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Western Reserve Land Conservancy is a nonprofit conservation organization dedicated to preserving the natural resources of northern Ohio. We work with landowners, communities, government agencies, park systems and other nonprofit organizations to permanently protect natural areas and farmland. In March 2011, Western Reserve Land Conservancy launched Thriving Communities Institute, a region-wide effort to help revitalize our urban centers, and named nationally known expert Jim Rokakis as its director.

Today, Thriving Communities is working with communities and organizations throughout the region to transform vacant and unproductive properties into new opportunities to attract economic growth, add green space to our cities and support safe, beautiful neighborhoods. Our cities have thrived in the past, and we believe they will thrive again in the future.

TCI was established to create an urban presence in the cities of Northeast Ohio. The primary objective was to establish County Land Reutilization Corporations, commonly referred to as county land banks, in these counties to give communities additional blight fighting tools. The mission of TCI expanded to include the raising of additional funds to remove blighted properties from these communities. To date TCI has raised 182 million dollars for blight removal statewide. Most recently, TCI played a critical role in convincing Cuyahoga County government to issue 50 million dollars in demolition bonds. The County has stressed the need to be strategic in the expenditure of these dollars. The detailed survey work provided by the property analysis contained herein will allow for a strategic expenditure of these funds and ensure that the City of East Cleveland will receive its fair share of these demolition dollars—and other funds—as the community attempts to move forward out of this crisis.
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Executive Summary

This report describes the findings of a property survey in the City of East Cleveland, Ohio. The survey was implemented by the Western Reserve Land Conservancy’s Thriving Communities Institute, in partnership with the Northeast Ohio Alliance for Hope (NOAH). The parcel-by-parcel survey was undertaken to create a general inventory of the city’s housing stock and, in particular, the vacant, abandoned properties that can cause economic, social, and safety issues within a community.

In accordance with the East Cleveland’s mission to “pursue innovative governance that is accessible, accountable, efficient and stable,” this survey is a pioneering step towards data-driven demolition planning and will assist the City of East Cleveland in their four-pronged land and housing strategy to more effectively target blight moving forward. This strategy includes eliminating the threat of blight, maximizing return on investment, moving beyond blight-light (the reduced, but still present danger of vacant, abandoned lots), and infill development.

In addition to this document, the Western Reserve Land Conservancy provided a spreadsheet data-set and web-based mapping application, as well as visual aids in the form of tables and maps that will provide a comprehensive view of the City’s housing stock.

Image 1: Photo of Survey Team

1 See: http://www.eastcleveland.org/about/about-us-a-community-rising/.
Background

Once known as the “Beverly Hills of the North Coast”, the City of East Cleveland has spiraled into decline in recent years. The city faced periods of fiscal emergency caused by a declining property tax base, fiscal mismanagement and political corruption. East Cleveland withstood more distress than any City of Cleveland neighborhood. This turmoil has contributed to a loss of confidence in the city and an out-migration of its population. However, the current Mayor of East Cleveland, Gary Norton Jr., perhaps the most involved and capable mayor that the city has seen in decades, in partnerships with the Cuyahoga County Land Bank and University Circle Incorporated, is moving the city in a positive direction.

A small city of only 3.1 square miles, East Cleveland hit its residential peak of approximately 40,000 residents in 1950. During this time, suburbs thrived as automobile dependence encouraged more and more Americans to live outside of the city. The city’s population was relatively stable until 1990, but as a result of the previously mentioned issues, and the foreclosure crisis which ravaged East Cleveland just as it did City of Cleveland neighborhoods, the number of East Cleveland residents declined from 33,096 in 1990 to 17,867 in 2010—a 46% decrease.

This population loss has been accompanied by an oversupply of housing stock. The number of housing units increased in East Cleveland until 1980, before decreasing from 15,168 in 1990 to 12,542 in 2010. However, Figure 1 shows that the population loss far outpaced the decrease in housing supply. The result has been an increase of vacant housing units in the city, which in turn has translated to an increase in vacant structures. There were 4,237 vacant housing units in East Cleveland by 2010, up from 2,268 in 2000. East Cleveland’s vacancy rate in 2010 stood at 34%, far worse than the 17% vacancy rate from ten years prior.

The number of vacant structures presents challenges for East Cleveland. Vacant structures act as sites for crime, create health hazards and distress, and generally degrade quality of life. Additionally, these issues negatively affect property values. As indicated in Figure 2, blight and abandonment from the foreclosure crisis began to impact home sale prices throughout Cuyahoga County after 2006. Median home sales in 2000 were $62,475 and dropped to an all-time low of $2,500 in 2008. Some areas are beginning to show signs of slow recovery, but in 2013, the median home sale price in East Cleveland had only risen to $8,064. Such challenges act as “push” factors for area residents, referred to as the “flight from blight.” This out-migration of residents leads to further population loss and yet more vacant structures. Before long, widespread vacancy reduces city revenues.

