

CITY OF PLYMOUTH  
Planning Commission - Master Plan Sub-Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, September 28, 2016  
7:00 PM  
Plymouth City Hall – Commission Conference Room

**AGENDA**

1. Roll Call: Jennifer Kehoe, Jennifer Frey, Scott Silvers
2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from April 25, 2016, Submission of Notes from July 13, 2016 and Submission of Notes from July 28, 2016
3. Discussion: Master Plan Survey Results and Summary
4. Motion to Adjourn

CITY OF PLYMOUTH  
Planning Commission – Master Plan Sub-Committee Meeting  
Monday April 25, 2016  
7:00pm  
Plymouth City Hall-City Commission Conference Room  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting called to order at 7:05pm.**

Members Present: Jennifer Kehoe, Jennifer Frey, Scott Silvers, Conrad Schewe

Others Present: John Buzuvis, Community Development Director  
Paulette Longe, Resident

**Approval of Meeting Minutes:** None

**Discussion**

General Discussion was had related to the draft Scope of Work submitted by Sally Elmiger for the 2016 Master Plan Review. The following comments and discussion was had specifically:

- Is it necessary to review/revise the Background Studies chapters of the Master Plan or is that information better put somewhere else?
- Adding the following categories to consider when writing questions for the on-line survey portion of the Master Plan review:
  - Old Village
  - Complete Streets
  - Parking (including Downtown)
  - Aesthetics/design guidelines
- Prepare 4-6 sub-area plans, including plans for “transitional areas” as identified by the sub-committee/planning commission
  - Sub-area examples: Old Village, Downtown.
  - Transitional areas: Bathey, 909 Sheldon, etc.
- Importance of thoroughly reviewing and revising the current and future land use maps
- Importance of the Planning Consultant’s attendance at various City Commission, Mayor & Chair and Master Plan sub-committee meetings
- Plan for and focus on the intentional implementation of the revised/reviewed Master Plan so the document is used by various City departments and boards in future decision making and project planning efforts
- Reworking the Master Plan into an easy to read/use document
- Investigate Form Based Code techniques as part of Master Plan review
- Create a separate section of the Master Plan focused on Complete Streets(non-motorized transportation)
- Designing the revised plan to be as user friendly as possible and “searchable” as a web-based document
- Establishing a timeline for the process/project
- Intention to have the Master Plan consulted/used as part of future Capital Improvement program planning

- Importance of the Master Plan to guide all future land use/zoning/rezoning decisions
- Consider Neighborhood Character (size of homes, aesthetics etc.)
- Volume of residential development/redevelopment currently taking place in town

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

A motion was made by Comm. Schewe and seconded by Comm. Frey to adjourn.

Meeting Adjourned: 7:48pm

CITY OF PLYMOUTH  
Planning Commission – Master Plan Sub-Committee Meeting  
July 13, 2016  
5:30 PM  
Plymouth City Hall-City Commission Conference Room

**Notes**

**Meeting called to order at 5:40 PM.**

Members Present: Jennifer Kehoe, Conrad Schewe, Jim Mulhern

Others Present: John Buzuvis, Community Development Director  
Greta Bolhuis, Assistant Community Development Director  
Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant  
Wes Graf, Plymouth Chamber of Commerce  
Bill Lincoln, resident

**Approval of the Meeting Minutes:** None

**Discussion:**

The Sub Committee went through the Draft Master Plan Survey. The following comments were made in regards to the draft survey:

- Changing the order of the questions in the first section
- Consider new single family homes built throughout the city, not just a specific neighborhood
- What's the opinion of tear downs?
- Historic preservation and role it should play in the update
- What form should/does parking take?
- Reconsider the future land use map
- Broad reach of the survey
- What does multi-family housing look like?
  - What is its form?
  - What is its intended use?
- Use the term "higher density housing"
- Define SEMCOG
- Develop more questions for the North and South Main subareas
- Height overlay in downtown and subareas
- Should the downtown change? If yes, where and how?
- What are the characteristics of the downtown?
- Comments for each pedestrian amenity
- Have "other" option for subarea questions
- Include marking crosswalks in non-motorized transportation
- Where do you want to go? And suggested destination points for bike transit
- Include an answer for "I'm interested in purchasing a street tree"
- What are other transit options?
- Make demographic information required

