

Municipal Building & Ramp Blight Study

Madison, WI



Prepared by MSA Professional Services, Inc.
August 2015




TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction..... 1
- 2. Parcel and Structure Survey Methodology..... 2
- 3. Parcel and Structure Survey Findings..... 5
- 4. Other Blighting Factors..... 9
- 5. Survey Forms..... 15

1. Introduction

The Community Development Authority of the City of Madison is considering the creation of a Redevelopment District that includes the Municipal Building at 215 Martin Luther King, Jr Dr. and the Municipal Parking Ramp at 215 S Pinckney St. This blight study seeks to determine if the identified parcels are blighted as defined by Statute 66.1333(2m)(b).

We visited both parcels on August 5, 2015, taking pictures of conditions and recording those conditions in the scoring tool (see Section 2 for the methodology of the scoring tool). **Based on this review, it was determined that both properties were BLIGHTED due to a combination of degraded site improvements, building conditions and the elevated police calls and personal safety crimes (per acre-basis as compared to the City as whole).**



2. Parcel and Structure Survey Methodology

To evaluate the condition of these parcels, we photographed conditions and scored the sites using an Excel spreadsheet evaluation tool.

The parcel evaluation tool was developed to standardize the parcel evaluation process and to ensure that the evaluation focuses on conditions consistent with the statutory definition of blight (see box at right). The law indicates that the presence of any of a variety of conditions that impair the growth of the city, or are an economic or social liability, allows for the “blighted” designation.

Our approach with all parcels is to begin with an assumption of satisfactory conditions and a full 100-point rating, and then to deduct points as blighting conditions are observed. The rating scale for all parcels is divided into four levels:

- 80-100 – SATISFACTORY
- 60-79.9 – DETERIORATING
- 30-59.9 – POOR
- 0-29.9 – VERY POOR

Parcels scored as POOR or VERY POOR are considered blighted in accordance with the statutory definition.

The parcel scoring system for parcels without structures includes three categories of characteristics: Utilization (20% of total score), Site Improvement Conditions (40% of total score) and Other Blighting Influences (40% of total score).

The evaluation form is provided at the end of Section 3. The form and its use are briefly described here.

PARCEL INFORMATION

The upper box on the form features basic information about the parcel, including its address, size, use, preferred use as designated in the comprehensive plan, and zoning.

Statute 66.1333(2m)(b) defines a blighted area as such:

“Blighted area” means any of the following:

1. An area, including a slum area, in which there is a predominance of buildings or improvements, whether residential or nonresidential, which by reason of dilapidation, deterioration, age or obsolescence, inadequate provision for ventilation, light, air, sanitation, or open spaces, high density of population or overcrowding, or the existence of conditions which endanger life or property by fire and other causes, or any combination of such factors is conducive to ill health, transmission of disease, infant mortality, juvenile delinquency, or crime, and is detrimental to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare.

2. An area which by reason of the presence of a substantial number of substandard, slum, deteriorated or deteriorating structures, predominance of defective or inadequate street layout, faulty lot layout in relation to size, adequacy, accessibility or usefulness, unsanitary or unsafe conditions, deterioration of site or other improvements, diversity of ownership, tax or special assessment delinquency exceeding the fair value of the land, defective or unusual conditions of title, or the existence of conditions which endanger life or property by fire and other causes, or any combination of such factors, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of a city, retards the provision of housing accommodations or constitutes an economic or social liability and is a menace to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare in its present condition and use.

3. An area which is predominantly open and which because of obsolete platting, diversity of ownership, deterioration of structures or of site improvements, or otherwise, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the community.

UTILIZATION

In this category we consider the extent to which the parcel is utilized in a manner consistent with the comprehensive plan (0-100%), including type of use, intensity of use (building size) and building design. For parcels without structures we consider the size and configuration of the lot and rate its suitability for the preferred land use as indicated in the comprehensive plan (0-100%).

SITE IMPROVEMENTS CONDITION

In this category we consider the condition of accessory structures such as sheds or garages, storage and screening, signage, drives/parking/walks, and the public sidewalk.