---

2 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
9 Frank Ford, Thriving Communities Institute, reporting on data collected by NEO CANDO at Case Western Reserve University, October 2014.
The more vacant structures a city has to deal with, the less it has in the coffers to fund other city services—be it in public safety, parks and recreation, or infrastructure maintenance. For example, the City of East Cleveland has had to rely on other government entities to carry out its duties: the Cuyahoga County Sherriff’s department has been providing police support for the past several years, and the Cleveland Metroparks has been quietly helping to maintain some East Cleveland parks.

Since 2010, East Cleveland, in partnership with the Cuyahoga County Land Reutilization Corporation (CCLRC, and commonly referred to as the Cuyahoga Land Bank), has utilized sources of federal funds to reduce the effects of blight on the community. One tool in this effort has been demolition. To date, CCLRC has demolished 282 of the city’s worst vacant properties, the majority of which have been residential apartment buildings and multifamily houses. Often, properties targeted for demolition are brought to the city’s attention by concerned residents. Once the vacant structure is removed, the response is relief. “I’m glad they tore [the houses] down,” said one East Cleveland resident to the Neighborhood Voice. “They were roach and rat infested.”

There is strong evidence that demolitions have helped decrease the vacancy rate in East Cleveland. Perhaps not coincidentally, the city’s population has started to stabilize. Census estimates have shown less than a hundred residents were lost from 2012 to 2013. The hope is that this population stabilization continues as the city carries out its housing and land strategy. The following analysis will serve as a guiding document toward the gradual rebirth of East Cleveland.

---

12 A recently publicized tragedy in East Cleveland involved three female victims who were murdered in vacant and abandoned properties.
13 Arms Length Sales exclude Sheriff Sales, Sales to Banks and Federal Agencies, and $0 Dollar Transactions.
14 See: http://www.mortgageorb.com/e107_plugins/content/content.php?content.15118.
How the Property Inventory Was Completed

During early 2014, Western Reserve Land Conservancy’s Thriving Communities Institute, along with North-east Ohio Alliance for Hope (NOAH) under the supervision of Trevelle Harp, completed a comprehensive citywide property inventory. In partnership with East Cleveland officials, a team of six trained surveyors (which included East Cleveland residents) inventoried over 7,000 parcels across the city’s three wards. The surveyors photographed each parcel using a mobile device, and assessed whether a structure was present. If a structure was present, the surveyor determined whether it was vacant or occupied. Determining occupancy versus vacancy required a visual inspection governed by a number of uniformed guidelines. Additionally, the surveyors assessed and graded the condition of all vacant or occupied residential structures. The grading ranged from “A”, or “Excellent”, to “F”, or “Unsafe/Hazard”. All of the surveying took place from the sidewalk.

Additional criteria collected included: For Sale/Rent signs, Broken Windows, Boarded Windows/Doors, Damaged Roof, Chimney Damage, Missing/Deteriorated Siding, Peeling/Deteriorated Paint, Damaged Masonry/Foundation, Damaged Porch, Damaged/Deteriorated Stairs, Gutter/Downspout Damage, Garage Damage, Graffiti, Junk Cars, High Grass/Weeds, Trash/Debris on Property. This information will help inform City staff of some of the characteristics that contributed to the decision on grading.

The following photos are examples of East Cleveland properties that were graded as part of the current report.

Image 2: East Cleveland Occupied House, Graded A:
Image 3: East Cleveland Occupied House, Graded B

Image 4: East Cleveland Occupied House, Graded C

Image 5: East Cleveland Vacant House, Graded D

Image 6: East Cleveland Occupied House, Graded F
The “What”, “Where” and “Who” of East Cleveland’s Vacant and Occupied Properties

City-wide, 7,077 parcels were investigated and assessed, and 5,813 (82%) of these parcels contained a structure. There were 4,437 occupied structures counted, making up 63% of all parcels assessed, and 76% of all structures. There were 1,376 vacant structures counted, making up 19% of all assessed parcels, and 24% of all structures. Among the vacant structures, 954 (69%) of them were secured, while 422 (31)% of them were open, and thus susceptible to entry. Moreover, 1,013 (14%) of all assessed parcels in East Cleveland contain vacant lots, which is evidence of demolition activity to date.

