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SECTION I:
PURPOSE

In early 2005, the Town of Milton undertook development of three planning initiatives undertaken simultaneously which include:

- Development of a Strategic Economic Development Plan consistent with the existing planning frameworks including the 2005 Comprehensive Regional Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) and the 2003 Town of Milton Comprehensive Plan. Town of Milton impact fees funded this project.
- Development of a Route 7 Corridor Land Use Study to evaluate the existing conditions and land use modifications which might be necessary to control the impacts of planned wastewater infrastructure extension along the corridor and identification of land management and related recommendations to guide growth and protect community character. A State of Vermont Department of Housing and Community Affairs Municipal Planning Grant and Town of Milton impact fees funded this project.
- Development of a Town Core Accessibility Design Study examining the next stage of planned improvements to the Town Core to position it as the Town’s retail and commercial center. A Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation for Livable Communities Grant and Town of Milton impact fees funded this project.

A team of consultants led by River Street Planning & Development and including Transportation Concepts, LLC, TRIAD Associates, Elabd Architectural Illustration, and Kathleen Ryan Landscape Architecture was selected to assist with the effort. In addition, the town’s transportation consultant, Resource Systems Group (RSG Inc.), simultaneously undertook a transportation analysis for the Town Core and assisted the consultant team by preparing transportation projections for the Route 7 corridor.
In 2003, the Town of Milton developed its Town of Milton Comprehensive Plan and other studies focused on Town-wide needs related to housing, economic development, main street development, recreation, open space and related elements.

In 1998, the Town of Milton proposed expansion of its municipal sewer system. Expansion along the Route 7 corridor to provide municipal service to the Catamount Industrial Park and other users was evaluated. The Conservation Land Foundation contested the Town’s permit request. A Settlement Agreement was issued in March of 2003. That agreement required that the Town initiate a comprehensive planning process for the Route 7 corridor. This plan satisfies that requirement.

The goal of this plan and the related studies is to present opportunities for broad-based initiatives that will, taken together, further the development initiatives for the Town. Each study exists as a stand-alone document. The Common Elements Action Plan summarizes the shared initiatives identified in these studies.

The planning process was two-fold: it included review of previous studies and research presented in this report as well as an integrated public process including focus group, visioning workshop and charrette that focused on building consensus about the Town’s strategic direction. Input was solicited from government officials, other local and regional planning agencies, local developers and Town residents. Public meetings identified the concerns, ideas and visions for Milton’s future of a wide array of residents. The Route 7 Transportation and Land Use Plan summarize this vision and identifies the specific projects and regulatory framework that will assist the Town to achieve the desired future.

Goals of the Route 7 Land Use and Transportation Study:

- Understand the current land use conditions along the Route 7 Corridor
- Estimate potential development build out under the current zoning framework and in response to market support estimated emerging from the Economic Strategy
- Evaluate transportation impacts of potential future development
- Frame land use and transportation recommendations to best manage growth and shape development for maximum tax base enhancement, largely by expanding the industrial and manufacturing base.
- Focus land use in the most progressive manner to maintain character and encourage tax and job base diversity and discourage reliance on a single industry or sector.
- Position the Town Core for economic success as a mixed-use dense retail destination and residential core.
As part of the historical review, the consultants were provided with a variety of previous documents and data that presented the current transportation system and recommendations made by previous consultants and transportation experts for the integration of the transportation systems in the Zone. This report is largely consistent with those analyses and they are included by reference.
Target Area

Currently the Town of Milton has developed around the Route 7 corridor. Rte 7 is a State Highway that extends through much of the State of Vermont. In this study is the focus is on Rte 7 totally within the Town of Milton. The southern end of the Town has an Industrial Development area known as the Catamount Industrial Park. As Rte 7 moves north, its land use is mixed. At West Milton Road, Rte 7 turns to the east and moves towards the center of the Town. At the Middle Road/Railroad Street intersection, Rte 7 then turns again to the north and continues to the Town limit.

Note on use of the phrases the “Town Core” and Downtown

Throughout the plan, the terms downtown and Town Core are used somewhat interchangeably, as the majority of the strategies and action items identified in this document are relevant for the entire “Town Core” area. While the Downtown Business District (DB1) Zoning District is where the Town’s densest development will occur, the Town’s growth will also occur in the adjacent zones, which together may form the Town Core. The boundaries of the Town Core have not yet been specifically fixed to provide the Town with flexibility in the pursuit of certain State of Vermont downtown incentive programs.