OTHER BLIGHTING INFLUENCES

In this category we consider an assortment of conditions that are unsafe or unsightly and may arrest the sound growth of the community, including minor maintenance issues (e.g. overgrown landscaping), major maintenance issues (e.g. piles of trash), compatibility of use or building bulk as compared to other parcels, safety hazards, erosion and stormwater management issues, and handicap accessibility (single family and duplex homes are not evaluated for accessibility). If the evaluator notes the presence of one of these conditions or issues, he or she decides if it affects just a portion or all of the parcel, and marks the appropriate box, thereby eliminating some or all of the points associated with that issue.

CODE VIOLATIONS, POLICE CALLS AND PUBLIC STREET CONDITIONS

The final parcel score is adjusted to account for code violations (up to 10 point deduction) and any delinquent taxes* or special assessments* (up to 50 point deduction) for the specific parcel and all parcel scores are adjusted to account for police call data (up to 5 point deduction) and public street conditions (up to 5 point deduction) in the study area. These deductions are explained in Chapter Four – Other Blighting Factors.

**Tax Delinquency and Special Assessments are not available since the parcels are city owned and tax exempt.*

PARCEL EVALUATION FORM (Parcel with Structures)



Study Area: City of Madison- Study Area	Evaluator:	Sub-Categories:	Factor:	Condition:	Points:
Study Area Parcel #	Parcel #:	A. UTILIZATION	20	0%	0.0
Street Name:	Street Number:	B. PRIMARY STRUCTURE EXT. CONDITION	40	100%	40.0
Preferred Land Use (Comp Plan):	Zoning:	C. SITE IMPROVEMENTS CONDITION	20	100%	20.0
Primary Occupancy:	Other Uses:	D. OTHER BLIGHTING INFLUENCES	20	100%	20.0
# Stories:	Basement (Y/N):	PARCEL RATING:			
Code Violations last 10 years:	Code Violations last 5 years:	Parcel Rating without Crime or Code Violation Deductions			
	Picture ID:	80.0			

TYPE	Factor	Value	Condition	Points	Comments
Lot Utilization (compared to Land Use Plan)	25		0%	0	
Occupancy (% of the building used)	75		0%	0	
Total	100		0%	0	

ITEM	Factor (if not value)	Entirely Missing			Structural Deficiencies	Missing/ Irreparable Components	Cosmetic Deficiencies	Condition	Points	Comments
		most/all	some	major/ minor						
Foundation	5				major/ minor	major/ minor	100%	5	(Structural Deficiencies = Crumbling, Leaking, Bulging, Sagging, etc.) (Missing/Irreparable Nonstructural Components - Siding, Flashing, Windows, Doors, etc.) (Cosmetic Deficiencies = Damage or Decay not affecting structural integrity)	
Walls & Cladding	15						100%	15		
Roof	15						100%	15		
Windows & Awnings	15						100%	15		
Canopies/Porch	15						100%	15		
Outlets & Overhead	5						100%	5		
Chimneys & Vents	5						100%	5		
Exterior Stairs/Sloops/Ramps	15						100%	15		
Exterior Doors & Entrances	10						100%	10		
Total	100						100%	100		

ITEM	Factor (if not value)	Entirely Missing			Structural Deficiencies	Missing/ Irreparable Components	Cosmetic Deficiencies	Condition	Points	Comments
		most/all	some	major/ minor						
Accessory Structures	30				most/all	some	100%	30	(Structural Deficiencies = Uneven Settling, Heaving, Crumbling, Leaking, Bulging, Sagging, etc.) (Missing/Irreparable Nonstructural Components - Siding, Flashing, Windows, Doors, etc.) (Cosmetic Deficiencies = Damage or Decay not affecting structural integrity)	
Storage & Screening	20						100%	20		
Signage & Lighting	20						100%	20		
Driveway/Parking/Walks	20						100%	20		
Public Sidewalks	10						100%	10		
Total	100						100%	100		

BLIGHTING INFLUENCES	Factor	Yes		Condition	Points	Comments
		most/all	some			
Minor Maintenance Issues (weeds, overgrown landscape, etc.)	20			100%	20	
Major Maintenance Issues (Slopes of roof, bad landscaping, graffiti, etc.)	30			100%	30	
Use Incompatible with Adjacent Use	10			100%	10	
Building Bulk Incompatible with Neighborhood	10			100%	10	
Safety Hazards	15			100%	15	
Erosion and Stormwater Management Issues	10			100%	10	
Building not Handicap Accessible	5			100%	5	
Total	100			100%	100	

3. Parcel Survey Findings

This blight study includes 2 parcels totaling 3.2 acres considered for possible inclusion in a Redevelopment District. Blight findings are presented here with the completed survey forms displayed in Section 4 of this document.

