Selection Criteria

Welcome: Select a parcel to begin
- Search for an address
- Locate use

What’s on the site?
- Buildings
- Multiple Codes
- A parking lot
- A park
- An empty lot

What is the property used for?
- Retail
- Service
- Restaurant/Bar
- Office
- Industrial
- Religious/Institutional
- Residential
- Unknown

If Retail, then:
- Hardware Store
- Gas Station
- Grocery Store
- Health/Personal Store
- Liquor Store
- Motor Vehicle Sales & Parts
- Other Retail

If Service, then:
- Cash Check/Payday Loan
- Bank w/o drive-through
- Bank w/ drive-through
- Hair, barber, or nail salon
- Hotel or motel
- Motor Vehicle Repair/Service
- General entertainment
- Adult entertainment
- Medical service
- Dry Cleaner

Occupancy:
- Occupied
- Occupied Possibly
- Vacancy/Vacant/Abandoned
- Vacant Possibly

If Multiple Codes, select then Add Another Use (after Use 1 has been selected):
- Retail
- Service
- Restaurant/Bar
- Office
- Industrial
- Religious/Institutional
- Residential
- Unknown

Residential Above:
- Yes
- No

Design:
- Auto-oriented
- Pedestrian-oriented

Condition:
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Demolished

General Condition:
- Vacant, open, and dangerous (Y/N)
- Fire damage (Y/N)
- Vacant Lot (Y/N)

Submit answers
CFA Application Screen Shots
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Detroit Current Master Plan Land Use Definitions: Retail and Local Services

The retail and local services portion of the Future General Land Use maps represent five categories of commercial land use. Some forms of intermixture with other land uses are permissible such as institutional uses where such uses are compatible within a commercial designation.

CM Major Commercial areas are generally distinguished by high-density office buildings with ground floor retail. Included within these areas may be department stores, specialized shops and services catering to area office or residential land uses. Areas should be accessible to mass transit routes and automobile parking located on the street or in structures. Ground level activity should be pedestrian-oriented. Downtown and New Center are Detroit's major commercial areas.

CRC Retail Centers are commercial sites featuring a clustering of retail establishments adjacent to large parking areas. These centers are designed to be accessed primarily by automobiles. Provisions are to be made to accommodate access by pedestrians and transit such as sidewalks and bus bays. Auto-Oriented Retail Centers may include large retailers or supermarkets as anchor stores.

CN Neighborhood Commercial districts generally consist of a large collection of contiguous storefronts along a street or streets. This commercial type is pedestrian-oriented with wide sidewalks and landscaping. Parking should be located on the street, in structures (with ground floor retail), at the rear of commercial establishments or in concentrated nodes at the periphery of the area. In addition to commercial uses, Neighborhood Commercial areas may also include institutional uses such as libraries and post offices.

CT Thoroughfare Commercial areas are located along the major automobile thoroughfares of the city. The retail uses along these thoroughfares are generally oriented toward the passing automobile traffic. High traffic generating uses are generally permitted provided that they are properly buffered from residential and other uses that may be negatively impacted.

CS Special Commercial areas attract people from the City, region, and State. These areas may include sports stadia, convention centers, casinos, or compatible uses such as theatres, nightclubs, bars and restaurants. Areas should be accessible to mass transit routes and automobile parking located on the street or in structures. Ground level activity should be pedestrian-oriented. Ancillary uses may include medium-rise offices, motels, medium and high-rise apartments, and mixed-use developments.
Detroit Current Master Plan Land Use Definitions: Mixed Use

MRC Mixed Residential-Commercial areas consist predominantly of medium-to-high density housing developed compatibly with commercial and/or institutional uses. This classification is well suited to areas proximal to existing centers of major commercial activity, major thoroughfares, transportation nodes, or gateways into the city.

MRI Mixed Residential-Industrial areas offer live-work opportunities for artists and trades-people to create a lively mixture of new residential, commercial, light industrial and/or entertainment opportunities. This designation is especially appropriate for historically industrial areas that may be suited to loft conversions.

MTC Mixed - Town Centers are activity centers for a neighborhood or Cluster. They are often located at the intersection of two major thoroughfares. Land uses include a commercial, entertainment and/or institutional anchor with a mix of support uses including or in close proximity to residential land uses. Town Centers are distinguished from other activity centers by an emphasis on pedestrian orientation with wide sidewalks, building facades built up to the lot line, street-front access to buildings and landscaping and street furniture (i.e. benches). Town Centers require strict design guidelines to maintain and enhance their streetscapes, pedestrian orientation and overall character.
Detroit Current Master Plan Land Use Definitions: Transportation

TF Freeways are the highest capacity roads, designed especially for carrying an uninterrupted flow of through traffic. They are distinguished by limited access via a relatively small number of specially designed points of entry and exit; continuous physical separation of opposing directions of traffic; and separation of grades at all intersections.

