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1. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of this Plan

The Bay City Housing Commission is planning improvements to Maplewood Manor, its high-rise senior living facility located at Madison Avenue and First Street. The Housing Commission is also targeting the surrounding neighborhood for targeted investments in both the public and private realms. This document presents a Plan for those investments, and other ways in which the neighborhood can be revitalized.

It has been several years since the City of Bay City has updated its Plan for the area surrounding Maplewood Manor. In that time, redevelopment has spread north and south from Bay City’s downtown along the Saginaw Riverfront, culminating with the under-construction “Uptown” development and the post-fire renovations to City Hall. But little attention has been paid to the area immediately east of downtown Bay City, a neighborhood with varied character and significant assets, but one which also faces troubling challenges. Now is the time for an improved Plan with comprehensive, thoughtful recommendations on how to sustain or improve the neighborhood’s economic, social, and environmental assets.

The overarching goal of the Neighborhood Revitalization Plan is to better capitalize on the assets of the four distinct land use patterns surrounding Maplewood Manor – the downtown businesses district, Maplewood Park and the Baytown apartment complex, the historic residential area, and the Woodside Avenue Jobs Corridor – while at the same time promoting their unique identities and ensure seamless transitions between the districts. Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) programs and other interventions will be used to ensure that the macro-level benefits of the implementation of the Plan also reach individual residents, to help ensure the provision of quality, affordable housing for all.

The Plan serves as a road map for increased connectivity, improved amenities, and higher quality of life in the neighborhood and, by extension, Maplewood Manor itself. This Plan could become an official part of the City of Bay City’s Master Plan. In any event, the Plan will lend context and inspiration to Master Plan updates. Additionally, the recommendations of this Plan include specific, immediate projects for the Housing Commission and others to implement and improve life in the neighborhood.

Although this Plan was created in conjunction with the 2014 renovation and rehabilitation of Maplewood Manor, it is independent of that project. The Maplewood Manor project is an important element in achieving the goals of this Plan, especially to provide quality, affordable housing in Bay City generally and the Plan area specifically. However, this Plan stands on its own as a vision for the neighborhood.
1. Introduction

B. Elements of this Plan

The Neighborhood Revitalization Plan is organized into several chapters describing existing conditions, the community’s vision, and recommended actions.

**Neighborhood Profile** is an analysis of the neighborhood with regards to its population and other demographic characteristics, especially compared to the rest of Bay City. Based on numerical data, this section gives an overview of the trends in the neighborhood. This chapter also includes an analysis of the existing land uses in the neighborhood (including the current zoning and planned uses envisioned by the Master Plan), as well as the transportation system and public amenities that serve the district.

**Assets and Challenges** synthesizes the data in the Neighborhood Profile to pinpoint specific positives and negatives for the neighborhood and how they impact quality of life. It then examines several key redevelopment sites, where targeted investments could have a major impact on the neighborhood.

**Community Vision** describes the meetings and interviews used to elicit public input and develop a vision for the neighborhood shared by all stakeholders, as well as planned actions to respond to the ideas presented by the community.

The **Action Plan** describes the recommended projects stemming from this Plan. The **Ongoing Projects** will include policies, interventions, and activities designed to improve quality of life in the neighborhood over the long term, through the day-to-day work of the Housing Commission, the City, and stakeholders. The **Major Investments** section outlines specific redevelopments, infrastructure projects, and improvements to the public realm that the Housing Commission and its partners can undertake in both the short and long term to invest in the neighborhood and make a positive impact on the lives of its residents.
C. Neighborhood History

The first permanent settlement built along the Saginaw River in what would become Bay City was constructed in 1831 and named “Lower Saginaw.” The original town was built near what is now the corner of Broadway and 17th Street, well south of the current downtown and the neighborhood surrounding Maplewood Manor. The name was changed to Bay City in 1857, and the City was incorporated in 1865.

The Bay City area grew due to the deep waters of the Saginaw River and the proximity of Saginaw Bay, which made it ideal for shipping and attracted lumber, milling, and shipbuilding operations. As the City grew, the center of commerce slowly moved north, to the present downtown area. Just east of that downtown area, the City’s wealthiest families built stately homes along Fourth, Fifth, and Center Streets. Many of these homes remain to this day, and are assets for the neighborhood. In the streets north of those stately homes, smaller, bungalow-style homes were constructed, and the difference in the housing stock north and south of Third Street is still noticeable to this day.

In 1890, a bridge across the Saginaw River connected West Bay City (which was a separate City until 1905) to Third Street. That bridge lasted until a shipping accident in the 1970s caused it to collapse into the river. It was replaced by the Liberty Bridge, which connects to Woodside Avenue, three blocks north of the old bridge’s crossing. While the old bridge was still standing, Third Street was a busy traffic route, which further served to divide the north and south parts of the neighborhood.

Around the same time as the bridge replacement, the area surrounded by Madison Avenue, First Street, Sheridan Street, and Third Street, was targeted for Federally-funded “urban renewal” development. The existing development and block structure was removed and replaced with housing developments (Maplewood Manor and Baytown), as well as Maplewood Park.

Figure 1.1: The Liberty Bridge (connecting to Woodside Avenue) replaced the Third Street Bridge in 1986
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2. NEIGHBORHOOD PROFILE

A. Study Area Boundaries

The boundaries of the Study Area for this Plan are based on major thoroughfares, other neighborhood boundaries, as well as the presence of other Plans and Planning areas (such as the Downtown/DDA area). Although some of the recommendations impact areas outside the study area boundary, the boundary defines the scope of the Plan’s analysis, and the recommended actions are designed to have most of their impact on the area within the boundary. The Study Area boundary is shown below.

The western boundary of the Study Area is Madison Avenue, with the institutional, government, and commercial uses on the west side of the street included because of their impact on Maplewood Manor, Baytown, and the neighborhood at large. The northern boundary of the Study Area is Woodside Avenue, although the boundary veers northeast along Ketchum Street to include the small neighborhood north of Woodside in that area. The eastern boundary is Johnson Street, including all the businesses on both sides of the street. The southern boundary is generally Fifth Street, including all the lots on the south side of the street, some of which stretch to Center Avenue.
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B. Northeast CDC

The City of Bay City has seven Citizen’s District Councils (CDC’s) that represent neighborhoods and advise the City administration and commission on neighborhood issues. CDC’s also keep the residents of the district informed about City policies and development proposals, and promote an improved relationship between the government and residents. Members must live or own a business in the district and are elected by the residents.

The Northeast CDC, chaired by Jan Rise, is one of the more active CDCs in the City. The area covered by the CDC includes the Study Area and surrounding neighborhoods. The council was a key voice in developing the recommendations of this Plan and will have a crucial role in shaping its implementation.

C. Demographics

Demographic analysis, or study of the characteristics of the population, is a fundamental element of Planning. Planning for future growth and development requires consideration of “how much” – how many people will need City services, how much housing is affordable, how many new houses will be built, and other vital signs. One must understand these existing conditions and past trends in order to appropriately anticipate and Plan for the future needs of the neighborhood.

The analysis compares the Study Area to the City of Bay City as a whole. Differences in demographic characteristics between the neighborhood and the City at large may indicate issues or areas in which land use Planning and public policies are warranted; may identify strengths or assets that can be further developed or emphasized; or may identify weaknesses or issues that need to be addressed. For some categories, Maplewood Manor itself is also included, to show trends for residents of the building.

Most of the data presented comes from the 2010 US Census. The most recent data comes from the 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. The American Community Survey is conducted every year and samples a percentage of the community on topics such as population, economics, housing, etc. The 5-year estimates for a given population are considered a reliable source as they represent 60 months of collected data for all geographic areas. However, in some specific cases, the data may contain inaccuracies due to sampling.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Maplewood Manor accounts for approximately one seventh of the population and approximately one fifth of the housing units in the Study Area. Between it and Baytown, nearly half the population and housing units in the Study Area are clustered in the high-density district west of Maplewood Park. This area also includes a concentration of low-income households, which drive down the Study Area’s median income and partially account for the youth of the population.

The neighborhood is subject to many of the same trends as other Bay City neighborhoods, including a struggling housing market and aging housing stock. But its location (near downtown and industrial employers, central to the City and region) gives it an advantage that can be capitalized on.
In general, the Study Area is a neighborhood with a high concentration of residents in poverty and a high proportion of renters. It has a lot of children, but also a large senior housing facility. Despite its challenges, it is a vibrant and attractive neighborhood, beloved by its residents.

**POPULATION**

Changes in the number of people residing in a neighborhood are an important indicator for community Planning. Growing neighborhoods have different needs than communities with stable or declining populations. Table 2.1 shows the change in population in the area surrounding Maplewood Manor since 2000, and compares it to the change in population in Bay City at large. The Study Area represents 4.1% of the City’s population, and has experienced a slightly faster population decline than the City as a whole.

The Census reports 188 people living in Maplewood Manor in 2000, and 203 people living there in 2011.

**Table 2.1: Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Maplewood Manor</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>City of Bay City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>36,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>34,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+7.9%</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

**HOUSEHOLDS**

Changes in the number of households in a community are an indication of changing demand for housing units, retail and office space, and community services. Table 2.2 shows that the number of households in the neighborhood has declined 7.5% since 2000, a slightly slower rate of decline than the population. Bay City as a whole has also seen a decline in number of households. The 158 units in Maplewood Manor each contain one household.

**Table 2.2: Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Maplewood Manor</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>City of Bay City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>15,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>14,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
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AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Average household size is another indicator of community composition. Larger average household sizes generally mean more children and fewer single-parent families. Nationally, household sizes are shrinking as young singles wait longer to get married and life expectancy increases for the senior population. Table 2.3 compares the change in average household size since 2000 for the neighborhood and the City as a whole. Bay City has bucked the national trend, with an increase in average household size over the past decade.

Conversely, the Study Area has an extremely small average household size, indicating a disproportionate number of people living alone. The number is likely skewed by Maplewood Manor, where most residents live alone and the average household size is 1.00, according to the Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Maplewood Manor</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>City of Bay City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+6.0%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
The age of a community’s population has very real implications for Planning and development, whether it is an increased or decreased need for schools to serve the population under 18, or a need for housing alternatives and services for empty nesters and older residents.

Age structure (analyzing which proportions of a community’s population are in which stages of life) gives a nuanced view of the makeup of a community. To compare age structure, the population is divided into the following groupings:

- Under 5 (Pre School)
- 5 to 19 (School Aged)
- 20 to 44 (Family Forming)
- 45 to 64 (Mature Families)
- Over 65 (Retirement)

Figure 2.1 compares the age structure of the neighborhood with that of Bay City at large. While the age breakdowns are similar, the Study Area has a slightly younger population, with more school-children and fewer retirees. Maplewood Manor is not displayed separately in this analysis, because almost all of the residents of the complex are seniors, with an average age of 66.

The data shows that the Study Area has a young population overall – young parents with pre-school and school-age children. This suggests a need for recreational and educational amenities for children and families. However, the neighborhood also has a concentration of seniors at Maplewood Manor. Amenities for this portion of the population are important as well.

A 2012 MSHDA survey indicated that seniors tend to prefer to stay in the neighborhoods they have lived in for years as they enter retirement. However, that survey also revealed that they tend to congregate towards facilities that allow them to interact with other seniors while at the same time reducing their responsibilities for maintenance of their housing unit. Facilities like Maplewood Manor achieve both of these goals.
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EDUCATION

This section analyzes the level of educational attainment in the Maplewood Manor Neighborhood and Bay City as a whole for persons age 25 and older. The City of Bay City is almost entirely within the Bay City School District. Generally, the neighborhood has similar educational attainment levels to the City as a whole.

Table 2.4: Educational Attainment, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>City of Bay City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended College, No Degree</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Figure 2.2: The Head Start facility at 3rd and Sheridan
D. Housing

HOUSING UNITS

According to 2011 US Census estimates, there are 754 housing units in the Study Area. 158 of these are in Maplewood Manor. Each housing unit represents one single family dwelling unit – a house, apartment, condominium, etc.

The neighborhood’s total housing stock has decreased slightly – by 2.4 percent. Bay City as a whole has lost 1.3 percent of its housing stock in the past decade.