Plans and Studies

At the beginning the study, a review of pertinent reports completed previously were reviewed. They included the following:

- 2025 Chittenden County Metropolitan Transportation Plan, CCMPO, December, 2004
- Capital Improvement Plan for the Town of Milton, VT, Capital Improvement Plan Committee, February, 2005
- Alternative Transportation Master Plan, Wilbur Smith and Associates, May 2002
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- Town Core Master Plan, Town of Milton, SE Group, December, 2000
- Town of Milton Zoning Regulations, Town of Milton, June, 2004
- US Route 7 Corridor Study, Oman Analytics, September, 2001
- Town of Milton Growth Management Study, SE Group, March, 2002

In addition to these documents, the consultants reviewed the CCMPO and the VTrans websites to review historic traffic volume and condition data. This data included Average Daily Traffic Volumes (ADT) and peak hour turning volumes at critical intersections.

The 2003 Town of Milton Comprehensive Plan: Setting Goals and Priorities

The 2003 Comprehensive plan updates a previous study completed in 1998 when the Town’s vision sought to:

“Enhance the quality of life in Milton by developing a greater sense of community and promoting greater citizen participation in the affairs of the town. New growth must recognize, integrate and enhance traditional settlement patterns. Milton's sense of community must include protecting the quality of the environment, promoting the vitality of the local economy, and improving education.”

Specific goals were established including the following that are most relevant to the current economic development planning effort:

Community Involvement - Enhance a sense of community and project a positive image by encouraging active individual and organizational participation in all levels of local government, and coordinating efforts among town, village, and school representatives.

Land Use and Development Patterns - Direct the most intensive development to the downtown area where services, utilities, transportation, and other supporting facilities are most readily available. Enable
a more diverse mix of uses emphasizing less intensive development in the transitional areas. Transitional areas are defined as the land between the downtown and rural areas. Agriculture, forestry, mineral extraction, clustered residential development, and outdoor recreation are encouraged in the rural areas.

**Economic Growth** - Develop a diverse economic base emphasizing high quality job creation. The economic base will focus on providing high value and rewarding job opportunities commensurate with available and planned infrastructure and services while minimizing impacts on the environment.

**Housing** - Provide for a variety of quality housing to meet the needs of the community for all income levels, including affordable housing options for elderly and disabled residents in the downtown area.

**Transportation** - Provide connected transportation facilities for the movement of goods and people and linking developments throughout the community. Additionally, alternative transportation, such as public transit, sidewalks and bike paths should be made available.

All of these goals have been advanced in this economic strategy and were confirmed as being of primary importance by the community in public sessions.

**Town of Milton Town Core Traffic Circulation Study (Ongoing)**

In 2003, The Town of Milton commissioned the Town Core Traffic Circulation Study. The Town conducted a system-wide assessment of traffic flow and congestion along US 7 and the local streets within Milton’s town core. The system-wide assessment focused on developing a set of coordinated roadway and intersection modifications that support local goals. The goal of this study is to ensure that each individual project, regardless of the year it is built and the party that builds it, helps achieve an overall plan for the study area. This study was conducted by Resource Systems Group, Inc. for the Town of Milton and is funded by the Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO).
The US Route 7 Winooski to Georgia Corridor Study was undertaken in response to a growing need for an integrated approach to transportation development along the US 7 corridor from Winooski to Georgia. New developments within the corridor and the increasingly wide reach of the Chittenden County economy have placed increasing strains on the aging transport infrastructure. The study focused on the following areas:

- The corridor should be served by a hierarchical roadway system.
- Providing a safe highway and transport environment for highway users and abutters
- Providing meaningful alternative means of transportation
- Designing transportation service and facilities that support, further, and enhance community land use and development strategies.
- Designing transportation facilities that complement the areas in which they are located.
- Providing for sound and effective long-term fiscal management of necessary improvements within the corridor

The following are conclusions of the study that specifically relate to Milton:

- Middle Road functions much more like a local road than a collector.
- North Road, presently classified a local roadway, provides significant regional access to the Husky development, suggesting potential "collector" status.
- A number of intersections have non-standard, difficult geometric configurations, including:
  - Railroad/Middle/US-7/Grand Union
  - W Milton/Bartlett/US-7
  - Haydenberry/Center/US-7 (although this appears to function adequately as two distinct T intersections)
Lake Rd/US-7 (not part of the same geographic cluster, but relevant in the larger picture).

- The segments of Route 7 in particular between Checkerberry and roughly Main Street exhibit a large number of curb cuts, many with little or no definition. This results in numerous uncontrolled left turns and the potential of vehicles backing into this through roadway.