TM Major Thoroughfares are the principal surface streets. Access is not limited, but high traffic volumes require special attention to the safe and expeditious movement of through traffic while minimizing land use and pedestrian conflicts. The network of major thoroughfares consists principally of radial routes and a gridiron system of roads spaced about one mile apart.

TS Secondary Thoroughfares are shorter, narrower or less continuous surface streets than Major Thoroughfares on which traffic must move safely and expeditiously, but often through residential areas. They are frequently routes for feeder transit lines.

TL Local Streets primarily serve to access neighborhoods and traffic movement within industrial areas. Speed limits and traffic volumes are lowest on local streets. The design of Local Streets should accommodate non-motorized means of transportation (i.e. pedestrians and bicycles).

TMT Mass Transit Routes as specified here represent preferred routes for high intensity transit connecting the City with the entire region. Implementation of Mass Transit Routes requires the City to work with its regional partners. Land uses along these routes, especially at station locations, should be of a high density and mixture of land uses.

TTR Truck Routes – The primary consideration in the designation of Truck Routes is to accommodate the movement of goods and services while minimizing the impact upon residential areas. In most cases, Truck Routes are to be limited to major thoroughfares and freeways. There may be instances when Secondary Thoroughfares are designated. Designation of Local Streets as Truck Routes will be limited to those streets within industrial areas or to local streets that provide exclusive access to industrial areas.
Appendix D - City of Detroit Zoning Ordinance

Zoning District Classifications

Residential Districts
- R1 Single-Family Residential District
- R2 Two-Family Residential District
- R3 Low Density Residential District
- R4 Thoroughfare Residential District
- R5 Medium Density Residential District
- R6 High Density Residential District

Business Districts:
- B1 Restricted Business District
- B2 Local Business and Residential District
- B3 Shopping District
- B4 General Business District
- B5 Major Business District
- B6 General Services District

Industrial Districts:
- M1 Limited Industrial District
- M2 Restricted Industrial District
- M3 General Industrial District
- M4 Intensive Industrial District
- M5 Special Industrial District

Special Districts and Overlay Areas:
- FD Planned Development District
- P1 Open Parking District
- PC Public Center District
- PCA Restricted Central Business District
- TM Transitional-Industrial District
- PR Parks and Recreation District
- W1 Waterfront-Industrial District
- SD1 Special Development District, Residential/Commercial
- SD2 Special Development District, Commercial/Residential
- SD3 Special Development District, Technology and Research
- SD4 Special Development District, Riverfront mixed use
- SD5 Special Development District, Casinos
Appendix D - City of Detroit Zoning Ordinance

Zoning Districts Definitions: Business and Special Districts, Overlay Areas:

B1. Restricted Business District
The B1 District is designed to provide an adequately controlled transition in land use from residential to business and commercial uses and is mapped accordingly. Permitted uses are limited to those which are desirable and can be fitted into such a transitional pattern of land use. Front, side, and rear setbacks are required of all permitted residential and commercial uses. To protect housing adjacent or across an alley, a set back line is required of nonresidential uses where adjacent to, or across an alley from, residential property.

B2. Local Business and Residential District
The B2 Local Business and Residential District provides for day-to-day consumer goods and services required to serve a small residential area. High-traffic generating and traffic-oriented uses are restricted because of their obvious undesirable influence on adjacent residential areas.

B3. Shopping District
The B3 Shopping District provides for a range of convenience and comparison shopping goods stores, which are generally grouped into neighborhood and community shopping centers, depending on the size of the area so zoned. Uses permitted include those which are exclusive under the provisions of a broad range of goods and services for the consumer, and to allow for as much freedom and healthy competition in the commercial real estate market and commercial activities as is commensurate with other community values.

B4. General Business District
The B4 General Business District provides for business and commercial uses of a thoroughfare-oriented nature. In addition to these uses, other businesses, which may benefit by drawing part of their clientele from traveling traffic are permitted. Additional uses, which may be successfully blended with permitted-by-right uses, are conditional.

B5. Major Business District
This district is designed to provide adequate regulations within the Central Business District, the New Center Area, and may be successfully utilized in other regionally-oriented shopping and office areas.