Table 2.5: Housing Units, 2000-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Maplewood Manor</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>City of Bay City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>16,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>16,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Figure 2.3 shows that between the years of 2000-2011, the Study Area has experienced a decrease in its population, the number of households and housing units, but not at equal rates. Population has declined faster than the number of households, with the number of housing units decreasing at the slowest rate.

Figure 2.3: Change in Population vs. Change in Households vs. Change in Housing Units, Maplewood Manor Neighborhood, 2000-2011

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
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**AGE OF HOUSING**

Table 2.6 shows the age of housing units existing in the neighborhood. Much of the north and east sides of Bay City were developed over 100 years ago, with the neighborhood largely built out by World War II (which is why over half of today’s housing units were built prior to 1940).

Maplewood Manor contains 158 units. Because it was built in 1979 and many of the units were not occupied until 1980, it is possible that the Census calculations are splitting the units between the 1970s and 1980s in the data. Alternatively, there may be an inaccuracy due the sampling error by the Census. Either way, Maplewood Manor and Baytown are the biggest reasons for the uptick in housing built in the 1970s and 80s. Aside from Maplewood Manor, the rest of the Study Area followed the post-World War II trend of a small number of housing units being built in each decade.

Typically, residences that are 30 years old and older will require substantial maintenance to prevent blight and decline for the broader community. Older homes also tend to lack features that support handicap access and may not be suitable for aging in place without significant retrofits. This is a concern for the neighborhood.

**Table 2.6: Age of Housing, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Structure Built</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 or later</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-99</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-89</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-79</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-69</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
**HOUSING TYPE**

This section analyzes the types of housing present in the Study Area and the City of Bay City as a whole. As Table 2.7 shows, the neighborhood has a high proportion of multiple-family units, due to the 158 units in Maplewood Manor and Baytown. In contrast, over three-quarters of the housing units in the City are single family homes.

**Table 2.7: Housing Type, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Maplewood Manor</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>City of Bay City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

**HOUSING TENURE**

Housing tenure describes how housing is occupied – by the owner, by a renter, or whether it is vacant. Table 2.8 shows that the percentage of renters in the Study Area is higher than the percentage of homeowners. This may be partially because Maplewood Manor (158 units) and other apartment buildings (such as Baytown) make up over 46 percent of the housing units in the neighborhood. In the City as a whole, almost two-thirds of housing units are owner-occupied. Additionally, the vacancy rate in the neighborhood is higher than the City as a whole.

**Table 2.8: Housing Ownership Status and Tenure, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Number of Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Number of Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>10,156</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

MEDIAN HOME VALUE

The value of the homes in a neighborhood is one measure of the quality of life in the community and the health of the economy. Currently, the median home value in the neighborhood is $85,679 and $74,100 in Bay City as a whole. Although the median home value has increased over the past 11 years, inflation has risen more quickly, indicating a slight loss in the overall equity in property in Bay City.

Figure 2.4: Change in Median Home Value, 2000-2011

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
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E. Economics

INCOME

The Study Area’s median household income in 2011 was $25,785 (in 2013 dollars). Bay City as a whole had a median income of $38,199 (2013 dollars). Neither of these indicates affluence, although the neighborhood median is probably skewed by the median income in Maplewood Manor (which is just $12,000) and other low income residents at Baytown. Incomes in most communities have declined (when measured without inflation) due to the impact of the Great Recession.

Table 2.9: Median Income, 2000-2011 (2013 dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>City of Bay City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$26,527</td>
<td>$41,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$25,785</td>
<td>$38,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Approximately 41 percent of the neighborhood’s population has an income below the poverty line. For households headed by a single female (which make up 18 percent of households), almost 70 percent are below the poverty line. Anecdotally, most of the poverty is concentrated in Maplewood Manor, the Baytown complex, and the residential blocks north of Third Street.

OCCUPATION

This section addresses the employment of Maplewood Manor neighborhood residents. This is not an analysis of what kind of jobs are available or what businesses are located within the neighborhood or City, but rather in what occupations members of the community are employed, regardless of where they work. Thus, commuters from Bay City to other areas are included in this analysis, but commuters from other locations coming into the City are not. By far the largest occupational sector in the neighborhood is the Education and Health Care sector. Bay City as a whole also relies on that sector for over a quarter of its employment, but also has significant Retail and Manufacturing sectors.
### Table 2.10: Occupational Sectors, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>City of Bay City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Mining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Utilities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Entertainment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Care</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
F. Existing Land Use

The existing land use analysis describes what land uses exist on the ground in the neighborhood at this moment in time. The first step in conducting an existing land use survey is to define land use categories to fit the neighborhood’s unique conditions. Traditional distinctions such as “residential” are broken down into smaller categories to more fully describe the situation on the ground. The next step is to determine which category each parcel in the neighborhood fits into.

For purposes of this analysis, vacant buildings are classified by their most recent use or the uses of their immediate neighbors. Vacant land is its own category.
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**LAND USE CATEGORIES**

**Single Family Residential**

This residential category consists of generally (although not exclusively) older homes, dating back to before World War II, on small to medium sized lots. Most garages are located in the rear or side yard with longer driveways. Setbacks along the front of the property are generally small and consistent within blocks. Many homes have front porches, making the neighborhood design ideal for social interaction.

The size and design of the homes varies throughout the neighborhood, from ornate Victorian mansions along Fourth and Fifth Streets to small bungalows on Second Street.

**Two Family Residential**

In order to analyze the nuance of the housing situation within the residential blocks of the Study Area, the duplexes and other two family properties were identified. In many cases, two family properties are subdivided single family homes, but there are some purpose-built duplexes as well.

Two family properties are generally encompassed within single family blocks, and are not clustered in any particular part of the neighborhood.
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Multiple Family Residential

Multiple family residential includes the neighborhood’s denser housing options. Baytown and Maplewood Manor form a cluster of multiple family residential in the northwest corner of the neighborhood, but in other areas subdivided single family homes offer apartment living in the midst of single family blocks. This is especially common in the larger homes along Fourth and Fifth Streets.

Commercial

There are a variety of commercial uses within the neighborhood. Johnson Street is lined with retail structures, especially near Third Street, and there are office buildings scattered along Woodside and Madison Avenues. There is little to no commercial development in the central part of the neighborhood, however.
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Mixed Use

The Mixed Use category includes sites that have two or more uses. The most common form in the neighborhood is retail businesses with apartments above. Mixed Use buildings are rare in the neighborhood, but it is the intent of this Plan to encourage more, especially along Johnson Street.

Industrial

The industrial uses in the neighborhood extend along the former railroad corridor (the current Rail Trail). In some areas, especially along Lincoln Avenue, the contrast between residential and industrial uses is sudden and drastic. Improving these meeting points between homes and jobs is an important goal of this Plan. Additionally, the industrial uses along First Street immediately north of Maplewood Park are under-utilized or even, in the case of the Van Poppelen site, completely unused. This is an opportunity for redevelopment along the park, as well as leveraging the concentration of industrial and office businesses along Woodside Avenue to create a jobs corridor.

Institutional

There are several institutions and public uses within the neighborhood. St. Joseph’s Church and its accompanying school, gymnasium, and rectory, could serve as a neighborhood anchor, although the parish is scheduled to close. Re-using that complex is an important goal of this Plan. The parish’s Bingo Hall, on Johnson Street near First Street, will remain open and operated by the Diocese of Saginaw.

Other institutional uses include the Head Start preschool at the corner of the Third and Sheridan and the Bay County Justice Complex at Third and Madison.
Parks and Open Space

Parks and recreation facilities contribute to a community’s quality of life. The only park in the Study Area is Maplewood Park. However, Maplewood Park is the size of approximately five City blocks, and therefore provides a significant chunk of green space in the middle of the neighborhood.

The Rail Trail is also included as Parks and Open Space through the portion where it has its own right-of-way.

Vacant Land

There is very little vacant land in the neighborhood. Almost all of the vacant parcels are along Woodside Avenue, where they act as potential development sites for offices and light industrial uses to support the Woodside Avenue Jobs Corridor concept discussed later in this Plan.
The Bay City Zoning Ordinance generally reflects the existing land uses in the neighborhood. It calls for Light Industrial uses along First Street and Woodside Avenue, and commercial uses along Madison Avenue and Johnson Street ("General Business" on Madison, "Neighborhood Business" on Johnson). A portion of Third Street is also zoned for General Business.

The area generally surrounded by Fifth Street, Madison Avenue, Jackson Street, and Third Street currently contains a variety of uses, including parking lots, but is zoned for "Office."

Baytown is zoned "Medium Density Residential" and Maplewood Manor is zoned "High Rise Residential." The rest of the residential areas in the neighborhood are zoned "Duplex," a district that permits both single family and two-family properties (although conversion of existing single family homes to multiple family units is discouraged).

Some revisions to the Zoning in the Study Area may be necessary to achieve the goals of this Plan. These are discussed in greater detail later in Chapter 5.
The Bay City Master Plan was adopted in 2000 and amended in 2005. The Future Land Use Map from that Plan, shown below, generally reflects the existing land uses in the neighborhood, but does not account for the nuance of the neighborhood’s development.

The Master Plan calls for industrial uses north of Second Street. While the existing industrial uses in this area should be preserved for their positive economic impact, the vacating of the Van Poppelen site has created an opportunity for redevelopment along the north end of Maplewood Park. Additionally, the Future Land Use Map does not account for the changing conditions along Woodside Avenue, where office uses such as United Bay Credit Union have replaced industrial sites.

A Master Plan update or amendment, or a corridor Plan for Woodside Avenue, may be useful to respond to these trends and articulate the City’s vision for the future.
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**APPLICABLE MASTER PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

Despite some recommended changes to the Master Plan, the Maplewood Neighborhood Revitalization Plan is generally in harmony with the Goals and Objectives of the Master Plan. The recommendations of this Plan will help implement the following specific Master Plan Goals and Objectives:

**Goal No. 1: Preserve and Strengthen Neighborhoods**

Objective A: Maintain a Community of stable, diverse, and appealing neighborhoods.

Objective B: Develop a strong center in each neighborhood.

Objective C: Maintain the City’s stock of quality, affordable housing.

Objective D: Require any new development to meet high standards of design with consideration given to the principles of traditional neighborhood design.

Objective E: Require that new developments be designed to promote a safe community.

**Goal No. 3: Maintain Quality Parks and Recreation**

Objective A: Provide a comprehensive system of recreational facilities, programs, and resources to meet the needs of all population segments of the community.

Objective C: Coordinate development and use all recreational facilities and programs to avoid waste, overlap, and duplication.

**Goal No. 4: Maintain Quality Public Services**

Objective A: Maintain and upgrade infrastructure, public safety services, and other public facilities.

**Goal No. 5: Provide an Efficient and Safe Multi-Modal Transportation Network**

Objective A: Continue to evaluate the existing street system to identify problems with traffic congestion, traffic safety, roadway aesthetics, etc.

Objective B: Promote street design that meets professional standards, consistent with the principles of traditional neighborhood design and traffic calming.

Objective C: Develop a ground transportation system that incorporates many modes of travel

Objective E: Promote a transportation system that reduces traffic congestion and vehicle miles travelled, and supports more efficient uses of land.

**Goal No. 6: Adhere to High Standards for Community Appearance**

Objective A: Plan, build, and maintain streets and sidewalks, emphasizing their importance as attractive and comfortable public spaces.

Objective B: Encourage different forms of housing in attractive, safe neighborhoods.

**Goal No. 7: Employ Plans and Policies that contribute to the City’s Economic Vitality**

Objective A: Sustain the economic health of the community.

Objective D: Maintain strong neighborhood commercial areas.

Objective F: Maintain a strong industrial sector
G. Transportation

**PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY**

A major asset to any neighborhood is its public right-of-way (ROW) which includes streets, roads, walks, utilities, vehicle parking, bikeways, signs, and road network. The Public ROW provides multiple means of access to the businesses and properties in the immediate community and efficient routes to other destinations in the region. The neighborhood also benefits from the ROW grid pattern developed in the mid to late 1800s which allows for multiple routes to destinations and ease of use. However, an abandonment of some streets, eliminating access points, and a lack of a comprehensive approach to street design has diminished the connectivity of the road network.