STUDY AREA DESCRIPTION

The study area includes two parcels: 1.2-acre Municipal Garage parcel (#1) and a 2-acre Municipal Building parcel (#2). Both parcels are designated “Downtown Core” in the Comprehensive Plan and are currently zoned C4.

Both parcels were evaluated on August 5, 2015.

PARCEL #1 EVALUATION (Municipal Building)

Our evaluation found a variety of blighting conditions, resulting in a parcel score of **54.4**, indicating a “Poor” rating and a finding that the parcel *is* blighted. A detailed description of our findings follows.



Utilization

This parcel is planned and zoned Downtown Core District. It’s current use is the City of Madison Municipal building. No points were deducted for the property’s utilization.

Primary Structure Exterior Condition

The detailed articulation of the building (i.e. cornice, frieze, and horizontal expression line) is discolored. The upper window frames are rusted and fabric is missing on the loading dock awning frame. The chimney has a rusted flue and discolored concrete cap. Most of the exterior stairs have concrete issues including staining, heaving steps, crumbling walls, and rusted railings. These deficiencies in building exterior conditions resulted in a deduction of 20.2 points from the final parcel score.





Site Improvements Condition

The public sidewalks are in satisfactory condition, excluding those on the Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd which have dirty/stained concrete, cracks and crumbling concrete near existing tree grates. The driveway and parking area features extensive, but repaired cracks, as well as loose aggregate debris. The solar parking canopy has rusted metal supports and a dirty canopy. Some sign poles in the parking area are rusted, while the lights' concrete bases are cracked. The dumpsters are located near the back street in plain view (not screened). These deficiencies in site improvements resulted in a deduction of 10.4 points from the final parcel score.



Blighting Influences

There are many minor maintenance issues on this property including weeds in pavement cracks, cob webs on lighting, stickers on signs and rusted and/or warped site furniture. There are some major maintenance issues as well, including dead (or partially dead) trees and several areas of missing lawn (dirt areas). These blighting influences resulted in a deduction of 8.0 points from the final score.



Other Blighting Factors - Building Code Violations, Crime and Street Conditions

There is data that suggests an increase in crime in the near vicinity of this property, and some street deficiencies that impact the perception of the area. These blighting factors resulted in a deduction of 7.0 points from the final score. See Section 4 for more details.

PARCEL #2 EVALUATION (Municipal Parking Ramp)

Our evaluation found a variety of blighting conditions, resulting in a parcel score of **44.4**, indicating a “Poor” rating and a finding that the parcel is blighted. Our survey form is attached, and detailed descriptions of our findings follow.



Utilization

This parcel is planned and zoned Downtown Core District. It’s current use is the Municipal parking ramp, which is a support use. Due to the utilization of property, 2.5 points were deducted from the final score.

Primary Structure Exterior Condition

The parking ramp is in poor condition with a significant amount of deterioration on the entire structure, including cracked and crumbling concrete, significant amounts of patchwork, rusted metal, and chipping paint. Stairwells have cracked and patched stairs and windows with dirty glass panes and stained framing. Most vents are rusted and/or bent. These deficiencies in the structure resulted in a deduction of 26.3 points from the final parcel score.





Site Improvements Condition

The sidewalks are dirty, stained, cracked in places, and missing pieces in other locations. The driveway is stained and crumbling, and has significant patchwork. Signs have stickers on them and staining from rusted bolts and nails. Some sections of sidewalk have aggregate showing. These deficiencies in site improvements resulted in a **deduction of 10.3 points** from the final parcel score.



Blighting Influences

There were weeds present in sidewalks, building joints and tree grates, and cob webs and dead bugs visible in many locations. Minor graffiti and garbage was noted. The crumbling concrete on ceilings can prove to be a safety hazard. These blighting influences resulted in a **deduction of 9.5 points** from the final score.



Other Blighting Factors - Building Code Violations, Crime and Street Conditions

There is data that suggests an increase in crime in the near vicinity of this property, and some street deficiencies that impact the perception of the area. These blighting factors resulted in a **deduction of 7.0 points** from the final score. See Section 4 for more details.