**The meeting concluded at 6:55 PM.**

CITY OF PLYMOUTH  
Planning Commission – Master Plan Sub-Committee Meeting  
July 28, 2016  
7:00 AM  
Plymouth City Hall – Police Training Room

**Notes**

**Meeting called to order at 7:00 AM.**

Members Present: Jennifer Kehoe, Jennifer Frey, Conrad Schewe, Scott Silvers,  
Jim Mulhern

Others Present: John Buzuvis, Community Development Director  
Greta Bolhuis, Assistant Community Development Director

**Approval of the Meeting Minutes:** None

**Discussion:**

The Sub Committee went through the Second Draft Master Plan Survey. The following comments were made in regards to the draft survey:

- Grammatical corrections
- Include language to only take the survey once
- Include "Please check all that apply"
- Add language for historic district in Old Village
- Clarify directions to include comments for trees throughout town
- Add language for sidewalks and crosswalks
- Add locations people may bike to
- Include subareas in street tree section
- Clarifications in non-motorized transportation section

**The meeting concluded at 8:00 AM.**

## **Survey Results Summary**

City of Plymouth Master Plan Survey

**(NOTE: THIS SUMMARY WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE MASTER PLAN TO DOCUMENT RESIDENT'S OPINIONS ABOUT THE FUTURE DIRECTION OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE CITY.)**

### **Introduction**

City staff and the Master Plan Subcommittee created a survey to gather resident's opinions on how various areas of the City should develop in the future. The following summarizes the responses to the Master Plan survey, which was available on the City's website from (DATE) to (DATE). The survey questions and quantitative responses are provided in the Appendix. (Note that given the large number of individual comments provided, it is impractical to include them all in the Master Plan Appendix. However, this information can be obtained from the City's Building Department upon request. This narrative summarizes common opinions on topics presented.)

### **Who Responded to the Survey?**

The city received 1035 responses to the survey. Of those, 901 are city residents, which represents almost 10% of the community's population. (In 2010, Plymouth's population was 9,132 persons.) Eight-hundred-three respondents own/live in a single-family home, and 98 respondents own/live in a condo, apartment or other type of housing in the city. Respondents representing other types of property owners/lessees include employees of Plymouth businesses (63), owners/lessees of non-residential property (32), and owners of commercial, office or industrial property (31). Eighty-six respondents identified themselves as a community supporter and not currently living in the city.

### **Single-Family Residential Development**

The first set of questions addressed resident's opinions about new residential development occurring in the City, including both new single-family homes, and residential building additions. Most respondents thought that new single-family homes (74.1%) were too big for the lot. Only a slight majority of respondents (48.3%) thought that residential building additions were the right size for the lot, while 39.3% of respondents stated that residential building additions are also too big for the lot.

The impact on neighborhoods of new residential development also reflects the opinion that new homes are too large (66.8%) for the lot. Similarly, respondents stated that building additions are generally the right size (48.7%), but slightly fewer respondents think that they are also too large (35.2%). These opinions are clearly borne out in the comments provided. Of the 374 comments given, 72% stated that they think new homes are too large for the lot, and don't like the loss of smaller, older homes. Most think that the smaller, older homes are what give Plymouth its quaint character. A feeling about the new construction most expressed was that the rights of the person constructing a new home overshadowed that of the person in the neighboring, older home. Many respondents thought that the new house should fit into the neighborhood, and be considerate of the neighbors in both location and size. Respondents also expressed concern that young families won't be able to afford to move into Plymouth, and that the city should strive to maintain a balanced mix of housing types and sizes. Other negative impacts expressed connected to new house sizes include:

- Removal of large, mature trees
- Little to no greenspace left, inhibiting infiltration of stormwater, causing flooding or water issues to neighbors
- Tall height of new homes dwarfing existing homes, and limiting sun and air to neighbors; limiting privacy due to higher windows overlooking back yards
- Reducing the economic and social diversity of Plymouth; speculators are outpricing individual home buyers
- Lack of diversity in architectural styles and suburban designs (front-facing garages) take away from Plymouth's small town charm

Comments in support of new home construction (8.0%), stated that new homes enhance property values of all homeowners in the city, modernizing the city, assisting in maintaining a thriving downtown, and property owners should be able to build to the extent allowed.