**Functional Classifications for Vehicles**

The neighborhood benefits from close proximity to roads ideal for longer trips to destinations within the region. The National Functional Classification (NFC) system is the best way to evaluate how the road network serves the neighborhood. Developed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in the late 1960’s, the NFC system classifies all roads and highways in the nation based on how they are intended to serve users. The following summarizes the classifications of the NFC system.

**Principal Arterials:** This classification is for highways and roads that carry users for long distances to major destinations such as other cities, institutions, passenger airports, and shopping centers. Road types included in this classification are interstate highways, freeways, state routes between cities and important surface streets in cities.

As seen on Map 5, Road Classifications, the neighborhood has three different principal arterials that provide regional access. M-25, located to the south of the neighborhood and providing east-west regional connections, also provides access to the Veterans Memorial Bridge over the Saginaw River. North Thomas Street travels north-south to the east of the neighborhood and connects with the Harry S Truman Parkway and the Independence Bridge, which is the northern most crossing point over the Saginaw River in Bay City. Woodside Avenue runs through the northern portion of the neighborhood and provides an east-west connection to both regional destinations and the Liberty Bridge over the Saginaw River.

**Minor Arterials:** While similar to principal arterials, this classification is for roads that are for shorter distances to destinations which generate less vehicular traffic. Road types include state routes between smaller cities and important surface streets within smaller cities.

Minor arterials are located both through and in close proximity to the neighborhood. Washington Avenue, Madison Avenue, and Lincoln Avenue function as connections between State Route 25 to the south and Woodside Avenue to the north. State Route 15 is located just to the east and provides a connection to other communities southwest of the City.

The NFC system classifies portions of several roads both outside and directly adjacent to the neighborhood as collectors. Third Street, Fifth Street, Center Avenue, Sixth Street, Saginaw Street, and North Water Street all funnel users between downtown Bay City and the principal and minor arterials that serve the larger community.
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**Collectors:** Roads which tend to funnel traffic from residential sites to local institutions or small business areas to the adjacent arterials are classified as collectors. They also provide more direct access to adjacent sites than arterials.

**Local:** Roads that mainly provide access to all adjacent property are classified as local. They are typically the first or last roads that most residential users encounter as they begin or end their trip.

The internal road network of the neighborhood provides a multitude of connections to the adjacent regional network. It also allows easy access to the local businesses located to the east along Johnson Street, to the north along Woodside Avenue, and to the west in downtown Bay City. This allows neighborhood residents who work or want to shop in those areas several routes to get to their destination. However, the abandonment of the Monroe Street, Jackson Street, and Van Buren Street from First Street to Third Street has diminished the access to the businesses on the neighborhood’s north side.

**Act 51**

Act 51 is the mechanism under which the State of Michigan shares road maintenance funds with communities. Municipalities are awarded funds based on the mileage of roadway within their boundaries.

Under Act 51, roads are divided into categories – Freeways, Highways, Primary Roads, and Local Roads. Freeways and Highways are maintained by the State of Michigan, which only distributes money to municipalities for Primary and Local Roads. Primary Roads received much more funding than local roads.

There are no Freeways within Bay City. Within the Study Area, none of the roads is classified as Highways, although Center Avenue and Madison Avenue both carry M-25 for portions of their lengths just outside the Study Area and are therefore classified as Highways in those areas. The Primary Roads within the Study Area are Madison, Woodside, Johnson, and Third. All other roads are considered Local Roads.
COMMUTING TO WORK

Because the Study Area is located in the heart of Bay City, it is an easy commute to other districts within Bay City and surrounding suburbs, including Essexville and Bangor Township, as well as downtown Bay City. Additionally, Midland and Saginaw are within a half an hour drive of the neighborhood. For this reason, more than 76 percent of residents commute less than half an hour to work.

Table 2.11: Commuting Destinations, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Commute</th>
<th>Places of Work Within this Radius</th>
<th>Percentage of Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10 Minutes</td>
<td>Bay City, Essexville</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30 Minutes</td>
<td>Midland, Saginaw</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-60 Minutes</td>
<td>Flint, Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ Minutes</td>
<td>Lansing, Detroit</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
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This page left intentionally blank.
The method of public transit in Bay City is via bus. The Bay Metropolitan Transportation Authority (BMTA) is the provider of the service. The BMTA Central Bus station is located at 1124 Washington Avenue in downtown Bay City, which is three City blocks from the western edge of the Study Area. This location allows potential riders in the western part of the neighborhood convenient access to all of the eight BMTA routes that service the Bay City/Bay County area. However, potential riders on the eastern end of the neighborhood have to travel further to access the Central Bus Station. The BMTA bus service is operational Monday-Friday, 6:40 AM-5:35 PM, and Saturday, 9:00 AM-6:00 PM. The BMTA bus service is not operational on Sundays.

There are dedicated stops along each of the 8 routes, with buses leaving the Central Bus Station every 45 minutes. If a rider is not near a dedicated stop, the bus will stop anywhere along the route if a rider flags the bus driver, much like a taxicab service. BMTA’s Route #2 is nearest the Study Area, leaving the Central Bus Station traveling east on Third Street, then south on Madison Avenue. Although Route #2 travels along the western edge of the neighborhood via Madison Avenue, there is no dedicated bus stop. Therefore, the rider would have to flag the bus driver to stop anywhere that is safe along Madison Avenue from Third Street southward.

Similarly, the route travels westbound along Center Avenue, just south of the Study Area. Like the Madison Avenue portion of the route, riders can flag down the bus in any safe place, but there are no dedicated stops.

Figure 2.5: Mass Transit Route nearest Study Area

Source: Bay Metropolitan Transit Authority, www.baymetro.com
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Seniors, age 60+, have the option of using BMTA’s Dial-A-Ride-Transportation (DART) service. The DART service is also available to disabled citizens requiring special accommodations in transportation service and regular riders. The DART service is operational Monday-Friday, 6:30 AM-6:15 PM, and Saturday, 9:00 AM-6:00 PM.

Fare for the BMTA bus service is available in the form of single-ride tickets and booklets of tickets. Single-ride one-way tickets are $1.00 for regular riders, $0.75 for students and $0.50 for the disabled and seniors. Booklets of 20 tickets are commensurate with the cost of single-ride tickets. Fare for the DART service is $1.50 for single-ride and $3.00 for regular riders. As of 2012, the approximate annual ridership for the BMTA service was 586,000 riders.

**Table 2.12: Mass Transit Fare, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rider</th>
<th>Fare: Single-Ride</th>
<th>Fare: Booklet of 20 Rides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (Age 60+)</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bay Metropolitan Transit Authority, [www.baymetro.com](http://www.baymetro.com)
PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS AND WALKABILITY

The vast majority of the neighborhood includes well-maintained, well-connected sidewalks in the ROW. These, along with the grid system of ROW, lush street trees, and frequent intersections, make the neighborhood ideal for walking. However, there are some areas in the neighborhood ROW that are unpleasant, difficult, or even dangerous to walk in. These areas should be targeted for investments to improve the pedestrian environment.

Within the neighborhood the vast majority of blocks have sidewalks of sufficient width (5 feet or greater) and an outlawn between the sidewalk and the travel lanes for vehicles. In some locations the outlawn has been eliminated for on-street parking, despite the fact that the road pavement was already of sufficient width for parked vehicles in both directions. In other locations the outlawn has been eliminated and perpendicular parking has been established in the front or side ROW of a business.

The greatest deficiencies exist on the public ROW on the west side of the neighborhood, adjacent to downtown Bay City. The sidewalks within the neighborhood and in the downtown vary greatly regarding their width and proximity to the vehicle travel lanes. The outlawn are sometimes narrow, two feet or less in width, or do not exist all together. Street trees are limited in quantity or do not exist at all. The existence of a outlawn and street trees is fundamental to providing a sense of safety and security for pedestrians. In addition they provide a pleasant aesthetic look to the adjacent properties and overall community.

The following areas are of particular pedestrian concern:

**North Side of First from Sheridan to Monroe**

No sidewalk exists in the ROW along the north side of First Street between Sheridan and Monroe Streets. On the east, the sidewalk ends where the Rail Trail crosses First Street to run alongside Maplewood Park. On the west, the sidewalk deteriorates and disappears just east of Monroe Street.

**Madison Avenue**

Although there is a continuous sidewalk along Madison Avenue, it is not a pleasant pedestrian environment. There are almost no street trees, except near Baytown/Maplewood Manor, and the road is generally lined with parking lots, leaving pedestrians feeling exposed to wind, sun, and dust. Further, because Madison Avenue is the truck bypass for downtown Bay City, the rumble of large vehicles makes the corridor unpleasantly loud.

**Third, Fourth, and Fifth between Jackson and Adams**

Third, Fourth, and Fifth Street suffer from similar pedestrian environment problems to Madison in the southwest corner of the Study Area. Walking from the lush green blocks to the east, pedestrians are suddenly confronted by parking lots, low-slung office buildings, a lack of greenery, and traffic. The pedestrian environment on these blocks is especially important because they form the connection...
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between the neighborhood and downtown Bay City. A more complete, pleasant pedestrian environment could promote more walking and biking to the businesses in the downtown area, which are only a few blocks away from the residents of the neighborhood.

Woodside Avenue

Woodside Avenue is lined with industrial and office buildings and is unlikely to be a popular walking route because the pedestrian environment is incomplete, loud, harsh, and feels dangerous, further discouraging walking. While there are sidewalks, there are few trees or on-street parking and trucks rush by, going from the Liberty Bridge to the industrial uses in the corridor, including the GM Powertrain Plant. There are also almost no places for pedestrians to safely cross Woodside Avenue. Several of the traffic lights have been downgraded to blinking yellow lights except at certain hours of the day, and therefore do nothing to slow traffic. Redevelopment of the south side of the corridor with more coherent office and light industrial uses, along with improvements to the streetscape, would encourage more walking to the many jobs along Woodside.

Complete Streets

The public ROW road network should exist and function effectively for all users; motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders. While not all roads will service all users to their highest satisfaction, it is important to take a comprehensive approach to addressing the existing road network. Building on its strengths and enhancing its use for more varied users can ensure that the network could be an asset for all members of the neighborhood.
H. Community Facilities

Access to community facilities is essential to the competitive livability and desirability of a neighborhood. They provide the services and opportunities that are first thought of when evaluating a neighborhood and support the overall quality of life within a community. Proximity and access to recreational opportunities enhances resident enjoyment of the immediate community. The location and quality of schools is of primary importance to young families and those considering starting one. Depending on the priority placed on the importance of a particular facility, the evaluation of the level of service provided by these community facilities greatly influence the overall opinion of a neighborhood.

HEALTH CARE FACILITIES

The greater Bay City area is serviced primarily by the Bay Regional Medical Center located on Columbus Avenue in Bay City. The Bay Regional Medical Center is a general medical and surgical hospital with 338 beds. It is part of the McLaren Health Care group which provides health services in northeast and southeast Michigan. After this medical center, the nearest full service health facilities are located in the Saginaw area, 12 miles away.

The McLaren Bay Regional Medical Center is located to the south of the neighborhood, approximately one mile away. Given the fact that this facility provides services to residents throughout Bay City and the adjacent villages and townships, its close proximity to the neighborhood is a strong asset for the community. While local doctors’ offices exist within the greater Bay City area, being in the immediate vicinity of a full service medical facility is very advantageous for the neighborhood.

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

The neighborhood is served by the Bay City Public School district. It has 13 total facilities including eight elementary schools, two middle schools, two high schools and one combined middle and high school facility which operates an alternative education program. One elementary school, one middle school and one high school are located within the City of Auburn, approximately ten miles to the west of downtown Bay City. The remaining ten facilities are located within the City of Bay City or within one mile of its municipal boundary. As a result, in the Bay City area these facilities are generally geographically well situated to service the community.

The closest public school facility to the Maplewood neighborhood is Washington Elementary located at the corner of McKinley Street and Johnson Street, four blocks south of the southern boundary of the neighborhood. The walk from much of the Study Area to the Elementary School is not difficult.

With only one middle school and one high school to serve the entire greater Bay City area, the neighborhood is provided a level of service equal to other neighborhoods within the community. Given the overall size of the community, the proximity to facilities is appropriate for the neighborhood.

In addition, the community is also served by private and charter schools. While not located within the neighborhood, they provide an alternative for neighborhood residents. As an example, the Bay City Academy, a kindergarten through 9th grade charter school, is located just to the south of the neighborhood at Ninth Street and Madison Avenue. The Bay Area Catholic schools have St James
Elementary and All Saints Central High School located at 13th Street and South Madison Avenue, to the south of the neighborhood.