Map 1 in Appendix A details where every occupied and vacant structure is in the city of East Cleveland, as well as every vacant lot. The map depicts data collected during the inventory, which is also summarized in Figure 2.

Table 1 further breaks down these numbers. Of the 5,813 structures in East Cleveland, 76.3% were occupied. Over half of East Cleveland’s occupied structures were in “excellent” or “good” quality. Specifically, there were 1,067 structures graded “A” and 1,391 structures graded “B”. Less than 10% of East Cleveland’s occupied stock was in poorer condition (i.e., rated “D” or “F”). In other words, the city has a sound housing stock to work with in creating future strategies.

Table 1. Vacancy and Occupancy Survey for City of East Cleveland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Counts</th>
<th>Key Data</th>
<th>Percent of Stock “A” or “B”</th>
<th>Occupancy Rate</th>
<th>Demolish-able</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Structure - A</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Structure - B</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Structure - C</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Structure - D</td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Structure - F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied</td>
<td>4437</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Structure - A</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Structure - B</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Structure - C</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Structure - D</td>
<td>526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Structure - F</td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be noted that the determination of what was “open” was limited by what could be observed from the sidewalk. Additional structures could have open rear entry doors and ground floor windows.
In terms of vacancy, our survey found that East Cleveland has 1,376 vacant structures. This represents 19% of the 7,368 parcels in the municipality of East Cleveland. By comparison, in 2010, US Postal Data collected by Case Western Reserve University found 1,590 vacant structures, which represented 22% of the 7,368 parcels in East Cleveland. This reduction in vacancy suggests that targeted demolition to date is beginning to have a positive impact on blight. However, issues remain as indicated by the low home sale prices cited above. Specifically, unlike the occupied structures, the quality of East Cleveland’s vacant structures is poor, with 1,030, or 75%, of its vacant structures graded as a “D” or “F”. These structures are prime targets in the city’s strategic demolition going forward.

Where are these blighted structures located? Also, where is the highest-rated housing stock? Answering these questions will further inform East Cleveland’s housing and development strategic framework.

An analysis of conditions was done for each of the eighteen East Cleveland precincts. Before detailing this, it is important to see whether there is a relationship between the concentration of vacant properties in a precinct and the concentration of high-quality, occupied structures. The thinking being that the presence of blight can be “contagious” to the structures around it. A correlation was run between the percent of vacant structures in a precinct with the percent of high-quality structures. The results show a strong negative correlation of -.779, which suggests that a high quantity of vacant structures reduces the number of high-quality structures in an area. This can suggest that demolishing the worst vacant structures in each precinct may benefit the conditions of surrounding properties.

Figure 3 shows where each precinct stands in its frequency of vacant and high-quality structures. The precincts with the highest percentages of vacancies are Precincts 3D (29.5% vacancy rate), 3E (25.8% vacancy rate), and 4A (27% vacancy rate). Each of these precincts has a vacancy rate above the city-wide average of 23.7% and together account for almost 30% of East Cleveland’s vacant properties. Conversely, the concentration of high-quality, occupied structures is more diffuse. In precincts 3C, 4D, 4E, 4C, and 2D, and 2A, a majority of the structures are rated “Excellent” or “Very Good”. The implications of these findings will be discussed in the final section below.

---

18 NEO CANDO 2010+ system, Northeast Ohio Data Collaborative (http://neocando.case.edu/neocando/).
Who owns these vacant properties? In addition to our physical survey, we also scanned public records to determine ownership of the properties surveyed. We identified five categories of ownership: 1) banks and other financial institutions, which included government-sponsored enterprises, known as “GSE’s” such as HUD and Fannie Mae, 2) the City of East Cleveland or other state and local government agencies, and non profit organizations, 3) corporations and other business entities, 4) individual investors who do not live in the property, and 5) homeowners who live in the property or still own it after vacancy.19

Overall, looking at all 7,077 properties surveyed, the largest number of properties (3,046 or 43%) are owned by individual absentee investors. Homeowners, at 31%, are the second largest category followed by government and non-profits (14%), and corporations and business entities (11%). Banks and other financial institutions own only 1% of the properties surveyed.

The percentages for the 1,376 vacant structures, and the 1,030 vacant structures rated D and F (most blighted and distressed), are relatively constant, although homeowners who have vacated their homes make up the highest percent of vacant structures (40%), up from 31% of all surveyed properties.

The small number of bank-owned structures may appear surprising at first, but not when a number of factors are considered. First, foreclosure filings across the county have come down since their peak in 2007, although as of 2013 they were still double the rate of filings before the foreclosure crisis. Second, foreclosing financial institutions have become more adept at quickly moving properties out of their inventories, often to private investors who fail to maintain the properties. Third, in recent years, it has become more common for foreclosing banks to “walk-away” from the foreclosure case after getting judgment in court, but before taking title at Sheriff Sale.