Regarding what characteristics of a house make it desirable, most respondents cited consistent street setbacks (59.6%) and front porches (59.6%) as the most important, followed by variable home styles (57.3%), sizes (45.2%) and heights (41.4%). In the comment section, many stated that variety is what makes the character of Plymouth desirable; however, within limits. New homes should be more compatible or uniform in overall size with the existing residential buildings along the street.

The last question regarding single-family residential development asked if they would support additional or expanded historic districts in the city. Seventy-four percent (74%) stated that they would, and 13.6% stated that they would not. Those in favor cited the need to preserve existing, older housing stock and downtown buildings to maintain Plymouth's character. Several respondents identified specific areas of the city (Hough Park and residential areas of Old Village) in which to create historic districts. Those opposed to new or expanded historic districts stated that the costs associated with renovating a historic home could be prohibitive, not equal to increases in property values, and having to get permission to make exterior renovations is undesirable.

While some respondents stated that regulations were sufficient, others made suggestions to address concerns about new residential development. Some comments made most frequently include:

- Pass an ordinance to restrict/mitigate for tree removal on residential construction sites
- Create character districts to offer some neighborhoods the ability to gentrify, while others to preserve their traditional character
- Create more than one single-family residential zoning district based on lot width/lot size
- Increase side yard setbacks (since homes are being built to the setback lines)
- Prohibit three-story homes.
- Allow three-story homes in exchange for a smaller building footprint/lot coverage and more green space
- Incentivize or encourage traditional architectural styles and/or maintenance of existing older home.

### **Multi-Family Residential Development**

The next set of questions asked residents about the type and location of housing for people in different life stages that may or may not necessarily live in a single-family home, such as young adults, renters/roommates, young families, empty nesters and seniors. When asked what type of residential units should be provided to accommodate these life stages, 55.1% stated town or row homes, 54% stated single-family homes, and 52.9% stated units in commercial areas on the second floor or above. These responses reflect the idea that Plymouth's housing stock should be varied, and include starter single-family homes as well as other types of housing to create a balanced mix.

Regarding location for other types of residential units, 57.4% stated that varied types of housing should be located in or near Old Village, 51.3% stated in or near downtown, and 41.9% stated along main roads such as Mill Street, Main Street, Starkweather, or Ann Arbor Trail.

When asked to envision what Plymouth's mix of housing types will look like in 20 years, most respondents (46.1%) stated that it should remain constant. Today, the city's housing stock is 58% single-family residential, 38% apartments, townhomes, condos, and 4% duplexes. Slightly more than thirty percent (31.6%) stated that Plymouth should have more single-family homes, and 20.1% stated that it should have more townhomes/condos.

Comments regarding housing for various life stages illustrate concerns for young families being able to afford a starter home in Plymouth. Others mention the need for "missing middle" housing for young professionals. This is consistent with the majority of opinions regarding the negative effects of replacing smaller, older homes with larger, more expensive homes. Most respondents feel that the city's existing smaller, older housing stock can serve young families and seniors if maintained. Detached, "small house" condos, low-rise (1 or 2 stories) buildings, and townhomes that were architecturally compatible with the neighborhood and provide green space were mentioned most often as desirable types of multi-family housing. "Mother-in-law suites" or apartments above garages were also mentioned. High rises or multi-storied apartment buildings were generally thought to be incompatible with the city's character. Many respondents also stated that there are enough rental/condo units within the city, and no more are needed. One reason given for this is the opinion that rented homes/buildings are not as well maintained as owner-occupied structures, and owner-occupied buildings provide more stability for the neighborhood. Others express concerns over traffic and parking problems from higher densities.

### **Downtown Development**

Survey questions regarding the downtown focused on desirable building characteristics, pedestrian amenities, and parking.

#### *Downtown Building Characteristics*

Respondents valued preservation of historic buildings (77.4%) as the most important characteristic of Plymouth's downtown. This was followed by buildings having mixed uses (retail first floor, office second floor, residential third floor)(60.6%) and similar setbacks from the street (55.8%). Buildings that have one primary entrance per storefront (46.3%) and that are variable in style (44.3%) followed in importance.