Within the neighborhood, the Northeast Michigan Community Service Agency (NEMCSA) operates an educational facility located at 1201 Fourth Street, to the east of Sherman Street. NEMCSA operates a Head Start program which promotes school readiness for young children by providing educational, health, nutritional, social and other services for children and families. While it provides these services for all of Bay County, having it located within the neighborhood is tremendous asset for residents.

Being able to capitalize on a relatively close proximity to several educational opportunities provides residents of the neighborhood with greater choices than those found in other outlying communities in the Bay City Area.
3. ASSETS AND CHALLENGES

As with any community, the neighborhood has its own particular strengths and weaknesses. In order to enhance the neighborhood’s overall quality of life it is important to identify those characteristics on which improvements can be built. It is also equally important to address the challenges that exist within the neighborhood. If the negative attributes are not adequately addressed, improvements could be severely compromised by lingering issues.

A. Assets

An asset to the community is one that adds to the standard of living within the neighborhood. It improves the day-to-day activities of residents. It’s something that can draw new residents in while at the same time making existing residents and business owners pleased with their choice of where to live and/or work. It is also something that, when enhanced, could greatly add to the overall positive, competitive impression of the neighborhood.

MAPLEWOOD PARK

Within the heart of the neighborhood is Maplewood Park. To have a nearly ten acre park centrally located within a historic residential area is a rare opportunity. While only 25 years old, Maplewood Park has positively impacted the neighborhood by providing both active and passive recreational opportunities and green open space for neighborhood residents. The existing basketball courts are used extensively. However, the baseball diamond and tennis courts are not adequately maintained.

While the grassy open space areas are well-maintained and do provide other opportunities for activity, such as a pick up ball game or simply providing a play area for children, the overall park space is underutilized. As a neighborhood park it has the potential to provide various levels of activities. Passive uses for seniors including walking along the paths and resting at a central fountain or pavilion can be complimented with active uses. The development of recreational programming at the neighborhood level can allow for the park to become the focal point of community activities. Art fairs, a summer neighborhood-wide block party and other communal gathering activities can bring a level of activity and care for the park that will enhance its value and overall appreciation by neighborhood residents.

PROXIMITY TO EMPLOYMENT GENERATORS

Located to the west, north and east of the neighborhood are various retail, service and industrial businesses that provide employment opportunities for both the neighborhood and the overall Bay City community. Downtown Bay City provides professional, retail and service employment opportunities. As the county seat, it generates job opportunities for those who may work directly or indirectly for the Bay County government. Johnson Street is a healthy business district that provides retail, service and office employment opportunities along the neighborhood’s eastern edge.

Within the northern portion of the neighborhood are various industrial businesses that can provide employment to craftsmen and laborers at a variety of skill level. To the north of Woodside Avenue is the GM Powertrain facility which manufactures engines for General Motors vehicles. A 50-year tax
abatement passed in 2007 by the Bay City Commission has resulted in General Motors making significant investment in the Plant’s equipment and employing additional workers.

These employment opportunities provide neighborhood residents with a wide variety of potential employment. The close proximity to these employers also provides residents with the potential for short commuting distances and a minimal amount of time spent going to and from work. By providing economic support to these businesses, these desirable quality of life characteristics can be maintained for the residents of the neighborhood.

**JOHNSON STREET BUSINESS CORRIDOR**

Located in the eastern portion of the neighborhood is the Johnson Street business corridor. It consists of small retail and service businesses and small professional offices. Having these commercial options is a tremendous convenience for the neighborhood residents. The ability to quickly make a needed purchase or run an errand is very advantageous for most people. These options enhance the quality of life within the neighborhood.

The local businesses also provide employment opportunities for residents. The opportunity to look for employment in close proximity to home and have a minimal commute time is convenient and desirable. In order to retain these opportunities for the neighborhood, any potential economic assistance that can maintain and grow the local businesses should be undertaken. The benefits of a strong and growing local business community will improve both the neighborhood and City overall.

**CENTER AVENUE HISTORIC DISTRICT AND EXISTING HOUSING STOCK**

Located along Center Avenue and including homes as far north as Fourth Street is the Center Avenue Historic District. Established to preserve and restore the wide variety of residential homes constructed since the mid to late 1800s, the Historic District and the Bay City Historic Commission have been able to maintain and repair a substantial number of architecturally significant structures. The opportunity to live in such aesthetically pleasing homes supports a higher quality of life for residents of the neighborhood.

The variety of homes includes both single family residences and those which have been refurbished to have several apartments within one structure. Having these residences scattered through the neighborhood increases the housing opportunities for people at various stages in their life. These residences allow students, young couples, empty nesters and seniors with the opportunity to live in the neighborhood and benefit from all the community’s other positive aspects.

While the residences are generally well maintained, efforts should be continued to provide support for owners looking to sustain their properties. Providing assistance for structural and aesthetic maintenance can help ensure the existing housing stock will provide housing options for a diverse cross section of residents.
BAY CITY LOOP (RAIL TRAIL) AND SIDEWALK NETWORK

The Bay City Loop is a 17 mile trail system in the public ROW that runs along the Saginaw River and through the east side of Bay City. It is commonly called the “Rail Trail” by local residents. A portion of the trail system runs through the Maplewood neighborhood generally along First Street. This segment of the trail allows residents to have immediate access to the complete Bay City Loop system which is both a tremendous recreational opportunity and benefits the users overall health. The Bay City Loop also provides residents with an alternative means of accessing other areas of the City. This can include not only the active recreational opportunities along the Saginaw River but the retail establishments adjacent to the trail system.

Encouraging a comprehensive approach to the maintenance and improvement of the sidewalks adjacent to the trail system can enhance the benefits it provides to the residents. Expanding the trail system to adequately serve bicyclists can be another way to ensure the residents’ quality of life is improved.
3. Assets and Challenges
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**Bay City Loop**
Providing recreational alternatives and connectivity to other areas of the city.

**Maplewood Manor**
Highly maintained site.

**Maplewood Park**
Open space recreational asset in the heart of the neighborhood.

**Industrial Businesses**
Providing employment opportunities.

**Johnson Street District**
Viable businesses serving the area.

**Maplewood Manor Historic District**
Strong residential community.

**Center Ave Historic District**
Strong residential community.

**Head Start**

Aerial Base: ESRI, date unknown
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B. Challenges

While the assets within the neighborhood can be the starting point for developing new policies and projects to improve the area, challenges can also serve as good places to begin. While proposed projects will build upon the strengths of neighborhood assets, they can also begin to address the deficiencies found in the following challenges to quality of life that currently exist.

**DISRUPTIONS IN CONNECTIVITY**

The neighborhood’s close proximity to adjacent retail and employment opportunities is an asset. However, when those connections are disrupted or in need of improvement, benefits to the neighborhood can be lost. One example is the pedestrian connections in the public rights-of-way (ROW) between the neighborhood and downtown Bay City. Within the neighborhood the sidewalks along First Street, Third Street, Fourth Street and Fifth Street ROW’s provide the appropriate width and a landscaped outlawn between sidewalks and the curb and vehicle travel lanes. However, these conditions vary greatly west of Monroe Street. A lack of adequate features for a pedestrian system makes the users feel unsafe. Even a perception of an unsafe corridor dramatically reduces its utilization. So despite the relative neighborhood proximity, the lack of connectivity to downtown detrimentally impacts the neighborhood.

This lack of ROW connectivity also negatively impacts the downtown business owners. Having potential consumers so close is a definite asset for these businesses. Finding additional ways to encourage these customers to visit them more frequently can only improve the businesses. But when the ease of use is disturbed, the businesses lose out on growth potential. By improving access to the businesses though enhanced pedestrian connections, both businesses and residents can benefit from their close proximity to each other.

**TRANSITION BETWEEN ADJACENT USES**

Located in the northern portion of the neighborhood, the industrial businesses provide tax base to the City and employment opportunities to the residents. However, these industrial operations are also in very close proximity to the residences and some retail shops. These businesses have been established over a long period of time and have varying levels of buffering and transition between them and residential uses. Some uses are heavily buffered with landscaping and even berms. Others provide only a minimal amount of screening from the off-site impacts of outside operations typical of light industrial uses. This is most evident along Lincoln Avenue between First and Second Streets, where overhead doors and idling trucks share a block with homes.

The lack of a comprehensive buffering and transition between such disparate uses has a negative impact on the overall neighborhood. The perception of industrial uses from aesthetically unpleasing to unsafe for pedestrians creates negative off-site effects on the property values of the rest of the neighborhood. Unless improvements are made to screen or eliminate perceived negative impacts of their operations, a confrontational atmosphere develops and negatively impacts both business operators and neighborhood residents. Despite the benefits industrial uses bring to the community, additional steps to create an atmosphere of good neighbors must be enacted.
RECREATIONAL PROGRAMMING

Maplewood Park is an asset to the neighborhood, providing for green space and active and passive recreational opportunities. However, this asset is severely underutilized and could be a key element in addressing several issues facing the neighborhood.

The lack of significant recreational programs is negatively impacting the community-building opportunities that could address important neighborhood issues. While adequately providing recreational programs on the regional level, the Bay County Recreation Department does not have the means or resources to create programs at the local level. The creation of activities to bring various members of the neighborhood together can address perceived issues of safety. By encouraging the use of the park as a focal point of neighborhood activities, residents could develop a strong affinity for what the park has to offer. Building a sense of community through common activities and gatherings leads to a more substantive understanding among all residents within the neighborhood.

CRIME EXAGGERATED

The area surrounding Maplewood Park, especially the Baytown complex, has an unwarranted reputation in the Bay City community for being dangerous. While crime is always an issue that needs to be addressed, the perception of crime is also an impediment to neighborhood revitalization. A 2012 poll on MLive.com, conducted in the wake of a shooting incident at Baytown, resulted in almost 80% of respondents reporting being “afraid” of the complex or agreeing that it is a “hotbed of criminal activity.”

However, data documents that the fears of danger at Baytown are unfounded. Police Chief Mike Cecchini reported that the complex experiences approximately the same amount of crime as the surrounding neighborhood and the rest of the City. That assertion is backed up by data on the website crimemapping.com, which shows similar rates of both violent and property crime in Baytown in 2013 as in the rest of the Study Area and City as a whole.

The site reports one larceny, one assault, one burglary, and one case of vandalism in the Baytown complex in 2013. There were no reported murders or rapes, nor any reported gun crimes or drug violations. For comparison, the area bounded by Lincoln, Fourth, Johnson, and Center, which has a similar population and is perceived to be the safest part of the Study Area, experienced two larcenies, two burglaries, two acts of vandalism, and a drug violation during 2013. There were no reported assaults, rapes, murders, or gun crimes in that area.

In general, Bay City has a low crime rate compared to other Michigan cities of its size and demographic profile. The City averages less than one murder per year, and has low rates of burglary, assault, and rape. Property crime is somewhat more of a concern, but is still lower than other similar communities.

Therefore, while stopping crime is a priority, the “fear” that Bay City residents expressed in the 2012 poll is not based in reality. Combatting the perception of crime should be a priority, along with crime prevention itself.
“Eyes on the Street”

One of the simplest and most effective ways to prevent crime is for neighborhood residents to be constantly engaged with what is going on along their block. The presence of witnesses (“Eyes on the Street”) deters crime. The best way for this to happen is for people to be out and about, walking to their destinations or being able to maintain a view of the public ROW and other public spaces. Drivers on the street can also deter crime, but they are not as effective as pedestrians.

Eyes on the Street can also be achieved through people spending time on their front porches and in their front yards. Residents can even serve as Eyes on the Street from their homes simply by looking out their front windows. Homes designed with porches and large front windows can help deter crime because their residents are more likely to be able to see what goes on in front of their houses. Conversely, dwellings designed with garages that take up most of their frontages or apartments designed to face away from the street create blind spots where crime can occur.

Retail businesses also create eyes on the street, with the pedestrian traffic that they encourage and their large storefront windows. Office and industrial buildings can also be designed to keep an eye on the street, but frequently turn blank walls or under-used lobbies toward the street.