In this last circumstance, the original homeowner who was foreclosed on continues to be the owner of record, even though they have vacated the home.20 Thus, bank ownership indicated here may not be a true indicator of vacancy caused by bank foreclosure since those properties could now be owned by corporate or private investors, or still be owned by the homeowner no longer living at the property.

---

19 Owner-occupants were identified using the 2.5% property tax reduction in public records. It must be assumed however, that some number of owners fail to apply for the 2.5% reduction, and in some cases the reduction may carry over to a new non-occupant owner, thus this count is an approximation.

20 The Role of Investors in the One-to-Three Family REO Market: The Case of Cleveland, Ford et al., 2013.
What Next? Charting a Land and Housing Plan Going Forward in East Cleveland

East Cleveland officials currently have a four-pronged land and housing strategy in place. The current analysis provides a detailed road map in helping city leaders implement their vision going forward, which includes the City’s existing strategy and a recommended fifth strategy.

Strategy 1—Eliminating Threat: A primary duty of any city is to ensure safety and security of its residents, and more generally to ensure residents’ quality of life. When it comes to blight, East Cleveland officials must be able to identify vacant properties that pose an immediate threat to the safety and security of its residents. As stated, open, blighted vacant structures, such as the one shown in Image 7 on Shaw Avenue, present serious concerns to surrounding residents. With the property database and maps created as part of the inventory, East Cleveland officials have the tools needed to make the city safer, thereby increasing its residents’ mental and physical well-being. In this way, East Cleveland can stem “flight from blight” by tackling the blight head-on.

Strategy 2—Maximizing the Return on Investment: A recent study commissioned by Thriving Communities Institute showed that for every public dollar ($1) spent on demolition of vacant properties in Cuyahoga County, there was a return of $1.40 in home equity of nearby properties. This return was greatest when selective demolitions were done in areas where home values were highest. That said, a key component of East Cleveland’s housing and land strategy will be to undertake a street-level, selective demolition process in areas of moderate- to high-housing value. This maintenance approach will allow for a continued high-occupancy rate at the street level, as well as an increase in home equity for residents near the removal of a vacant, blighted structure.

Strategy 3—Beyond “Blight Light”: When a house is demolished, the resulting vacant lot can be derisively called blight light. While area residents often prefer a vacant lot to the presence of an unsafe vacant structure, the lot can act as an eyesore, particularly when grass remains uncut or the lot is used as dumping ground. The current analysis allows East Cleveland officials to keep track of their vacant lot inventory to ensure they are well kept and debris-free.

Beyond maintenance, a major goal of East Cleveland’s is to reuse many of the city’s vacant lots as places for green space, particularly as sites for tree planting. The plan would be to replicate the ongoing efforts in the City of Cleveland to re-forest the neighborhoods that have lost their tree canopy due to development. In a recent study completed by the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission, East Cleveland ranked 31st out of 59 cities in its existing tree canopy. The study showed that 20% of East Cleveland’s land area is not covered in concrete, making it suitable for tree planting. This potential for green space will increase as more vacant, blighted houses continue to be removed. Moving beyond vacant lots that have not been repurposed is an important aspect in East Cleveland’s livability initiatives, as parks and green space add to the city’s urban amenities to make the city more attractive to new and existing residents. Research has also shown that adding green space to a street adds to nearby home values.

Strategy 4—Infill Development: The City of East Cleveland sits at the edge of Cleveland’s Health Tech Corridor, which runs from Downtown Cleveland to University Circle along Euclid Avenue. The area has experienced $3 billion in investment, which means the Health Tech Corridor is quickly becoming the region’s “second downtown”. The Corridor, according to the City of Cleveland’s website, is “home to 75+ biomedical companies, 45 technology companies, 7 business incubators, 4 world-class healthcare and research systems including the Cleveland Clinic and University Hospitals, and 3 higher education institutions”. Job growth along this corridor increased by 22% according to a recent Cleveland State University report.

This growth has brought an increase in demand for new housing. In 2012, the Circle East Townhomes were completed in the City of East Cleveland to help meet this demand. In all, 20 units were built. As the region’s “second downtown” gets larger, infill development will continue into East Cleveland’s borders. This demand will play a huge role in the city’s land and housing strategy, particularly in the Precincts of 2B and 2D that border University Circle. To further attract development, city officials will use the survey to continue to put together a land acquisition strategy so that new housing can be developed, boosting not only population and city revenue, but city pride.