B6. General Service District
This district provides for wholesaling, transport, food services, and similar activities essential to the commerce and health of the City. Office, retail, service, and other uses normally desiring to locate in this type of district are also permitted.

S01. Special Development District, Residential/Commercial
The S01 District is designed for areas of the City where there is much investment interest and activity, and where great development potential. Generally, in these areas, private developers have been active in changing the character of the area by increasing the intensity of development and converting land to both residential and commercial higher intensity uses. The S01 District is designed to encourage one (1) portion of this development, and will permit high intensity residential development with a carefully controlled mix of low-rise office, commercial, and service facilities.

S02. Special Development District, Commercial/Residential
The S02 District is designed for areas of the City where there is much investment interest and activity, and great development potential. Generally, in these areas, private developers have been active in changing the character of the area by increasing the intensity of development and converting land to both residential and commercial higher intensity uses. The S02 District is designed to encourage one (1) portion of this development, and it will permit high-rise office and commercial structures with a controlled mix of transient and permanent residential facilities, together with appropriate service and retailing facilities and with an emphasis on entertainment venues.

S03. Special Development District, Technology and Research
The S03 District is designed for areas of the City where research facility development in a campus-like setting is practical. In addition, the district is designed for areas of the City where the future general land use map of the Master Plan indicates usage other than "Residential." Advances in industry and technology have created uses, which are related to industry and office or commercial uses, but may not be appropriate or function adequately in a typical industrial or business zoning district. The S03 District provides an environment where "high technology" uses such as engineering, design, research and development, photonic/optics, computer assisted design, robotics research, numerical control equipment (CAD/CAM), prototype development and limited manufacturing, biotechnology labs, medical research, food and materials testing, telecommunications, and related storage, warehousing and limited assembly operations associated with principal permitted uses can be located. The S03 district will be located in a campus-type environment and so situated that uses will be developed without being negatively impacted by elements and conditions which are commonly found in a traditional industrial district and without negatively impacting uses found in a business district.

S04. Special Development District, Riverfront Mixed Use
The S04 District is intended for areas indicated in the Detroit Master Plan as appropriate for high intensity residential and commercial mixed-use development due to regional significance and unique location attributes and amenities, such as the Riverfront. While recognizing that, although it may desirable to retain in such areas a mix of existing uses, such as offices, hotels, and certain industrial establishments, due to the local ambience is provide, increased industrialization of such areas by very intensive and intrusive land uses is considered inappropriate. S04 regulations are intended to promote the public health, welfare and general safety; to encourage the use of the land in accordance with its character and adaptability, to avoid the overcrowding of population, to control congestion of the public roads and streets, to reduce hazards to life and property, to facilitate land use and development, and to encourage innovative high intensity developments while simultaneously protecting those attributes and amenities which make such areas unique. These objectives shall be accomplished by a system of flexible regulations, performance requirements, and review procedures.

S05. Special Development District, Casinos
The S05 Special Development District is designed to facilitate the location of licensed casinos and casino complexes within the boundaries established by the City of Detroit for casino gaming activities. The S05 District focuses on urban entertainment and recreational activities that will enhance the area as a desirable location for tourists, conventions, and other visitors. The provisions of the district encourage pedestrian and transit-oriented linkages between casinos and casino complexes and other activity areas within the City. Because of the special characteristics of casinos and casino complexes, the requirements applicable to development in this district include supplemental requirements and criteria that are specific for this division. These regulations are designed to ensure that casinos and casino complexes can contribute positively to the built environment, that the operation of casinos and casino complexes will help to enhance, expand, and stabilize employment and the local economy while simultaneously ensuring effective public services and a high quality of life for nearby businesses, institutions and residents.
review and recommendation by the Planning and Development Department and the City Planning Commission, the City Council shall review and approve site plans and design features for all casinos and casino complexes.

OVERLAY AREAS

Gateway Radial Thoroughfare Overlay Areas.
The Gateway Radial Thoroughfare Overlay Areas consist of property abutting those major radial streets, within and leading to the Central Business District, upon which the Master Plan of Policies has generally proposed a rezoning from B4, General Business, district to a Special Development zoning district.