Parking lots are among the worst uses for Eyes on the Street. In fact, parked cars can actually encourage crime, because they are a target for thieves.

Streets are not the only part of the public realm that needs “Eyes.” It is also important to have Eyes on Parks. One of the disadvantages of Maplewood Park is that it is fronted by industrial uses and the backs of St. Joseph’s buildings. Additionally, the Baytown Apartments are not designed to encourage Eyes on the Park.

“Under the seeming disorder of the old City, wherever the old City is working successfully, is a marvelous order for maintaining the safety of the streets and the freedom of the City. A City street equipped to handle strangers, and to make a safety asset, in itself, out of the presence of strangers, as the streets of successful City neighborhoods always do, must have three main qualities:

First, there must be a clear demarcation between what is public space and what is private space. Public and private spaces cannot ooze into each other.

Second, there must be eyes upon the street, eyes belonging to those we might call the natural proprietors of the street. The buildings on a street equipped to handle strangers and to insure the safety of both residents and strangers must be oriented to the street. They cannot turn their backs or blank sides on it and leave it blind.

And third, the sidewalk must have users on it fairly continuously, both to add to the number of effective eyes on the street and to induce the people in buildings along the street to watch the sidewalks in sufficient numbers. Nobody enjoys sitting on a stoop or looking out a window at an empty street. Almost nobody does such a thing. Large numbers of people entertain themselves, off and on, by watching street activity.”

-Jane Jacobs
“The Life and Death of Great American Cities”
3. Assets and Challenges
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- Perceived lack of safety.
- Dramatic transition from residential to industrial.
- Lack of buffer.
- Lack of programming.
- Inconsistent pedestrian connections between community and adjacent areas.
- 4th Street blocked.
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C. Major Redevelopment Sites

The sites listed on the following pages are the parcels of the neighborhood which are most ripe for investment, improvement, and redevelopment. The recommended actions and interventions for each site are discussed in Chapter 5.

**VAN POPPELEN SITE**

The Van Poppelen Brothers brick company sold building materials beginning in 1904, but began to struggle in the early 21st Century and eventually ended up in bankruptcy. Their storage yard, which takes up most of the four square block area immediately north of Maplewood Park, was acquired by Bay Aggregate as part of the bankruptcy. Bay Aggregate may be interested in selling the site, which would be a prime redevelopment area. A well-designed, mixed use development could re-activate Maplewood Park and bring an influx of new residents and businesses to the neighborhood.

![Figure 3.1: Van Poppelen Property, as viewed from Woodside Avenue](image)

**JOHNSON STREET BUSINESS DISTRICT**

Johnson Street, on the far east side of the Study Area, is home to one of Bay City’s most thriving business districts. The district, centered on the intersection of Johnson and Third, houses a number of unique local businesses, including the Loft on Johnson, Tummy Ache, and Little Muffins, as well neighborhood staples such as Martha’s Market grocery store and Coonan’s Irish Hub (a popular local bar). Despite its success, the business district does not have a formal business association to market itself, nor does it have a funding mechanism (such as a TIF district) for improvements like signage and streetscaping.

![Figure 3.2: Businesses on Johnson Street](image)
WOODSIDE AVENUE

Woodside Avenue, at the north end of the Study Area, is a corridor ripe for economic re-development. The north side of the street is taken up by the GM Powertrain Plant, a major employer in the Bay City region. The south side of the street is a mixture of industrial, office, vacant lots and residential uses. Some of these uses are thriving, but many are dilapidated and blighted. In addition, there is a small residential neighborhood north of the corridor (between Woodside and Ketchum Street) that has been targeted for redevelopment.

In general, the corridor is in need of a vision and a coordinated redevelopment effort. Because of the existing uses and character of the Avenue, a vision for a “Jobs Corridor”, with office and light industrial uses attracting workers while also providing a buffer between the GM Plant and the neighborhood to the south, should be developed and implemented. More details are included in Chapter 5.

DOWNTOWN CONNECTIONS

The blocks on the southwest side of the Study Area, immediately south/southwest of Baytown/Maplewood Manor, are under-utilized and have poor pedestrian environments. Low slung office buildings and parking lots dot the tree starved landscape. While many of the uses in this area are important (including the Bay County administration), redevelopment or targeted public realm investments could dramatically improve the area.

Importantly, this portion of the neighborhood, especially the east-west streets (Third, Fourth, and Fifth), is a crucial connection point between the residential neighborhood and the downtown area. Redevelopment in this area would encourage more biking and walking by residents to patronize downtown businesses, which are only a few blocks further west.

One particular issue in this area is the barricade on Fourth Street at Jackson Street. The origin of the barricade, which prevents auto traffic from continuing west past Jackson on Fourth, appears to be a proposed development in the 1980s that was never built. It creates awkward traffic patterns, unnecessary psychological separation, and public safety concerns, but is popular with Fourth Street...
residents because it reduces auto traffic on the street. Its impacts should be further studied, with an eye toward removing it.

**ST. JOSEPH CHURCH**

St. Joseph Catholic Church, located on Third Street near Farragut Street, was for many years an anchor for the neighborhood. In addition to the church itself, the St. Joseph complex includes a school, a gymnasium, a rectory, and a convent on the main campus, as well as a bingo hall on Johnson Street near Woodside Avenue, and a playing field along First Street east of Johnson Street. Today, the school and gymnasium are closed, the convent is being demolished for redevelopment, and the playing field is for sale. The exact future of the parish is unclear, but the Diocese of Saginaw has stated that it will close the church soon (although bingo hall will remain active under the auspices of a different parish).

The future of the complex, in the center of the Study Area, is important for the future of the neighborhood. Potential uses include community and recreational facilities, or a charter school. (See Chapter 6)

**MAPLEWOOD PARK**

Located in the heart of the neighborhood, Maplewood Park has the potential to be a gem and a gathering place for the neighborhood. However, it is currently under-programmed and under-utilized. The park currently contains basketball courts, tennis courts, pavilions, and a baseball field, but the field is in very poor condition, the nets from the tennis courts have been removed, and the basketball courts are perceived as being a magnet for crime (although crimemapping.com does not report any incidents in 2013.) Additionally, playground equipment was removed from the park over resident objections. A new park master Plan, re-envisioning the park, with upgrading and adding amenities, is necessary.
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4. COMMUNITY VISION

During the Planning process input was solicited from community members. This feedback was used to help fashion the goals and recommendations for this Plan. In order to show the ways in which the recommendations of this Plan flow from the ideas of community members, the tables on the following pages show not only the feedback, but also the Plan goal associated with the comment, and the recommended action in response to the idea.

In this way, the Revitalization Plan combines the traditional Plan elements of Public Input and Goals and Objectives to create a “Community Vision” – shared Goals and Actions for the future of the neighborhood.

A. Department Head Interviews

On October 9, 2013, the following department heads from the City of Bay City administration were interviewed and generously gave input regarding issues, concerns, and goals for the Maplewood neighborhood:

- Neighborhood Services Coordinator
- Economic Development Marketing Manager
- Interim City Assessor
- Parks Manager
- Director of Public Works
- Director of Public Safety
- Public Safety - Fire Division Director
- Code Official Coordinator

Their feedback is included Table 4.1 as well as the goals and actions stemming from their ideas.
# 4. Community Vision

## Table 4.1: Department Head Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUT</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFRASTRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve and replace roadways as necessary.</td>
<td>Ensure all roadways are adequately maintained for the safe movement of traffic.</td>
<td>Target streets with maintenance problems and repair as needed. Pursue funding for repairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make all pedestrian pathways ADA accessible.</td>
<td>Ensure the highest degree of public accessibility.</td>
<td>Identify public infrastructure that is not ADA compliant and pursue funding for the necessary improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain current quality of water and sewer systems.</td>
<td>Maintain infrastructure at current levels of service.</td>
<td>Monitor infrastructure for failure and deterioration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve fire safety.</td>
<td>Increase education, awareness, and enforcement of fire codes and crisis response measures.</td>
<td>Work with code enforcement and the school district to ensure code compliance and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKS, RECREATION, AND GREEN SPACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Right-size” parks and recreational programing.</td>
<td>Identify park and recreational needs of the community in City Parks and Recreation Plan.</td>
<td>Devote resources to parks based on the needs of the community and existing recreational amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade recreational facilities at Maplewood Park.</td>
<td>Plan recreational facilities that better meet the needs of the community.</td>
<td>Identify recreational facilities in need of repair and construct appropriate recreational facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the Rail-Trail.</td>
<td>Plan specific safety and aesthetic improvements along the Rail-Trail.</td>
<td>Install lighting, public art (murals), wayfinding and safety improvements (especially within the industrial area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and improve the urban tree canopy.</td>
<td>Partner with private land owners to provides incentives for tree Planting based on a Street Tree Plan.</td>
<td>Develop Plans which create conditions for added and replacement trees in development/redevelopment projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REDEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize community development funds to target properties in the Study Area.</td>
<td>Create a Corridor Improvement Plan for Woodside which is consistent with its vehicular traffic function and impact on Maplewood Neighborhood.</td>
<td>Execute community development projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the Third Street Corridor.</td>
<td>Implement complete streets policies on Third Street.</td>
<td>Install bike lanes, improve pedestrian atmosphere, and evaluate traffic lights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate blight and existing vacant structures.</td>
<td>Identify blighted structures that cannot be rehabilitated.</td>
<td>Develop a program for targeted demolition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Community Forum

On October 17, 2013, a Community Forum was held in the activities room at Maplewood Manor. Attendees were asked to discuss their vision for the neighborhood under the following categories:

- What elements of the neighborhood need to be **fixed**?
- What aspects of the neighborhood are important to **keep**?
- What should the neighborhood **aspire** to be like?

Attendees were then asked to vote for their top priorities in each category. The results for “fix”, “keep”, and “aspire” are in Table 4.2, Table 4.3, and Table 4.4, in order of priority and including the goals and actions to be pursued as a result of the input.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUT</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail-Trail is unappealing between Birney and Lincoln and narrows along Maplewood Park.</td>
<td>Invest in safety and aesthetic improvements along the Rail-Trail.</td>
<td>Install lighting, public art (murals), wayfinding and safety improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Street, between Madison and Sheridan (the potential negative influence of the Liberty Park store—only sells alcohol and tobacco).</td>
<td>Improve safety and security on Third Street.</td>
<td>Install pedestrian scale lighting and encourage redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee landlords in single-family areas with increased presence of low property values.</td>
<td>Protect renters against landlord abuses.</td>
<td>Enforce the rental inspection ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underfunded City Rental Program.</td>
<td>Improve the City Rental Program.</td>
<td>Dedicate additional funding to the City Rental Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No equipment or investment in Maplewood Park, poor condition of tennis and basketball courts.</td>
<td>Provide recreational facilities that better meet the needs of the community.</td>
<td>Identify recreational facilities in need of repair and construct appropriate recreational facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial uses south of Woodside Avenue.</td>
<td>Improve the transition between residential and industrial uses.</td>
<td>Require buffering, modify truck routes, and work to soften the impact of industrial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wooded area along First Street, east of Johnson.</td>
<td>Improve safety and security along First Street.</td>
<td>Install additional lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Street, from Madison to Sheridan.</td>
<td>Target redevelopment for First Street to better interact with Maplewood Park.</td>
<td>Acquire and redevelop the Van Poppelen site; building sidewalk on north side of First Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative perception of the area and noise complaints.</td>
<td>Support community relationships in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>Work with community groups to improve factors influencing the perception of the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to redevelopment small lots.</td>
<td>Clear the way for creative uses of vacant lots.</td>
<td>Implement a side lot program; reevaluate lot size minimums in the Zoning Ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need an elementary school that is closer to the neighborhood.</td>
<td>Partner with the school district to improve transportation to schools.</td>
<td>Evaluate school bus routes and the location of schools; work with charter schools to locate within the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put a bike lane back on Woodside Avenue.</td>
<td>Work with the City to evaluate traffic patterns / volumes on Woodside Avenue and bike lane requirements.</td>
<td>Reinstall a bike lane on Woodside Avenue if conditions are satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing gap between the downtown core and the neighborhood.</td>
<td>Improve the pedestrian atmosphere and street character on the east and west blocks between Jackson and Washington Avenue.</td>
<td>Install street trees, wider sidewalks, and promote redevelopment of the pedestrian atmosphere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.3: Keep