Regarding comments made about the downtown, many stated that they wanted to maintain the historic structures that create the charm of Main Street. Opinions were shared that the city should be more proactive about protecting these buildings from future changes, while others felt that historic preservation should be done if economically feasible. The character of new development should be consistent with existing buildings, and take on the charm of the downtown. Concerns over “cookie-cutter” new development were expressed.

In addition, respondents also talked about uses. A number of people stated that there are too many bars and restaurants downtown, and not enough shops. Maintaining a balance of uses is most important for a thriving downtown in their opinion. Others stated that making Plymouth an entertainment hub is best for the city’s future. Further ideas about uses included allowing food trucks and pop-up shops to increase shopping and dining opportunities, and limiting “chain” businesses if possible to maintain a unique “Plymouth” experience.

#### *Pedestrian Amenities in Downtown*

The most important pedestrian amenities downtown include sidewalks (85.5%), street lights (77.3%), crosswalks (76.9%), crossing signals (66.7%), benches (63.9%), and street trees (61.5%). In the comments portion of the survey, pedestrian crossing signals were identified as a need at the following intersections (in order of number of times mentioned):

1. Penniman and Harvey
2. Church and Main St.
3. Wing and Main St.

A number of people thought that more bike racks were needed downtown, followed by more drinking fountains. Adding more street trees was a frequent comment, followed by the request that fewer trees in the parkway (between the sidewalk and curb) be removed. Many ideas about how the downtown is maintained were also shared, such as quicker sidewalk replacement, better trash pick-up, more frequent public bathroom maintenance, and more enforcement of outdoor dining areas (to reduce blocking sidewalks).

#### *Parking*

Participants were first asked where parking that serves the downtown be located. Most respondents chose behind the Library and City Hall (55.7%), then on the old Saxton’s property (52.4%), the Central Parking Deck (50%), and lastly on the streets at the edges of downtown (26.7%). Sixteen percent of respondents thought that the existing parking stock was sufficient.

Whether the city should add parking meters to parking spaces downtown, 62.1% were not in favor of this change. In contrast, twenty-four percent were in favor, and the remaining had no comment.

The survey included a “comments” section about parking in the downtown. This topic received the second most number of comments in the survey. Many respondents call for more parking, either on the existing parking structure, a new structure behind the library, or a new structure on the lot west of Forest. More are in favor of restoring/expanding the existing parking structure, or building a new

parking structure versus building a new surface lot. All seem to want any new parking to be screened from view of the main downtown streets.

Some think there is not a parking problem in the downtown, but that people are unwilling to walk to their destination. They feel that events do cause parking issues, but this is a temporary issue and does not justify devoting more land to parking. They also suggested that adding more/better signage directing visitors to the parking areas would help alleviate the perception of a parking shortage. Another suggestion was to modify the limits on the length of time someone could use a spot, and have no time limits past 6:00 p.m.

Concerns about street parking, and new parking near residential properties were also shared. Some felt that having parking meters would force many to park on residential streets, causing problems for property owners. Others stated that they didn't want a parking lot at the Saxton's property (all the way to Maple Street), as it would have a negative impact on this neighborhood. Some also felt that a new parking structure on the Saxton's parcel (that removed the Saxton's Building and the Jewell Blaich Hall) would damage the character of the downtown and Kellogg Park.

Adding parking meters received many comments. Most were not in favor of paying for parking, as they felt it would have a negative impact on local businesses. If such a change was made, residents should not have to pay.

### **Old Village Development**

Similar questions that were asked about development in downtown Plymouth were also asked about development in Old Village. Residents offered their comments and ideas about desirable building characteristics and pedestrian amenities.

#### *Old Village Building Characteristics*

Survey participants also valued preservation of historic buildings in Old Village (64.7%) as the most important characteristic of this part of the city. However, next in importance was having buildings of variable styles (43.3%), followed by buildings having mixed uses (retail first floor, office second floor, residential third floor)(42.8%). Buildings that are a variety of heights (42.2%), but setback similarly from the street (41.6%) were also important. Old Village has some similarities to downtown, but survey respondents seemed to appreciate the greater variability in building types and sizes in comparison to downtown's more uniform building patterns.