Traditional Main Street Overlay Areas.
Certain commercial areas of the City are, or have the potential to be, high quality, pedestrian-scale, walkable areas with a traditional urban atmosphere. Areas designated by City Council as Traditional Main Street Overlay Areas are listed in Sec. 61-11-312 of this Code. Such areas are typically zoned B3 or B2, although commercial areas zoned B4 or in other district classifications may be suitable for designation as Traditional Main Street Overlay Areas. Development within Traditional Main Street Overlay Areas should be geared, as much as possible, toward street-level pedestrian-generating uses. Ground level treatment of buildings should be pedestrian scale. Parking areas, alleys, and small streets should be designed as integral parts of a pedestrian network. Distinctive landscaping, attractive street furniture, and a well-designed signage system should enhance pedestrian activities. Designated Traditional Main Street Overlay Areas are subject to additional development standards as specified in Sec. 61-14-281 through Sec. 61-14-300 of this Code in order to address pedestrian needs and to enhance pedestrian interest, access, and enjoyment.

Major Corridor Overlay Areas.
Certain wide major thoroughfares of the City of Detroit, typically zoned B4, pass through neighborhoods undertaking commercial revitalization efforts. Similarly, certain major thoroughfares pass through both Detroit and neighboring cities and townships that participate in multi-jurisdictional improvements to the vehicular corridor. In all such areas, the character and design of development is important to the attraction of additional development and to the improvement of environmental aesthetics. The Major Corridor Overlay Area provides the opportunity for more detailed review of proposed development.

Grand Boulevard Overlay Area
The Grand Boulevard Overlay Area includes all zoning lots abutting or bounded by East Grand Boulevard, the Detroit River, and West Grand Boulevard.
## Appendix E - CLICS Findings

### CLICS Area Site Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Surveyed Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings</td>
<td>5468</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empty-lot</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple-cod</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>park</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking-lot</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>9536</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLICS Area Parcel Condition Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>demolish</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>6212</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>9536</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLICS Area Use by Site Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use by Site</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Surveyed Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>empty lot</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrial</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>office</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>park</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking lot</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious/institutional</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>9536</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLICS Area Design Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On Site</th>
<th>Auto-Oriented</th>
<th>Pedestrian-Oriented</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>4115</td>
<td>5468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple-cod</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Buildings</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CLICS Area Residential Above Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Buildings Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Above</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Buildings</td>
<td>5866</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLICS Area Retail Uses Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Uses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Retail Uses Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gas-station</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grocery</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardware</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motor-vehic</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLICS Area Service Uses Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Uses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Service Uses Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adult-ent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bank</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bank+driv</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dryclean</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general-e</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hotel-mot</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medical</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motor-veh</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>payday</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salon</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CLICS Site Use Findings by Geography

#### CLICS Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Use</th>
<th>Sum of Size (sq ft)</th>
<th>Sum of Size (pcd)</th>
<th>Parcel (qty)</th>
<th>Parcel (pcd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>1661357</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>5095227</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3155145</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>7364418</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>11120424</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>29921542</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>5908742</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>5992703</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>20535012</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>15485856</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12852015</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9536</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Traditional Main Streets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Use</th>
<th>Sum of Size (sq ft)</th>
<th>Sum of Size (pcd)</th>
<th>Parcel (qty)</th>
<th>Parcel (pcd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>1432064</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2592623</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1061986</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>1736596</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>2596011</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4402017</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>1284444</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2579689</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2750688</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>663997</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1537588</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Major Corridors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Use</th>
<th>Sum of Size (sq ft)</th>
<th>Sum of Size (pcd)</th>
<th>Parcel (qty)</th>
<th>Parcel (pcd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>4607899</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>413881</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1058132</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>5419889</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>4509691</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1937202</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>853250</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>3732206</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2137507</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>9732187</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6800528</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4578</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Detroit Water Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Use</th>
<th>Sum of Size (sq ft)</th>
<th>Sum of Size (pcd)</th>
<th>Parcel (qty)</th>
<th>Parcel (pcd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>2972322</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>153543</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1603863</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>256787</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>4085438</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>3792245</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>3335983</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1048190</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2992547</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3104559</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23022451</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2545</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Major Thoroughfares:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Use</th>
<th>Sum of Size (sq ft)</th>
<th>Sum of Size (pcd)</th>
<th>Parcel (qty)</th>
<th>Parcel (pcd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>2212010</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>5496</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>56105</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>1509696</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>234583</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>73841</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>185793</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>324513</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>771153</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>695488</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>265836</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5039262</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLICS Area</td>
<td>Detroit Works Project</td>
<td>Major Corridors</td>
<td>Traditional Main Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcel (qty)</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcel (pct)</strong></td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Damage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOD</strong></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcel (pct)</strong></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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