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUT</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph Church to be used as a gathering place.</td>
<td>Use St. Joseph facilities as community assets.</td>
<td>Work with Diocese to redevelopment St. Joseph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood serving places including Coonan’s Irish Hub, Tummy Ache Candy Story, Martha’s Market, Utermalen Furniture.</td>
<td>Support local businesses.</td>
<td>Incentivize a business association, wayfinding program and TIF district to support businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy community.</td>
<td>Support public health initiatives.</td>
<td>Support education and awareness of healthy lifestyles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Center and boat launch at Johnson on the Saginaw River.</td>
<td>Improve connections to the Saginaw River.</td>
<td>Identify transportation improvements for greater access to help the community experience the Saginaw River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic homes.</td>
<td>Maintain historic architecture.</td>
<td>Through the Zoning Ordinance, Historic Commission and code enforcement, require and incentivize maintenance and improvements to the housing stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early education programs: Head Start and Pre-schools.</td>
<td>Support educational institutions.</td>
<td>Work with Head Start to keep facility within the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail training program.</td>
<td>Continue to support the retail training program.</td>
<td>Inform business owners of available resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to and investment in an aging population.</td>
<td>Plan for “aging in place”.</td>
<td>Ensure neighborhood meets the needs of older residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4: Aspire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace the Van Poppelen property with more appropriate uses, including office, residential on the first floor and on-street parking.</td>
<td>Target redevelopment for First Street to better interact with Maplewood Park.</td>
<td>Acquire and redevelop the Van Poppelen site; build sidewalk on north side of First Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater park and recreational infrastructure and programming at Maplewood Park, including baseball diamonds, playground equipment, and multi-purpose fields.</td>
<td>Provide recreational facilities that better meet the needs of the community.</td>
<td>Identify recreational facilities in need of repair and construct appropriate recreational facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of community gardens in raised beds on the Maplewood Park tennis courts.</td>
<td>Support the creation of community gardens.</td>
<td>Aid community members implement a gardening program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Bay City school system (especially Central High School) to help maintain the tennis complex.</td>
<td>Work with the school district to partner on recreational programming and maintenance.</td>
<td>Use Maplewood Park for high school sport practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a public/private partnership with St. Joseph’s for community space, recreation and parking.</td>
<td>Work with Dioceses to redevelop St. Joseph’s.</td>
<td>Use St. Joseph’s facilities as community assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An improved Rail-Trail system.</td>
<td>Invest in safety and aesthetic improvements along the Rail-Trail.</td>
<td>Install lighting, public art (murals), wayfinding and safety improvements (specifically within the industrial area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger buffering of uses (C-1, Office) along the south side of Woodside Avenue.</td>
<td>Implement “Woodside Jobs Corridor” economic development strategy.</td>
<td>Improve aesthetics and the level of service on Woodside Avenue to encourage new business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a park-like feel north of Maplewood Park (with mixed uses).</td>
<td>Ensure high quality development on Van Poppelen site.</td>
<td>Work closely with developers to ensure a high quality result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning the property for St. Joseph’s to allow for a wider ranges of uses, including new single family homes, a private school, a Catholic museum, etc.</td>
<td>Reevaluate the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance to meet goals of the Plan.</td>
<td>Execute Zoning Amendments and Sub-Area Plan(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start a Farmer’s Market at Maplewood Park.</td>
<td>Promote the opportunity for a Farmer’s Market.</td>
<td>Contact market operators to gauge interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use TIF or other incentives for redevelopment.</td>
<td>Target Woodside Avenue and/or Johnston Street for TIF districts.</td>
<td>Set up TIF districts on Woodside Avenue and/or Johnson Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw new residents from development.</td>
<td>Encourage unique housing types to spur interest.</td>
<td>Evaluate the Zoning Ordinance, Master Plan and other development standards to encourage a range of housing options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. ACTION PLAN

The recommended actions of this Plan are included on the following pages. Taken together, these projects and investments are designed to improve the quality of life for residents of Maplewood Manor and its surrounding neighborhood. The recommendations are designed to capitalize on opportunities, leverage the neighborhood’s strengths, and address problems identified by community members.

A. Neighborhood-Wide Policies

The following recommendations are projects and policies designed to bring about improvements to the entire neighborhood through a coordinated series of actions over the long term. They are different from the Major Investments later in this chapter, which are designed to address a specific issue or opportunity in the neighborhood, or to address a specific site or portion of the neighborhood.

The general recommendations on the following pages have been divided into six categories:

- Housing
- Infrastructure
- Circulation and Walkability
- Planning and Zoning
- Placemaking
HOUSING

The Bay City Housing Commission has two sites within the neighborhood where it is actively pursuing redevelopment for new infill housing. The first is the former St. Joseph Convent, at Third and Grant Streets, which is being torn down by the City. The Housing Commission envisions new infill single family homes on that site.

The second site is a deteriorating vacant house at the corner of Fourth and Van Buren Streets. That structure is also being torn down by the City, and the Housing Commission is interested in acquiring the property to redevelop it for housing.

The following additional housing activities are recommended:

- Continue “scattered site” investments in rehabbing existing housing and new construction on vacant lots, as properties become available.
- Ensure high-quality design and function for infill housing, constructing homes with features that are visually interesting and complement the existing surroundings.
- Maintain high quality living environments at public housing communities such as Maplewood Manor and Baytown.
- Incentivize the building of new housing typologies to provide additional housing choices and stimulate the housing market.
- Conduct a housing study to better understand the market conditions in the Bay City region.
- Educate residents on available housing options, as well as homeownership, financial responsibility, and landlord-tenant relations.
- Enforce rental inspection requirements.
- Develop a procedure for receiving and reacting to housing discrimination complaints, and conduct fair housing testing to determine if discrimination is taking place.
- Establish a landlord training program.
- Create a fund to assist residents with the upkeep of their homes, especially in the historic district.
- For large-scale projects, implement the Master Plan principles of Traditional Neighborhood Design to strengthen Bay City’s walkable and historic neighborhoods.
- Utilize MSHDA programs to achieve housing goals.

Figure 5.1: Cottage-style homes provide architectural interest in a neighborhood without high building costs
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**MSHDA Programs**

The Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) offers many programs to assist in the provision of quality, affordable housing for all residents. Some of the programs that may be effective in Bay City follow:

**Property Improvement Loans**
The Property Improvement Program offers low-interest home improvement loans to single-family Michigan homeowners with annual household incomes up to $105,700. Landlords also have access to a similar program. Providing owners with the funds to improve their properties is a crucial component in stabilizing neighborhoods and breeds additional investment in surrounding properties.

**Homeownership Assistance**
MSHDA provides a variety of programs designed to assist low-to-moderate income families own their own home. From Federal programs like NSP I and II to down payment assistance to homeownership counseling, these tools can help families afford quality housing in the neighborhood of their choice. Programs like these should be leveraged to assist new families in moving to areas in Bay City with quality schools and other amenities.

**Housing Choice Voucher Program**
This federal program provides rent subsidies for very low income people to find their own housing in private homes and apartment buildings. These vouchers allow families to afford quality housing opportunities for families in this program should be spread throughout the City in neighborhoods of their choice.

**Community Foreclosure Response Toolkit**
Underwritten by Charter One Bank, the Community Foreclosure Response Toolkit is intended for any individual, group, or organization that wants to respond effectively to the foreclosure crisis in their own backyards. It is filled with Michigan-specific foreclosure-related information, resources, strategies for mortgage and tax foreclosure prevention and response, as well as best-practice models from around the state. It also includes resources for at-risk homeowners and advice on organizing a local, community foreclosure response effort. This online toolkit is searchable, interactive and continually updated, providing the opportunity for Michigan communities to learn from one another as they address the foreclosure crisis.
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**INFRASTRUCTURE**

City officials report that generally the infrastructure in the neighborhood is in good condition and has enough capacity to sustain existing and projected development levels. Infrastructure should be evaluated on a regular basis to ensure that it is in good condition and continuing to provide a high level of service.

The following infrastructure activities are recommended:

- Repair and re-surface roads as necessary, working with the Bay County Road Commission and MDOT to ensure that Bay City’s roads are a top priority for both agencies.
- Target Third Street for re-paving.
- Inventory sidewalks to ensure they are in good condition and meet ADA standards.
- Re-locate utility poles to alleys or underground where possible.
- Ensure that public light fixtures are in working order.
- Augment auto-scale light poles with decorative pedestrian scale lighting, especially in the historic district.
- Replace under-sized light poles on major corridors with full-size lights.
- Investigate condition of sewer pipes to ensure that stormwater infiltration is rare.
- Promote green infrastructure on private property to reduce runoff into stormwater system and prevent street flooding.
- Establish a tree maintenance program to preserve and replace existing street trees, as well as Plant new ones where necessary to fill gaps.
- Preserve the public ROW including alleys where they exist.
- Pursue Safe Routes to School grants for sidewalk improvements.
- Re-open and re-connect closed and blocked off streets as possible and appropriate.
- Do not close additional ROW or sever existing conditions within neighborhood without replacing them with new connections nearby.
- Consider the reasons behind the barricade of Fourth Street at Jackson and investigate the impact of removing it.
- Provide “complete streets” to maintain property values and competitive neighborhoods.
“Traffic Calming”

“Traffic Calming” refers to re-designing streets to slow down cars and create a safer, more pleasant environment for both pedestrians and drivers while increasing property values and maintaining the competitiveness of mature neighborhoods. Traffic calming measures are not intended to reduce capacity, but are intended to slow the maximum speed of autos through a stretch of road, reducing the severity of accidents and encouraging pedestrianism. Traffic Calming can slow down cars on a residential street without adding excessive stop signs or closing off the street all together.

Below are some examples of Traffic Calming improvements:

- **Bump Out**
- **Speed Bump**
- **Pedestrian Refuge/Island**
- **Traffic Circle**
In general, the neighborhood’s grid system promotes both walkability and efficient movement of auto traffic. However, there are improvements that could be made to better reflect the principles of “Complete Streets.”

“Complete Streets” is the concept that roads should be safe and available for all types of users, not merely automobiles. Complete Streets promote vibrancy and reduce crime. In many ways, the neighborhood’s streets already have some “complete streets” characteristics, including sidewalks, a bike path, and a public transit route nearby. However, improvements can be made.

The following circulation and walkability activities are recommended:

- Implement improvements to the Rail Trail, as discussed in detail in Section B of this chapter.
- Stripe bike lanes along Third Street as part of re-construction.
- Construct bump outs and other traffic calming measures along major thoroughfares and in the blocks immediately adjacent to downtown.
- Work with Bay Metro Transit to improve routing and expand bus service to the neighborhood.
- Investigate need for additional traffic calming or pedestrian crosswalks, especially along Third, Madison, and Johnson Streets, as well as Woodside Avenue.
- Build a sidewalk along the north side of First Street between Sherman and Monroe Streets.
- Consider traffic calming measures such as on-street parking along major corridors such as Third Street, Johnson Street, Madison Avenue, and Woodside Avenue, in places where it is not already permitted. Re-design traffic patterns to accommodate on-street parking.
- Install wayfinding signage to help navigate visitors to Maplewood Park, the Johnson Street business district, and other destinations.
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**Connected Street Patterns**

The neighborhood surrounding Maplewood Manor was built with a fully interconnected street grid. Over the years, several of the street rights-of-ways have been vacated, truncated, disconnected, or barricaded. While the reasons for some of these changes have validity today, others reflect trends or development patterns that no longer exist. In general, connected street patterns are preferable over disconnected patterns with dead ends, for the following reasons (Source: Smart Growth America):

- People are more likely to walk to their destination when there is a direct route made up of short blocks.
- An interconnected system spreads traffic to many streets, reducing overall congestion.
- An interconnected system reduces overall traffic because vehicles travel shorter destinations to reach their destinations.
- Interconnected systems provide multiple access points for emergency vehicles.
- Interconnected systems have less severe accidents and fewer fatalities from accidents.
- Public transportation routing is simpler and easier for riders to understand in a connected system.

“Neighborhoods should rarely contain cul-de-sacs. Because dead-end systems reduce the number of through streets, those streets which do connect become overburdened. In a truly porous network, each street receives enough traffic to keep it active and supervised, but not so much as to make it unpleasant for pedestrians.”