4. Other Blighting Factors

The parcel scores include considerations for four factors that indicate and influence conditions consistent with blight – code violations, police calls, tax delinquency and the condition of public streets in the study area. Our analysis revealed high police call data in this area and some deficiencies with the public streets. A uniform five (5) points were deducted from each parcel for crime based on the police call data, and a uniform two (2) points deducted for street conditions. The data and the scoring are described below. Though this analysis typically considers and deducts points for code violations, the City does not track code violations on City parcels.

Police Calls

There are a variety of different conditions which, if present, can support a determination of blight. As defined in Statute 66.13333(2m)(b), these conditions include those that are “conducive to...juvenile delinquency and crime, and [are] detrimental to the public health, safety, morals or welfare...”

To analyze the levels of crime within the Municipal Building & Ramp Study Area, we examined the number of police calls in both the near vicinity of the parcels (see Figure 4.1 for area included) and city-wide from 2010 to 2014 on a per-acre basis (calls divided by acres). Data was provided by the City. We compared both total police calls and several specific types of calls.

Figure 4.1: Police Data Boundary




Total Police Calls

It is important to note that “police calls” include nearly 150 types of contact tracked by the City of Madison Police Department, including reported crimes but also including 911 phone calls and requests for information. Table 4.1 displays police calls per acre for the Municipal Building & Ramp Study Area, and within Madison.

Over the past five years there have been, on average, 1,383 calls per year in the Municipal Building & Ramp Study Area, or about 52.07 per acre. City-wide, over the same period, the average is 120,128 calls per year, or about 2.45 per acre. Some of this discrepancy can be attributed to the fact that the study area is downtown and has an overall higher concentration of people.

The graph shows that there was a sharp increase in police calls per acre in Municipal Building & Ramp Study Area since 2012.

Figure 4.2: Police Calls per Acre, Blight Study Area Versus the City of Madison



Selected Police Calls

We also considered the occurrence of specific police calls associated with crimes that are particularly detrimental to actual or perceived personal safety (sexual assault, aggravated assault, burglary/robbery, theft, etc.).

Table 4.1 (on the next page) displays reported crimes that threatened personal safety within the Municipal Building & Ramp Study Area, and within Madison. For ease of comparison, the numbers are reported on a per acre basis. Seven of the eight selected crimes were reported much more often in the study area than the city as a whole.

Based on the high percentage of police calls per acre and crimes that threatened personal safety, there is a five (5) point deduction from the blight scores for crime conditions.

Table 4.1: Reported Crimes in Study Area & City of Madison

Reported Crimes Threatening Personal Safety in Capitol Area & Madison (per acre)						
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Average
Homicide	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Madison	0.0000	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001
	<i>Compared to Madison</i>					0.0%
Sexual Assault 1-2-3-4/Rape	0.1882	0.0000	0.2635	0.4140	0.3011	0.2334
Madison	0.0033	0.0030	0.0042	0.0055	0.0041	0.0040
	<i>Compared to Madison</i>					5349.2%
Robbery (armed & strong armed)	0.1129	0.0753	0.0753	0.1882	0.1506	0.1204
Madison	0.0068	0.0055	0.0059	0.0064	0.0054	0.0060
	<i>Compared to Madison</i>					2011.8%
Aggravated Assault	0.1506	0.0376	0.2258	0.0000	0.0000	0.0828
Madison	0.0087	0.0079	0.0067	0.0013	0.0006	0.0050
	<i>Compared to Madison</i>					1114.4%
Burglary (res & non-res)	0.3387	0.1129	0.4517	0.1129	0.2258	0.2484
Madison	0.0423	0.0370	0.0397	0.0363	0.0318	0.0374
	<i>Compared to Madison</i>					653.1%
Stolen Autos	0.3764	0.3764	0.2258	0.4517	0.5646	0.3990
Madison	0.0124	0.0122	0.0098	0.0133	0.0118	0.0119
	<i>Compared to Madison</i>					3321.5%
Theft	2.4465	3.0863	2.3712	3.9520	3.9896	3.1691
Madison	0.1070	0.1077	0.1089	0.1147	0.1108	0.1098
	<i>Compared to Madison</i>					2874.6%
Arson	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0376	0.0075
Madison	0.0015	0.0017	0.0006	0.0000	0.0002	0.0008
	<i>Compared to Madison</i>					3359.6%

Public Street Conditions

Though we focused mostly on the condition of the *parcels*, it is also important to consider the condition of the public streets, alleys and medians adjacent to the parcels we evaluated, and also public improvements such as street lights and bus stops. Whereas the sidewalk and terrace is (or should be) maintained by the adjacent property owner and was evaluated as part of the adjacent parcel, these other features are maintained only by the City. The condition of this public infrastructure can positively or negatively impact perceptions of the area and investment and maintenance decisions of surrounding property owners.