"Thousands of people work in University Circle," said nationally renowned urban planning expert Norm Krumholz, who is also an East Cleveland planning consultant. "This is something that instills hope. It’s a great day."

26 Ibid.
27 See: http://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2145&context=urban_facpub.
Recommendation: Strategy 5—Enhanced and Targeted Code Enforcement: We recommend the City of East Cleveland consider utilizing its code enforcement “police power” to adopt strategies that are tailored to match the type of ownership categories we found in our analysis. Following are four examples for consideration. Each of these strategies is designed to help a municipality recover the cost of demolition and nuisance abatement.

**Joint and Several Liability Ordinance.** The City of Cleveland has enacted an ordinance which allows it to retroactively hold a prior owner accountable for demolition costs, provided the property was inspected and condemned during the prior ownership. This would be useful in cases where a foreclosing bank has taken ownership of a blighted structure but then sold it to an investor before the property is demolished. If the City of East Cleveland inspected and condemned the property during the bank’s ownership, the City would be able to go back to the bank and demand reimbursement. This would enable the City to stretch available demolition funding further.

**Foreclosure Bond Ordinance.** As noted earlier, in some cases banks are filing foreclosure, causing the home to be vacated, then choosing not to take title at Sheriff Sale, thereby avoiding financial responsibility for blighted conditions. The City of Youngstown has enacted an innovative ordinance that requires foreclosing banks to post a $10,000 bond with the City. Whether or not the bank takes title at Sheriff Sale, the bond can be used by the City to offset the cost of demolition, boarding, clean-up or other nuisance abatement actions taken by the City.

**Bulk-Holder Enforcement Program.** While conducting our analysis of ownership types we observed that there are many cases where a business, bank or private individual investor owned multiple properties in the City of East Cleveland. The City of Cleveland has adopted a bulk-holder enforcement program to address this. Rather than initiate code enforcement actions on one property at a time, enforcement can be pursued against multiple properties owned by one owner. This is not only more efficient, but gives the municipality greater leverage for enforcement.

**Code Enforcement Partnership Program.** The City of East Cleveland is not alone in confronting the problem of addressing many blighted structures with too few resources. The City of Cleveland has created a “Code Enforcement Partnership Program” which leverages the “on-the-ground” resource of the city’s community development corporations. These community-based organizations serve as extra “eyes and ears” helping to efficiently guide limited code enforcement resources where they can have the most impact. Similarly, the City of East Cleveland could consider partnering with organizations such as NOAH (The Northeast Ohio Alliance For Hope) to achieve cost effective application of its resources.

Thriving Communities Institute is prepared to offer additional research and technical assistance to explore these options.
Conclusion

East Cleveland’s viability as a “standalone” city has been the subject of considerable discussion and speculation. At issue is whether annexation by the City of Cleveland would be in the best interest of East Cleveland and its beleaguered residents.

These discussions have already proven to be complicated and contentious—both in East Cleveland, where proud residents bristle at the suggestion that their city cannot govern itself, and in Cleveland, where municipal leaders question the wisdom of annexing a city with such a high level of distress. Regardless of where these discussions lead, it is essential that blight removal must continue in East Cleveland. This is critical to the people who live in its neighborhoods and suffer with those conditions on a daily basis—and to all the residents of Cuyahoga County, who are being forced to pick up a larger share of the countywide tax burden as a result of the collapse of East Cleveland’s property tax base.29

To date, the critical blight removal in East Cleveland has been funded from a variety of sources, including NSP grants, the Moving Ohio Forward program through the Ohio Attorney General’s Office, corporate dollars of the Cuyahoga County Land Reutilization Corporation and, most recently, from monies provided by the Treasury Department through Hardest Hit Funds. As of this writing, Cuyahoga County is preparing to issue $50 million in demolition bonds to remove blighted properties in residential neighborhoods of Cuyahoga County. The bulk of these dollars will be spent in two communities: Cleveland and East Cleveland. The impact of this bond on East Cleveland cannot be overstated: It can remove a significant percentage of the remaining blighted structures in East Cleveland. It will stabilize the city and create opportunities for the repurposing of land that were unimaginable 10 years ago. East Cleveland will not “turn the corner” overnight. But the removal of the majority of blighted properties will make it much easier—and provide critical relief for the people who still call East Cleveland home. This report will help leaders at the city and county level to prioritize dollars for demolition—and the rebirth of the city that will follow.
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East Cleveland Property Inventory Results: Precinct 3F
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East Cleveland Property Inventory Results: Precinct 4F
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