- Andres Duany/Jeff Speck
  *The Smart Growth Manual*
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**PLANNING AND ZONING**

Bay City’s Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance are key tools in implementing the recommendations of this Plan and other goals of the City and its residents. The following activities are recommended with regard to the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance:

- Update or amend the Master Plan with a sub-area or corridor Plan for Woodside Avenue, to articulate to vision for the Woodside Avenue Jobs Corridor.
- Re-zone the south side of Woodside Avenue for office and light industrial uses, to create a buffer between the heavy industrial uses to the north and the residential uses to the south.
- Re-zone the north side of First Street for Medium Density Residential to prepare it for redevelopment.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the “Duplex” designation for the residential portion of the neighborhood and consider rezoning the area to a single-family designation. A new district may be necessary to account for small lot sizes in the neighborhood.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the “Office” and “General Business” designations in the area bounded by Third, Fifth, Jackson, and Madison.
- Evaluate the dimensional and design standards in all zoning districts, as well as the permitted uses, to ensure they fit existing conditions, the vision of this Plan, and the Bay City Master Plan.
- Consider including on-street parking in required parking calculations, to reduce paved surface and encourage density.
- Promote developments of similar density to the existing neighborhood, to ensure that Maplewood’s ideal population density is preserved.
- Evaluate the amount of required off-street parking in the zoning ordinance.
- Prepare an Urban Street Tree Canopy Plan for the area.
PLACEMAKING

Placemaking policies and projects can help to strengthen the identity of the neighborhood, both for its residents and the rest of the Bay City community. Placemaking utilizes both changes to City policies and physical improvements to establish, strengthen and promote the identity of the neighborhood.

The Project for Public Spaces is a non-profit organization that has an excellent strategy to utilize or create public spaces as part of an overall placemaking process. The following is taken from the Project for Public Spaces website and identifies 11 key principles for developing public spaces.

Eleven Principles for Creating Great Community Places

Project for Public Spaces has identified 11 key elements in transforming public spaces into vibrant community places, whether they’re parks, plazas, public squares, streets, sidewalks or the myriad other outdoor and indoor spaces that have public uses in common. These elements are:

The Community Is the Expert

The important starting point in developing a concept for any public space is to identify the talents and assets within the community. In any community there are people who can provide an historical perspective, valuable insights into how the area functions, and an understanding of the critical issues and what is meaningful to people.

Create a Place, Not a Design

If your goal is to create a place (which we think it should be), a design will not be enough. The goal is to create a place that has both a strong sense of community and a comfortable image, as well as a setting and activities and uses that collectively add up to something more than the sum of its often simple parts. This is easy to say, but difficult to accomplish.

Look for Partners

Partners are critical to the future success and image of a public space improvement project. Whether you want partners at the beginning to Plan for the project or you want to brainstorm and develop scenarios with a dozen partners who might participate in the future, they are invaluable in providing support and getting a project off the ground.

You Can See a Lot Just By Observing

We can all learn a great deal from others’ successes and failures. By looking at how people are using (or not using) public spaces and finding out what they like and don’t like about them, it is possible to assess what makes them work or not work.

Have a Vision

The vision needs to come out of each individual community. It should instill a sense of pride in the people who live and work in the surrounding area.
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Start with the Petunias: Lighter, Quicker, Cheaper

The complexity of public spaces is such that you cannot expect to do everything right initially. The best spaces experiment with short term improvements that can be tested and refined over many years!

Triangulate

“Triangulation is the process by which some external stimulus provides a linkage between people and prompts strangers to talk to other strangers as if they knew each other” (Holly Whyte). In a public space, the choice and arrangement of different elements in relation to each other can put the triangulation process in motion (or not).

They Always Say “It Can’t Be Done”

Creating good public spaces is inevitably about encountering obstacles, because no one in either the public or private sectors has the job or responsibility to “create places.”

Form Supports Function

The input from the community and potential partners, the understanding of how other spaces function, the experimentation, and overcoming the obstacles and naysayers provides the concept for the space.

Money Is Not the Issue

This statement can apply in a number of ways. For example, once you’ve put in the basic infrastructure of the public spaces, the elements that are added that will make it work (e.g., vendors, cafes, flowers and seating) will not be expensive.

You Are Never Finished

By nature good public spaces that respond to the needs, the opinions and the ongoing changes of the community require attention.
B. Site-Specific Projects

The projects listed on the following pages are large scale investments and redevelopment Plans. Unlike the Ongoing Projects in Section A, these are not long-term policies, but one-time interventions. They may take several years to implement, however, and are not considered short-term solutions. If implemented, these projects, along with the policies described in Section A, will achieve the revitalization envisioned by the Housing Commission, the City, and the residents of the neighborhood.

MAPLEWOOD MANOR RENOVATION

Funded by Low Income Housing Tax Credits and investments by a non-profit developer, the Bay City Housing Commission envisions completely modernizing Maplewood Manor. Renovations include new mechanical and HVAC systems, improved common areas, and more comfortable apartments.

Additionally, the public right-of-way for the stub of Second Street running east from Madison Avenue has been vacated by the City. Maplewood Manor has been given the northern half of the right-of-way for improved access and green space.

The renovations to Maplewood Manor will make it a higher quality home for its residents and a better asset for the neighborhood.

Priority: High

Timeline: Short Term

Participants:
- Bay City Housing Commission
- Private Developer
- MSHDA
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**VAN POPPELEN SITE**

The former Van Poppelen Brick facility north of Maplewood Park is ripe for redevelopment. The site, bounded generally by First, Sherman, Woodside, and Van Buren Streets (with an additional area along First between Van Buren and Monroe), is for sale. It was acquired by Bay Aggregate in Van Popplen’s bankruptcy, and the quarrying company is now looking to sell it.

Located in a crucial position on the north side of Maplewood Park, the Van Poppelen site presents a tremendous opportunity to transform the park and the neighborhood as a whole. This Plan envisions a mixed use development with office space along Woodside Avenue and residential units along First Street. The development would add vitality to the area, put additional “eyes on the park” to promote safety, and add a new housing typology not currently found in this part of Bay City.

The recommended steps to re-developing the Van Poppelen site are as follows:

1. Create a Plan for the site and Woodside public ROW.
2. Develop a public-private partnership with developers, investors, potential tenants, non-profits, and public organizations to finance the project.
3. Assemble the land, including surrounding parcels such as the dilapidated residential structures on Woodside near Farragut, into one development site that can be purchased by a developer or through a public-private partnership.
4. Re-zone the area, either using a PUD process or through a larger Planning process that amends the zoning in this area to anticipate office development along Woodside and residential development along First. Ensure quality design through working closely with a developer through the site Plan approval process.
5. Obtain entitlements from Bay City and other entities, such as MDEQ.
7. Clear the site and remediate any environmental hazards.
8. Construct public improvements, such as a sidewalk along First Street and improvements to Woodside Avenue.
10. Market any unclaimed space to office tenants.
11. Market residential units to tenants.

*Priority: High*

*Timeline: Short Term*

*Participants:*
- City of Bay City
- Bay City Housing Commission
- Bay Aggregate
- Northeast CDC
- Developers/Investors
- Non-profits
- MSHDA
MAPLEWOOD PARK

Maplewood Park has the potential to be a true gem for the neighborhood and Bay City as a whole. Located in the heart of the neighborhood, it is a five-square-block green space with plenty of space for facilities and programming for all age groups.

However, Maplewood Park is currently underutilized. The following improvements are recommended to return vitality, safety, and a wider variety of users to the park:

- Pursue Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund grants for improvements to the park.
- Make improvements and upgrades to the existing tennis and basketball courts, including lighting to improve safety.
- Work with Bay City schools to allow school sports teams to use the park as necessary, and for the school district to help with upgrades and maintenance.
- Develop or permit a community garden at the far west end of the park.
- Plan the rehabilitation of the baseball field, in order to host most organized games and practices.
- Restore playground equipment near the existing pavilions.
- Create a gateway element near the corner of Third and Sheridan to draw residents from the area to the southeast into the park.
- Make upgrades to Second Street ROW to allow for angle parking for the park.
- Use the parking lots at St. Joseph, especially as the complex is converted into a community center.
- Investigate the possibility of an “outdoor fitness center*,” which is a concept of playground equipment for adults designed to help promote fitness and health lifestyles.
- Pursue the vision in the City’s Parks and Recreation Plan’s 5 Year Capital Improvements Plan.

  Priority: High
  Timeline: Short term
  Participants:
  - City of Bay City
  - Northeast CDC
  - Neighborhood Residents
  - Volunteers
  - Youth Sports Leagues

* Modelled after the facility at the Jewish Community Center in the City of Oak Park, Michigan.
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VAN POPPELEN/MAPLEWOOD PARK CONCEPT PLAN

On the following page is a concept Plan of the way the Van Poppelen site could be redeveloped and how Maplewood Park could be improved with new amenities.

The concept for the new development includes office space along Woodside Avenue ROW with a new streetscape or both sides and townhomes along First, Van Buren, and Sherman Streets. In the center of the block would be a courtyard with parking and small outdoor respite areas for residents. New public ROW would cut through the block, to restore the connections lost by the removal of Grant and Farragut Streets in this area.

Figure 5.2: Potential typologies for townhomes on the Van Poppelen site

The vision for park improvements includes a community garden at the west end of the park, upgrades to the existing basketball and tennis facilities, new playground equipment, a refurbished baseball field, and a new gateway element near the corner of Third and Sheridan. An “outdoor fitness center,” including exercise equipment for adults designed in a similar fashion to children’s playgrounds is also a possibility.

Figure 5.3: Outdoor fitness center - a "playground for adults"
Figure 5.4: Concept Plan for Van Poppelen Site and Maplewood Park
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WOODSIDE AVENUE JOBS CORRIDOR

Woodside Avenue, which carries 10,000 vehicles per day, many of them trucks, along the north side of the Study Area, currently has an awkward mix of adjacent land uses, including offices, industrial, residential, and vacant land. The north side of the street is entirely taken up by the heavy industrial GM Powertrain Plant.

Because of existing adjacent land use, and its impacts on a successful Maplewood Neighborhood its transportation link (across the Liberty Bridge), and the presence of several potential redevelopment sites with ROW access, Woodside Avenue ROW should be targeted for economic development, beginning with branding it as a “Jobs Corridor.”

Woodside is already home to major employers such as General Motors and United Bay Credit Union. Through targeted redevelopment, public realm improvements, and marketing to companies and developers, a redeveloped corridor could bustle with new business. Additionally, redeveloping the south side of the street for office and light industrial uses would provide a buffer from the existing heavy industrial uses (such as Powertrain) and reenforce the residential neighborhood to the south.

The following actions are recommended:

- Conduct a market study of potential uses.
- Develop a Corridor or Sub-Area Plan as an update or amendment to the Bay City Master Plan.
- Evaluate the zoning along Woodside Avenue to discourage heavy industry, remove non-conforming residential uses, and encourage offices and light industry.
- Branding and marketing of the “Woodside Avenue Jobs Corridor.”
- Re-design the Woodside Avenue ROW itself with Complete Streets/traffic calming principles, including bike lanes, pedestrian crossing points, a tree-lined median, and other landscaping, sidewalk lights etc.
- Evaluation of traffic patterns along Woodside to study changes to locations of traffic lights, including adding or removing.
- Re-connecting north-south streets that have been vacated for the expansion of now-dormant industrial uses.
- Work with General Motors to install berming, landscaping, and other buffering along the frontage of the Powertrain Plant.
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- Acquisition and demolition of vacant lots and dilapidated housing along Woodside, in order to combine parcels for sale to developers.
- Redevelopment of neighborhood bounded by Woodside, Ketchum, Sherman, and Johnson Streets to remove single family homes and encourage new commercial and industrial development.
  
  Priority: Medium

  Timeline: Long Term

Participants
- City of Bay City
- Bay County
- General Motors
- United Bay Credit Union
- Northeast CDC
- Developers
- Business Owners
- MSHDA
JOHNSON STREET BUSINESS DISTRICT

Johnson Street is a very vibrant business district on the east side of the neighborhood. Although it has been successful, it lacks formal organizations to market it and pay for public realm improvements.