- The high number of commercial uses strung along Route 7 between Checkerberry and Milton Village generates a high level of internal circulation between destinations, increasing congestion, turning movements and safety issues.

- Despite the recent growth in Milton's sidewalk system, there is still room for improvements and expansion especially along part of Route 7 and the New Town Center.

- The compact nature of Milton Village and the expanding sidewalk system provide a good environment for linking to transit.

- Both industrial and residential development at the southern end of Route 7 in Milton is set back from the roadway behind green buffers. Given the low industrial buildings, this area retains some feeling of open space and long-range views to the west.

- Although Checkerberry is currently undistinguished, the curve in the roadway, the open "village green", and its historic role in the town center present opportunities for future, high quality development.

- New Town Center - Middle Road to Barnum: Although the character of the corridor through this section has tremendous potential, the full range of amenities needed in a town center have not yet been completed.

- Historic Town Center: The intersection of Main Street and US Route 7 is the entrance to Milton's historic district. Although a few historic buildings remain, the historic character of the intersection has been weakened and there is little to draw visitors east onto historic Main Street.

- Arrowhead Lake Corridor: Development in this beautiful part of the Route 7 corridor is likely to be limited due to the difficulty of building on the steep hillsides either side of the roadway. The narrow roadway and 50 mph permitted speed keep the driver focused on the road and limits opportunities for enjoying the scenic surroundings.
Husky Traffic Impact Study Master Plan – March 1997

Husky develops, manufactures, and tests injection molding machines for the plastics industry. The site is located between North Road and Arrowhead Lake in Milton. The long term plan is for the Husky site to accommodate 2,000 employees. Currently the site is accessed by North Road; however, a bridge over Arrowhead lake directly connecting Husky with US 7 has been proposed to alleviate traffic on Railroad Street and Main Street. This bridge has not been constructed to date. Within the study area and assuming the complete build out of Husky, the only intersection that would experience a detrimental Level of Service requiring improvement would be the US 7 – Main Street intersection.

US 7-Rebecca Lander Drive Scoping Study – August 2004

The CCMPO commissioned Dufresne – Henry to investigate potential access improvements to Milton High School, which is accessed by US 7 via Rebecca Lander Drive. The goals of the study were to increase intersection performance, increase turning radii to better accommodate school buses, improve the mobility function of US 7, and create a safe pedestrian environment. The recommendations from this study include:

- Adding a left turn lane on the northbound approach at US 7 – Rebecca Lander Drive;
- Adding northbound and southbound left turn lanes at US 7 – Barnum Road; • Signalizing the US 7 – Barnum Road intersection;
- Increasing the corner radii at both US 7 – Rebecca Lander Drive and US 7 – Barnum Road; Installing pedestrian crossing on all approaches to US 7 – Barnum Road;
- Installing a pedestrian crossing on US 7 between Barnum Road and Rebecca Lander Drive; • Improving Street Lighting on US 7;
- Designating a school speed zone with flashing beacons; and
- Constructing a raised median on US 7 north of Rebecca Lander Drive and use landscaping to encourage pedestrians to cross only at designated crosswalks. VTrans has jurisdiction over US 7.
They remain skeptical that the proposed improvements will force students to cross US 7 at designated locations and are hesitant about signaling US 7 – Barnum Road.

**US 7-Middle Road-Railroad Street Scoping Study**

The intersection of US 7 – Middle Road – Railroad Street has been labeled as substandard by both the Town of Milton and the CCMPO. The purpose of this study was to investigate alternative geometries for the intersection that would maintain sufficient capacity, while improving safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. Seven alternative designs were proposed for consideration to improve the US 7 – Middle Road – Railroad Street intersection. The seven designs could be placed into 3 categories:

- do nothing,
- realigning the roadway and adding lanes,
- and the construction of a roundabout.