Our qualitative review of the adjacent public street infrastructure reveals that conditions are generally fair, but there are enough problems to warrant point deductions from the blight scores. Both parcels received a two (2) point deduction for these infrastructure deficiencies.

All parcels: two (2) point deduction



Intersection of Doty and Pinckney looking East
(Fair to Poor condition)



Ramp entry drive on Pinckney Street
(Poor condition)



West Wilson Street
(Good to Fair condition)



Intersection of West Wilson and Pinckney
(Fair condition)



West Wilson near MLK Jr. Blvd
(Fair condition)



Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd
(Good condition)



Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd, asphalt patches
(Fair to Poor condition)



Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd, curbs missing
chunks (Fair to Poor condition)



West Doty Street
(Good to Fair condition)



Intersection of West Doty and Pinckney
looking south, cracks and patchwork
(Poor condition)



Stickers on Traffic Signs



Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd Bollards
(leaning & crumbling)

This page was intentionally left blank.

5. Survey Forms

PARCEL EVALUATION FORM (Parcel with Structures)



Study Area:	City of Madison - Municipal Building & Ramp		Evaluator:	Sarah McDonald	
Blight Study #:	1	Parcel #:	070924207016	Date of Evaluation:	5-Aug-15
Street Name:	Martin Luther King J.	Street Number:	215	Area (sq. ft.):	87,120
Preferred Land Use (Comp. Plan):	Downtown Core District	Zoning:	DC, HIS-L, WP-17	2013 Value Ratio:	Tax Exempt / No Data
Primary Occupancy:	Madison Municipal Building	Basement (Y/N):	y	Other Uses:	Madison Credit Union
# Stories:	3	Code Violations last 5 years:	0	# Dwelling Units:	none
Code Violations last 10 years:	0	Code Violations last 5 years:	0	Picture ID:	1a-w

TYPE	Factor	Not Preferred Use		Not Preferred Size		Not Preferred Design		Points	Comments
		Supports Preferred Use	Not Preferred Use	Building Height	Density	Building	Site		
Lot Utilization (compared to Land Use Plan)	25							25	line
Occupancy (percent of building used)	75							75	
Total	100							100	

ITEM	Factor (0, if not visible)	Entirely Missing		Structural Deficiencies		Missing/Irreparable Components		Cosmetic Deficiencies		Points	Comments
		most	some	major	minor	many	few	major	minor		
Foundation	5									5	
Walls & Cladding	15							X		9	cornice and freeze: quite discolored; horizontal bands; discolored; not visible
Roof	15							X		5	upper windows: metal frames rusted; first level windows: line; no fabric on awning frame over rear loading dock
Porches & Overhangs	5									NA	none visible
Gutters & Downspouts	5							X		3	chimney: some discoloration of concrete cap, rusted flue;
Chimneys & Vents	15				X					0	Wilson Ramp; rust, stained; Wilson Stair; heaving stairs, crumbling walls; rusted railing; body Ramp; rust; stained; Loading; crumbling, stained
Exterior Stairs/Stoops/Ramps	10									10	MLK doors: liner; CU Loading Dock Doors: paint wearing thin/faded
Total	65									32	

ITEM	Factor (0, if not visible)	Entirely Missing		Structural Deficiencies		Missing/Irreparable Components		Cosmetic Deficiencies		Points	Comments
		most	some	most	some	most	some				
Accessory Structures	30									18	Solar Parking Canopy: rust on metal supports and canopy, dirty
Storage & Screening	20	X								0	dumpsters in view of street (no screening)
Signage & Lighting	20							X		12	sign/rusted sign poles in parking; concrete lighting foundations, cracked concrete
Drives/Parking/Walks	20							X		12	driveways: repaired cracks; MLK pavement cracked, chunks missing, rust stained, rebar exposed;
Public Sidewalk	10							X		6	dirty/stained/cracked, spalling in places
Total	100									48	