Comments made regarding the future of Old Village emphasized preservation, renovation and re-use of historic structures. In general, respondents think that Old Village has great potential. It has an independent character, unique businesses and creative events. Residents think that any changes should make it more of a destination than it already is, possibly by adding a central gathering place for events, and some type of connection with downtown (shuttle bus, bike lanes, etc.). One suggestion to improve Old Village is to consider a streetscape project that could give Old Village a face lift, such as new lamp posts, cobblestone pavers, street trees, or planters. Some feel that the new LED light fixtures recently installed are too glaring, and the white color doesn't mesh with the historic character of the area. Others suggested screening surface parking lots better.

Regarding residential properties, some think that rental properties could be better maintained. There were also concerns about new residences being taller than historic homes. Most felt that new residential buildings should carry on the historic character of the area.

#### *Pedestrian Amenities in Old Village*

Sidewalks (56.4%), street lights (41.5%), street trees (34.6%), and crosswalks (33.4%) were named the top most important pedestrian amenities in Old Village. Other amenities identified in the survey include benches, bike racks, and drinking fountains. Crosswalks/pedestrian signals should be added at the intersections of Farmer/Starkweather, Farmer/Mill, Liberty/Starkweather, and Liberty/Mill to help pedestrians walk to Old Village from residential areas of Plymouth.

#### **South Main Street Development**

The next section of the survey asked about desirable building and site characteristics if the South Main Street area (between Wing St. and Ann Arbor Road) were redeveloped. Respondents agreed that these properties should locate parking lots behind the buildings (62.9%), and driveways and parking areas should be shared between buildings (47.9%). Additionally, buildings should be setback from the street the same/similar distance (47.1%), and buildings should be mixed use (43.4%), including first floor retail, second floor office and third floor residential.

Respondents also provided comments regarding this part of town. Many thought that this area could use some work to eliminate the suburban “strip mall” pattern and add new developments that were more consistent with Plymouth’s downtown. Buildings should be set on the lot similar to the existing homes that are re-purposed for office, accommodate mixed uses, and be a maximum of two stories. Existing homes used for offices/businesses should be maintained.

Many suggestions for improving the streetscape were also offered. A coordinated streetscape project could improve the aesthetics of the corridor, improve pedestrian amenities, and add traffic calming measures. An effort to extend downtown/pedestrian scale street lighting into this area should be considered. Reducing the traffic lanes from four to three or two, and possibly implementing pedestrian refuge islands, or a boulevard (or boulevard segments) would improve pedestrian crossings and slow traffic speeds. Adding green space and street trees could be another component of the project. Even if a whole streetscape project is not accomplished, respondents stated that crossing South Main Street is very difficult on foot or on a bike, and cross walks should be added along the corridor.

It was also suggested that the entry into Plymouth at Ann Arbor Road could be redeveloped so that it blends in better with the downtown. This is Plymouth’s “front door,” and it should reflect the community’s character.

#### **North Main Street Development**

The survey asked the same question about North Main Street as it did about South Main Street. The area being considered in this question is between Church Street and N. Mill Street. From the list of desirable building and site design characteristics, respondents listed parking at the rear of buildings as being the most important (same as South Main Street). However, participants thought the next most important characteristic is that buildings are set back from the street at a similar distance (40.7%), and then driveways and parking areas are shared between buildings (39.3%). This is reversed for South Main Street. The last most important characteristic is that buildings should be setback from the sidewalk (37.3%), rather than be right on the sidewalk like downtown. While the top three desirable

characteristics are the same as South Main Street, the last one (more distance between the building and sidewalk) will create a slightly different feeling as there will be potentially more green space in front of each building.

Many respondents stated that the existing strip malls seem to have trouble maintaining businesses, and that both could be redeveloped in a way that is more appealing and consistent with the downtown. Similar comments made for South Main Street regarding the streetscape were also made about North Main Street. However, several encouraged making PARC a centerpiece of North Main Street, maintaining the existing open space and redeveloping it as a downtown park and gathering area.

### **Bicycle Amenities**

Questions about new bicycle facilities were included in the survey, asking about types of bike lanes, designated routes and preferred destinations. Of those providing opinions, 44% wanted to see pavement markings for dedicated bicycle lanes, 36% wanted roadway signage indicating bicycle routes, and 31% wanted pavement markings indicating shared vehicle/bicycle use of road lanes. Favored bike routes included Ann Arbor Trail (30.8%), North Harvey (28.6%), and South Harvey (27.7%). Twenty-seven percent of respondents didn't think bicycle routes should be added to any of Plymouth's streets. Lastly, destinations where people want to visit by bicycle include downtown (67.6%) city parks (60.1%), Hines Drive (57.5%) and Old Village (50.3%).