Various tools exist which can be used to develop and prioritize improvements necessary to maintain and grow area businesses. These tools can also establish finance mechanisms to fund identified improvements. Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is a method of focus the growth in tax base over a limited time on specific district in need of specific public investment in infrastructure and physical features. These mechanisms can also provide funding sources to assist property owners with improvement projects. For example, a façade improvement program can provide low interest loans or matching grants to facilitate necessary repairs to existing front building facades.

Business Associations are another means to organize and fund projects. These associations rely on the voluntary participation of property owners within a defined area to fund projects which benefit the entire development area.

Specifically, a business association or TIF district board would typically pursue the following activities:

- Develop a brand and a logo for the business district to use on signage, banners, and marketing materials.
- Market the business district, focusing on the specialty businesses and the variety of consignment shops offering rare finds and great deals.
- Install wayfinding signage at Johnson and Woodside, Johnson and Center, and other major intersections near the Johnson Street business district.
- Install a gateway element along Johnson Street itself.
- Enhance the public realm at Johnson and Third to create a focal point for the business district.
- Invest in pedestrian safety improvements, sidewalk amenities (benches, trash cans, etc), lighting, and other streetscape improvements.
- Organize and manage events to bring new customers to Johnson Street.
- Coordinate with the City government to ensure the needs of Johnson Street are met.

  Priority: High

  Timeline: Long Term

Participants:
- City of Bay City
- Johnson Street business owners
- Business association/TIF district board
ST. JOSEPH SITE

The St. Joseph Church site, right in the middle of the neighborhood, has long been a community anchor. However, the school, convent, and gymnasium have already closed, and the parish itself is scheduled to close in the near future. The re-use of the site is crucial for the future of the neighborhood.

The buildings on the campus, including the church itself, lend themselves to conversion for community and recreational functions (public or private), including sports leagues and camps, educational programs, gatherings, and special events. However, in order to turn the church into a community center complex, donors/sponsors would need to be lined up to pay for renovations, maintenance, and programming.

The convent property, across the street from the church at Third and Grant Streets, is already being demolished by the City to make way for new affordable housing to be built by the Housing Commission.

The following process is recommended:

- Partner with the Diocese of Saginaw and community groups to Plan re-use of the property.
- Market the property to potential investors, donors, sponsors, and non-profits to fund renovations, maintenance and community programming.
- Conversion of church for special events space.
- Conversion of school into educational/community gathering space.
- Find uses for gymnasium as recreational space.
- Use of parking lots as public parking for Maplewood Park.
- Demolition of rectory for private housing, use site surplus for parking or community gathering space.

  Priority: High

  Timeline: Long Term

Participants:

- City of Bay City
- Diocese of Saginaw
- Northeast CDC
- Non-Pros
- Donors
- Volunteers
RAIL TRAIL

The Bay City Loop (generally called the “Rail Trail” by residents) converted an unused rail right-of-way and existing sidewalk to a biking and walking path. The trail is owned by the City and maintained by the Parks and Recreation Department. The trail comes into the Study Area from the east near the intersection of Johnson and First, then runs through old rail ROW to Lincoln Street. At Lincoln Street, the trail merges with the First Street sidewalk on the north side of the street, then crosses to the south side of First near Sheridan and runs along the north edge of Maplewood Park. After Maplewood Park, it turns north along Monroe Street and then follows Woodside Avenue over the Liberty Bridge.

The trail is a major community asset, but could still be improved with lighting, signage, and public art. Specifically, the stretch between Johnson and Lincoln Streets is lined with industrial uses and barbed wire fences, and is uninviting.

The following activities are recommended:

- Adding additional lighting along the entire length of the rail trail, especially between Lincoln and Johnson.
- Adding additional wayfinding and interpretive signage, especially at intersections.
- Re-aligning the trail to reduce 90-degree turns like the one at First and Sheridan Streets.
- Establish a working group of businesses, artists, schools, and volunteers to improve the stretch between Johnson and Lincoln Streets with murals and other public art.

  Priority: Medium

  Timeline: Long Term

  Participants:
  - City of Bay City
  - Bay County
  - Bay Metro Transit Authority
  - Business Owners
  - Northeast CDC
  - Artists
  - Schools
  - Volunteers
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**DOWNTOWN CONNECTION AREA**

The blocks in the southwest corner of the Study Area (generally the area bounded by Third, Jackson, Center, and Adams Streets) are the connection point between the neighborhood and the core Downtown Bay City area. However, the current character of the blocks discourages walking and biking to Downtown streets and businesses. The uses in the area are office buildings scattered among landscaped surface parking lots, and the atmosphere for pedestrians is stark, windswept, and unpleasant.

Much of the area is controlled and used for civic uses like the City of Bay City and Bay County. That represents both an opportunity and an impediment. Because public entities control much of the land, the lots can be re-developed (if not needed) in partnership with the private sector, or with public or quasi-public facilities. One example of infill development is the proposed Bay Arenac Behavioral Health Center, in the block bounded by Madison, Monroe, Fourth, and Fifth. A program of landscaping within the parking lots is also possible.

However, the public functions are important and need to remain – as do the parking spaces for the employees. Therefore, redevelopment is likely to be slow, and must be carefully planned out to minimize disruptions to the public servants. In the near term, streetscape and pedestrian improvements could promote walking and biking connections between the neighborhood and downtown. Simple improvements such as Planting street trees, adding on-street parking, evaluating the need for additional traffic lights, and painting bike lanes on the roadways could be substantial improvements and take advantage of the natural connections through the area.

The following activities are recommended:

- Planting additional street ROW trees, especially along Third, Fourth, and Fifth Streets.
- Improving the approach to the Pere Marquette Depot on Fourth Street.
- Painting bike lanes on Third and Fifth Streets.
- Replacing Bay County parking lots at Fifth and Madison with parking garages, infill development, and landscaped areas designed to showcase the Pere Marquette Depot.

  **Priority:** Medium

  **Timeline:** Short Term (Streetscape/Complete Streets Improvements), Long Term (Redevelopment)

  **Participants:**
  - City of Bay City/Bay County
  - Infill Developers
Figure 5.5: Examples of streetscape improvements in Downtown Connection area
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6. ONGOING INVESTMENTS

The investments listed on the following pages were ongoing or planned to begin around the time of the adoption of this Plan. These projects support the goals and long-term vision of this document, and are the first steps in the pursuit of the ideas listed previously.

### MAPLEWOOD MANOR RENOVATION

The Bay City Housing Commission has entered into a partnership with private nonprofit developer MHT Housing to modernize Maplewood Manor over the next 40 years using the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Program. LIHTCs are allocated on a competitive basis by the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) using a strict scoring system. If the Housing Commission and MHT win a $12 million LIHTC competitive allocation, the Housing Commission will be able to modernize Maplewood Manor. Additionally, the LIHTC will allow the Housing Commission to receive over $5 million for neighborhood improvements around the housing units it owns throughout Bay City. In order to maximize its chances of being awarded the credits, the Housing Commission needs the City Commission to approve a Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) to earn 10 points and also needs to develop this Neighborhood Revitalization Plan for an additional 10 points.
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PRIVATE NEARBY INVESTMENTS

The following major investments are being made in the core of Bay City by private organizations and developers. Although they are not in the Study Area, they will have an impact on the neighborhood.

Uptown

Uptown is a large-scale mixed use development on 43 acres along the Saginaw Riverfront between 9th Street and Columbus Avenue. The site was formerly industrial. SSP Associates is investing over $50 million in “Phase 1” of the project, which will include extensions of 11th Street and Columbus Avenue west of Saginaw Street. The new streets will be lined with office and residential buildings, with retail on the ground floor. Anchor tenants for the office portion include Dow, McLaren Bay Region Hospital, and Chemical Bank. Phase 2 of the project, including extensions of 9th and 10th Streets and additional mixed-use development, will begin when Phase 1 is complete.
USS Edson
The USS Edson, a former Navy Destroyer, has been moored in the Saginaw River downstream from the Study Area near the Independence Bridge as part of a new exhibit for the Saginaw Valley Naval Ship Museum. The Ship is expected to draw new tourists to Bay City.

Mill End Lofts
The Mill End Lofts are currently under construction along Water Street between Fifth and Center Streets in Downtown Bay City. The mixed use project, a $7.5 million dollar investment by a team led by developer Paul Rowley, will include offices, retail, and residences. The development replaces the former Mill End Stores building, which had fallen into disrepair.
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**Former Dunlop Pontiac**
The former site of Dunlop Pontiac dealership, at 7th and Saginaw Streets in Downtown Bay City, has been repurposed into an office and retail complex. The owner of the site, Dunlop Motor Company, has invested $100,000 in the property since the auto dealership closed in 2009. Tenants in the complex include Carter’s Soap Company, Survival Fitness, and Distressed Design. An outdoor-air craft market to be called “Dunlop’s Downtown Market” is planned for summer 2014 on the part of the site that used to be the auto sales lot.
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ONGOING HOUSING COMMISSION INVESTMENTS

The Bay City Housing Commission has several ongoing or completed projects in the Study Area, some of which are mentioned previously in this Plan. The map below shows the parcels that are owned by the Housing Commission.

In addition to Maplewood Manor, within the Study Area the Housing Commission also owns single-family homes at Fourth/Jackson, Third/Farragut, and Third/Sherman, and a piece of land north of Maplewood Manor at Monroe and Woodside.

The Housing Commission is also actively involved with two projects in the study area on land it does not yet own. A dilapidated house at Fourth and Van Buren is being torn down by the City. The site will be redeveloped with housing by the Housing Commission. The Commission is also seeking to acquire the site of the St. Joseph Convent at Third and Grant, which is slated for demolition. That site will also be redeveloped with infill housing. More details on these projects follow.
The map on the following page shows properties owned by the Housing Commission throughout the City of Bay City. The Commission’s priority is to target dilapidated properties that may be negatively impacting existing Housing Commission properties, in order to capitalize on previous investments and ensure a high-quality neighborhood for residents of sites where the Commission has already invested.

In 2014, the Housing Commission plans to invest in the following locations outside the study area:

- **521 Broadway**: A home acquired by the Housing Commission through Bay County’s tax foreclosure sale will be renovated. Renovation costs will be $57,000.

- **1200 Webster Street**: The Housing Commission acquired a dilapidated structure on this site through the tax foreclosure sale. City funds will be used to demolish the structure, and the Housing Commission will build a new home on the site.

- **112 Spruce Street**: A home that the Housing Commission acquired through the tax foreclosure sale will be renovated. Construction costs will be $76,000.

- **308 37th Street**: The Housing Commission acquired a vacant parcel on this site through the tax foreclosure sale and intends to construct a new single family home on the site.

- **1019 Harrison Street**: The Housing Commission acquired a vacant parcel on this site through the tax foreclosure sale and intends to construct a new single family home on the site.

- **308 Polk Street**: A vacant structure on this site will be demolished by the City. The Housing Commission intends to acquire the site from the City in order to build a new single-family home.
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LIHTC-FUNDED NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENTS

In addition to the renovation of Maplewood Manor itself (estimated cost: $5.9 million), the Bay City Housing Commission will use the proceeds from the sale of the facility for neighborhood investments. In general, the Housing Commission will follow the recommendations of this Plan, although the projects may be re-prioritized as necessary as circumstances change. The Housing Commission’s ongoing priority of investing in neighborhoods that are near existing Commission properties will continue to be the guiding principle behind investment decisions.

The Housing Commission is also planning to fund a comprehensive study of the housing market in greater Bay City with the proceeds of the Maplewood Manor sale.

The following construction projects in the Study Area are already planned for implementation by the Housing Commission as soon as funds become available:

**St. Joseph Convent (Total Investment: $345,000)**
The former convent building at 3rd and Grant will be demolished by the City of Bay City with a $95,000 grant. The property will then be deeded to the Housing Commission, which will construct two houses on the site, each with a construction cost of $125,000. The funding for construction will come from the proceeds of the Maplewood Manor deal.

**921 Van Buren Street (Total Investment: $149,000)**
The dilapidated house at 921 Van Buren Street (on the southwest corner of Fourth and Van Buren) will be demolished by the City of Bay City with a $24,000 grant. The property will be deeded to the Housing Commission to construct a new house at the site. The construction cost for the new house will be $125,000, funded with the proceeds of the Maplewood Manor deal.