BLIGHTING INFLUENCES	Factor	Yes		Points	Comments
		most	some		
Minor Maintenance Issues (weeds, overgrown landscape, etc.)	20	X		0	rusted/warped site furniture; cob webs on lighting; weeds; stickers on signs; trash on south stairs and under front bench
Major Maintenance Issues (piles of trash, dead landscaping, graffiti, etc.)	40		X	20	couple dead or partially dead trees; many areas of unrepared lawn areas (just dirt)
Use incompatible with Adjacent Use	5			5	compatible
Building Bulk Incompatible with Neighborhood	5			5	compatible
Safety Hazards	15			15	none visible
Erosion and Stormwater Management Issues	10			10	none visible
Building not Handicap Accessible	5			5	accessible
Total	100			60	

PARCEL EVALUATION FORM (Parcel with Structures)



Study Area:	City of Madison - Municipal Building & Ramp		Evaluator:	Sarah McDonald	
Blight Study #:	2	Parcel #:	070924202090	Date of Evaluation:	5-Aug-15
Street Name:	S Pinckney St	Street Number:	215	Area (sq. ft.):	52,272
Preferred Land Use (Comp Plan):	Downtown Core District	Zoning:	DC, WP-17	2013 Value Ratio:	Tax Exempt / No Data
Primary Occupancy:	Automobile surface parking.	Basement (Y/N):	Y	Other Uses:	none
# Stories:	3	Code Violations last 5 years:	0	# Dwelling Units:	0
				Picture ID:	2a-u
			PARCEL RATING: POOR		
			44.4		

TYPE	Factor	Value	Not Preferred Use		Not Preferred Size		Not Preferred Design		Condition	Points	Comments
			Supports Preferred Use	Not Preferred Use	Building Height	Density	Building	Site			
Lot Utilization (compared to Land Use Plan)	25								50%	13	parking structure
Occupancy (percent of building used)	75	100%	X						100%	75	
Total	100								88%	88	

ITEM	Factor (0, if not visible)	Entirely Missing		Structural Deficiencies		Missing/ Irreparable Components		Cosmetic Deficiencies		Condition	Points	Comments
		most	some	major	minor	many	few	major	minor			
Foundation	5				X					0%	0	(Structural Deficiencies = Crumbling, Leaning, Bulging, Sagging, etc.) (Missing/Irreparable Nonstructural Components - Siding, Flashing, Windows, Doors, etc.) (Cosmetic Deficiencies = Damage or Decay not affecting structural integrity)
Walls & Cladding	15			X						0%	0	
Roof	15									NA	0	
Windows & Awnings	15						X			60%	9	
Porches & Overhangs	5						X			100%	NA	
Gutters & Downspouts	5						X			60%	3	
Chimneys & Vents	15						X			60%	3	
Exterior Stairs/Stoops/Ramps	10						X			20%	3	
Exterior Doors & Entrances	10						X			60%	6	
Total	70									34%	24	

ITEM	Factor (0, if not visible)	Entirely Missing		Structural Deficiencies		Missing/ Irreparable Components		Cosmetic Deficiencies		Condition	Points	Comments
		most	some	most	some	most	some					
Accessory Structures	20									100%	NA	(Structural Deficiencies = Uneven Settling, Heaving, Crumbling, Leaning, Bulging, Sagging, etc.) (Missing/Irreparable Nonstructural Components - Siding, Flashing, Windows, Doors, etc.) (Cosmetic Deficiencies = Damage or Decay not affecting structural integrity)
Storage & Screening	20						X			20%	4	
Signage & Lighting	20							X		60%	12	
Drives/Parking/Walks	20							X		60%	12	
Public Sidewalk	10							X		60%	6	
Total	70									49%	34	

BLIGHTING INFLUENCES	Factor	Yes		Condition	Points	Comments
		most	some			
Minor Maintenance Issues (weeds, overgrown landscape, etc.)	20	X		0%	0	weeds in cracks of sidewalk, at joints of building & in tree grates; piles of dead bugs in windows, cob webs
Major Maintenance Issues (piles of trash, dead landscaping, graffiti, etc.)	40		X	50%	20	
Use incompatible with Adjacent Use	5			100%	5	
Building Bulk Incompatible with Neighborhood	5			100%	5	
Safety Hazards	15		X	60%	8	
Erosion and Stormwater Management Issues	10			100%	10	
Building not Handicap Accessible	5			100%	5	
Total	100			53%	53	