**Long Range Access and Mobility Committee Report – January 2001**

The long range access and mobility committee was formed in 1998. They were charged with developing a long term transportation plan for the town of Milton while promoting and ensuring public participation in the planning process. The committee also provided input to the CCMPO, Town Selectboard, and Town Planning Commission on the US -7 corridor study and on other long range transportation planning pursued by the town of Milton. In 2001, the committee released a report that envisioned significant changes to the Milton transportation network over a twenty year horizon. These ideas include a developed downtown core area with direct access to I-89 via an interchange at West Milton Road, transit service connecting Milton to the rest of Chittenden County, an improved sidewalk system, and a strong grid of east – west roads to connect the north-south roads in the town.
Alternative Transportation Master Plan – May 2002

The goals of this master plan were to develop a plan for linking existing and planned developments with transportation facilities in Milton and improve mobility and accessibility to the town core area and other locations inside and outside of Milton. Using a combination of input from residents at Town meetings, potential number of users, the number of destinations served, and references to areas in other studies alternative transportation improvement recommendations were made for various areas in Milton. Some key recommendations are listed below:

- From the areas of the town to the town core: shared use paths, sidewalks, and bicycle routes;
- From the town core area to Essex: bicycle route, expansion of CCTA bus service, and train service;
- From town core area to Colchester: bicycle route and shared use trail;
- US 7 south of town core: shared use paths, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and expansion of CCTA bus service;
- Town core area to Grand Isle: bicycle route;
- US 7 north of Milton: sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and bus service; and
- North Road: sidewalks and bicycle lanes.


The 2005 CEDS is a focused economic development plan that builds from a regional vision and a mission for the collaborating entities:

CEDS Vision

“Our economy will be strong and more diverse, with a base of small and large globally competitive employers, and will provide meaningful and challenging jobs that are consistent with Vermont’s culture, values, & a high quality of life.”
Mission

“Through a focused effort in collaboration with the state and other regions, strengthen existing businesses and search out new opportunities to achieve a diverse economy of globally-competitive businesses that offer challenging and good-paying job opportunities, offer the resources necessary to support a high quality of life, and provide economic opportunity for those who work and reside in northwest Vermont.”

The CEDS analyzes an enormous amount of regional economic and demographic data and uses this research to identify the most desirable industry clusters to be targeted for investment and employment in the region so that available assets and resources may be directed most effectively to accomplish the regional goals.

The CEDS identified a number of clusters that are appropriate in the region’s economy and can be supported by its assets. The identified targets are characterized by high wages, and offer alternatives to younger well-trained workers who might, in the absence of these jobs, leave the area seeking better employment.
Section III:

Existing Conditions

Most of the Route 7 Corridor is shown in Exhibit 1. Shown is Route 7 from the point where it turns east at West Milton Road, travels through the Town to a northern intersection with Main Street.
Overall Town Land Use

Milton contains a mix of land use types. Residential uses are scattered throughout the Town. Commercial areas are concentrated primarily near US 7, with three main clusters of commercial activity:

- Near the US 7-Main Street Intersection
- Along US 7 south of Rebecca Lander Drive and the portion of the Town Core bounded by US 7, Middle Road, and Bombardier Road
- From west of Bombardier Road on US 7 to south of West Milton Road

The Catamount Industrial Park, located along US 7 just north of the Colchester/Milton town line and the Husky campus are two of the Town’s major industrial and manufacturing locations. Public facilities, such as town offices, library, and fire station are located along Bombardier Road and the High School is located on Rebecca Lander Drive with the elementary school nearby.

Map 1 shows the current land uses in the Milton area. Commercial activity, shown in red, is dispersed along Route 7. The industrial property (shown in purple), is concentrated near Route 89 or in the upper right quadrant at the Husky campus.
Previous Work By Resources Systems Group (RSG)

RSG completed their report in October 2005 and essentially confirmed conditions previously outlined and observed. They were:

The Route 7 corridor generally operates well. Analysis is completed at important intersections that are controlled by Stop signs or traffic signals. Traffic signals have the potential to limit the operation of Route 7 because they cause traffic to stop. Letter grades are assigned to traffic movements based upon delay. These letter grades, just like the grades received in school, range from “A” to “F” with “A” being very good and “F” poor. Analysis of the signal at the Hannaford Plaza gives the intersection a grade of “B” during both the current morning and afternoon peak traffic periods.

- Some unsignalized intersections operated poorly, especially side street traffic that waits long periods of time in order to access Route 7. These conditions generally reflect the lack of “adequate gaps or spaces in traffic on Route 7.” This does not necessarily mean that there is a capacity problem. Rather, it means that there are periods of time when traffic on Route 7 is steady and does not have the space between vehicles to permit access from side streets. This condition can be a safety issue because drivers will begin to accept less than reasonable spaces in traffic along Route 7 as their wait time increases. One reason for this condition is that there is only one traffic signal along Route 7 in the downtown core creating spaces during peak periods. As the distance from the signal to upstream or downstream intersections increases, the effects of the signal’s gap creation diminish.