Later on in the survey, it specifically asks if more bicycle amenities are needed in the downtown, Old Village, North Main St., South Main St. or residential neighborhoods. Survey participants stated that more are needed in downtown (71%), Old Village (50.8%) and residential neighborhoods (62.9%), but are not needed along North Main St. (43.4%) or South Main St. (41.2%).

A number of comments suggested that the main city streets are too congested to add bicycle lanes, and that some on-street parking may need to be eliminated to accommodate bike lanes. Many commented that bike riding in the downtown was not possible given the number of cars and pedestrians. However, alternatives, such as adding bicycle lanes or shared road symbols to less traveled streets may work, prevent accidents, and bike racks could be provided at the edges of downtown so cyclists can lock their bikes and walk to their destination. Some are not opposed to bikes on city streets as long as cyclists obey traffic laws.

Those advocating for bike lanes argue that keeping bikes in the designated lanes and off the sidewalks is safer for everyone. They also conclude that encouraging biking will lessen the vehicle traffic and parking demand downtown. In contrast, a number of respondents stated that adding any bike amenities may not be necessary given the number of bicyclists currently riding around the city without them.

Many comments stated that more bike racks are needed downtown, and in city parks. Two connections that are specifically mentioned are with Hines Drive and the I-275 bicycle path. These routes should be studied and appropriate amenities added to create this connection.

### **Sidewalk/Crosswalk Improvements**

When asked which intersections needed either a crosswalk, crosswalk signal or improvements to crosswalk signals, respondents listed the following (number indicates times mentioned):

1. Harvey & Penniman (23)
2. Church & Main St. (13)
3. Wing & Main St. (11)
4. Wing & Forest (8)
5. Fleet St. & Harvey (Entrance/exit lane at parking structure) (5)
6. Hartsough & Main St. (4)
7. Liberty & Starkweather (3)
8. Mill & Main St. (3)
9. Northville Road & Starkweather (2)
10. Evergreen & Ann Arbor Trail (2)
11. Church & Penniman (2)

Another suggestion to improve crosswalk safety included adding “Yield to Pedestrian” signs at crosswalks.

Regarding the condition of sidewalks, many stated that they thought that most were generally kept in good repair. One noticeable exception are the sidewalks on the west side of S. Main St. where tree roots have heaved the sidewalk. Old Village sidewalks were also mentioned by several respondents as needing attention. A few people also identified the sidewalk on the west side of Harvey Street as being too narrow and close to the road. More separation between the sidewalk and street would be beneficial. Lastly, several participants stated that downtown sidewalks in the summer are severely limited because of encroachment by outside dining.

### **Street Trees**

The survey ends with a question about street trees, and an opportunity to leave a comment on this topic. Forty-eight percent of respondents are aware that the city has a Street Tree Program. Forty percent were not aware of the program, and 12% are interested in knowing more about it. Eight percent have purchased a tree through the Street Tree Program.

A number of respondents praised the city’s Street Tree Program, and feel it is working well. Several participants suggested that the Program be advertised more, so more people will use it. They also suggested that incentives for planting trees be offered to property owners who may be interested in putting a tree on their own properties. Regarding the types of trees available in the program, several suggested that native trees be used, which are better adapted to the region.

However, many voiced concerns about trees being removed for new residential construction. These respondents think that mature trees are a defining characteristic of our neighborhoods. Many recommend that residential property owners that remove trees for new construction should be required to replace them. The city should also provide incentives and/or requirements to protect trees with large diameters during construction.

Regarding street trees and trees on public property, several respondents stated that the city should preserve, plant and re-plant more street trees because of the benefits trees offer residents, such as protecting property values and ensuring environmental advantages of trees.

Some comments described issues caused by street trees, such as heaving sidewalks and needed clean up. Greater enforcement of tree and shrub trimming along sidewalks was identified as a need so they

are not blocked. Others suggested that trees not be planted under power lines, as it's not good for the tree or the power line.

Regarding trees near the downtown, a few comments recommended that more trees in sufficiently-sized parking lot islands could improve the appearance of parking lots near the downtown significantly.