- Route 7 intersections had reserve capacity and could account for additional traffic related to normal growth over the next 20 years. Normal growth in traffic is reflective of increased traffic volumes due to changes within existing population without changes to the land use plan. There is a direct relationship between population changes and traffic growth. Demographics suggest that the annual
growth rate in the Town of Milton, under current conditions, is expected to range from 1.2% to 1.4% per year between 2005 and 2025.

Further Evaluation of the Corridor

In reviewing previous work it became clear that much of the technical data collection and evaluation had been completed by RSG. The Technical Memorandum prepared by RSG, dated November 9, 2005 forms the basis for analysis and problem identification and is included by reference to this work. As such, the consultants focused on getting a “fresh perspective” on transportation issues and listening to the public about challenges and opportunities facing the Town in the development of a future transportation system.

Visual observations of the transportation system and of intersection function at Route 7 and Rebecca Lander; Route 7 and the Hannaford Plaza and Route 7, Middle Road and Railroad Street were completed. Count data was collected and visual observations were made. Trips were made along the Town’s street system to see where opportunities may exist to make new connections that could help circulation without being in conflict with land use.

Because of these efforts, the evaluation of the corridor using SYNCHRO was confirmed. The corridor generally operates well. Speeds are generally at or slightly above posted speed limits. There is only one traffic signal at the Hannaford Plaza. There are some difficulties created by left turns from Route 7 into side streets. While waiting for opposing traffic to pass by, the left turning vehicles cause traffic behind them to wait until they can complete the turn. This is especially true at the intersection with Rebecca Lander Drive where the problem can be very pronounced when the High School discharges students in the afternoon. The period for delay and back-ups usually lasts less than fifteen minutes each afternoon. During other times, especially during the peak traffic periods, traffic volumes on Route 7 are sufficient to cause long side street delay under stop sign control.
Generally, however, the volume, speed and delay characteristics along Route 7 suggest good operating characteristics and ample “reserve capacity.” Reserve capacity is defined as the difference between the actual traffic demand and the point at which the system reaches capacity. As an example, if a section of road or street is calculated to be able to carry 1,800 vehicles per hour and actual counts measure 1,000 vehicles per hour, then the “reserve capacity” is 800 vehicles per hour.

Other observations include:
- Road and or geometric features that may not meet recognized standards at West Milton and Bartlett and also at Lake Road
- A general lack of driveway control along most of the corridor
- The corridor lacks opportunities for shared transportation modes
- Traffic volumes in the corridor vary from 8,400 to 12,000 vehicles per day
- Difficulty exiting the North driveway at Catamount Industrial Park during the afternoon peak hour
- Accident history reflective of the short sight distance at the intersection of Railroad Street and Main Street due to the vertical curve to the east of the intersection.
- Difficulty traveling from the east side of Town to the west side of Town without using Route 7
- Operations and safety concerns at the intersection of Route 7, Railroad Street and Middle Road
- Driveway density and access management along some portions of Route 7
- Lack of connectivity between the retail uses along Route 7 and the rest of the Town Core
- Accident history at the intersection of Middle Road and Bombardier Rd. This issue has been addressed by the Town through the installation of a 4-way Stop.

**Relevant Findings from the Economic Strategy**

Simultaneous with the development of this study, the Town has prepared an Economic Strategy which will shape and influence land use and transportation choices along the Route 7 Corridor and in the Town
The following summary identifies the key market approaches and the land use opportunities and constraints identified in that study.

The strategy evaluated many different alternatives to improve the economic climate and quality of life in the Town. It responded to the ongoing concern that runaway residential development is consuming land suitable for commercial and industrial growth. It underscored the contention that the town must act proactively to ensure that an adequate supply of land is available to sustain the tax base and that proper controls and land management techniques are in place to make land perform as efficiently as it can to meet that end.

Perhaps the most important strategy is to make commercial and industrial zones more attractive for investment by providing public services. As Map 3 shows, the current sewer/wastewater collection system does not extend to the industrial zones along Route 7 including Catamount Park.

**Map 2: Wastewater Collection System**

**Business Growth Potential**

The identification of potential business recruitment targets for the Town is identified as having two components. The first part examines the retail, small commercial and residential markets that may be viable options for downtown (DB1) development and parts of the Route 7 corridor. The second part of the target industry strategy involves the identification of industrial recruitment targets. These businesses need to fit two criteria:
they must provide high-wage jobs which fit both the state’s value-added, high-wage industrial sector and the USEDA requirements for providing above average wages for the region

- they must have shown employment growth in the region in the recent past and be projected to grow in recent regional and state plans

Attraction of business to Milton, particularly to Catamount Park, will require that the Town participate in both regional marketing efforts and regional policies that encourage industrial development in partnership with GBIC.

Commercial and Town Core Development

Milton can act proactively to attract a larger share of the regional growth especially through planned development and build-out in the Town Core. Successful retail development in the Town Core depends on two market sources: local population spending and outside (non-Milton) worker or visitor spending. The market assessment for commercial development that follows estimates spending potential of Milton residents and evaluates whether or not the existing mix of establishments captures maximum market share. The assessment also evaluates whether residents are leaving downtown to spend in neighboring communities and calculates the impact of this retail sales leakage. Evaluation of this data will enable the Town to identify strategies to recapture lost local spending. It will also identify growing non-retail commercial industries which can locate anywhere in a wide geographic area and could be attracted by Milton’s amenities and location.

Milton’s competitive development strategy for downtown must include several options to enable it to compete effectively with the robust retail development occurring in the surrounding communities. Milton’s Town Core can distinguish itself by adding residential uses and small commercial/office development to retail offerings, creating a true mixed use environment rather than the big box or strip mall options available regionally. In addition, it will be critical that the Town carefully locate community
facilities as well as recreation and entertainment amenities to anchor Town Core growth. In order to be chosen as the location for a larger share of regional service sector growth, the Town needs to understand and provide the amenities these firms desire.

**Industrial Development**

Milton should not attempt to create its own market for industrial development, but rather it should proactively compete for a larger market share of the region’s growing sectors based upon a clear understanding of the advantages and deficiencies of its existing sites and incentives. All of the regional studies include high value-added manufacturing as a cluster in their recommendations, recognizing that the region is characterized by both high wages and high land costs relative to other parts of the country that may also have fewer environmental constraints.

The town has the ability to accommodate new industrial users. The Catamount Industrial Park consists of 26 lots (175 acres) with approximately nine lots currently undeveloped. Each of these lots is suitable for between approximately 50,000 and 100,000 square foot buildings. There has been significant demand for acquisition of industrial lots serviced by municipal wastewater. GBIC, which manages Catamount Park owned by the Cynosure Corporation, has tried to keep land from being developed for less intensive uses until public services to the park could be improved. The initial thrust of the regional CEDS is upgrading infrastructure to accommodate and attract the region’s growth industries. A proposal requesting infrastructure funding for wastewater service has been funded by USEDA.

GBIC expects that the Catamount Industrial Park should have a relatively strong progression of lot sales and industrial/high value-added business development once the park is serviced by the Milton wastewater system. In addition, the businesses on the seventeen existing developed lots are expected to access and utilize the Milton wastewater system services as soon as it is available in the Catamount Industrial Park.
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The Husky Campus consists of approximately 600 acres of land. The original Husky master plan concept referred to a total of as many as 24 buildings totaling over 4 million sq. ft. to be constructed over a twenty year period.

- Currently there is a total permitted sq. ft. of: 845,685 sq. ft.
- The existing Husky Building consists of: 247,784 sq. ft.
- Leaving additional permitted sq. ft. of: 597,901 sq. ft.

In the near term, it does not appear likely that Husky will be proposing a new building on the campus. The company has made significant capital investments in Asia to appropriately serve its customers in that hemisphere and service its new market growth. It appears that at this time Husky’s customers in North and South America are being served adequately by its existing facilities on its campuses in Bolton, Ontario and in Milton, Vermont.

Significant industrial infrastructure, including Town of Milton wastewater services, is already in place on the Milton Husky Campus. The campus has nearly 600,000 sq. ft. of pre-permitted industrial space with Act 250 construction permits in place. Because of Husky’s master planning, this campus is one of the most aesthetically appealing settings in our region. The development of high value-added businesses creating high wage jobs on this campus has tremendous potential.

Act 184 of the 2005-2006 Vermont Legislative Session gives the Town the ability to negotiate a ten year extension of the state- approved Tax Incremental Financing Districts (TIF) that encompass the Husky Campus, the Catamount Industrial Park, and the Sanderson properties; these TIFs were set to expire in January of 2008. A TIF district enables the Town of Milton to collect property taxes paid by Husky, businesses in the Catamount Industrial Park and future businesses on the Sanderson properties and to use the tax revenues to help pay for infrastructure projects including the new Town of Milton wastewater treatment facility and collection system. The Milton wastewater treatment project is now permitted for
construction, the Town voters have approved the bond for the project and construction has commenced. The Town anticipates additional wastewater users to support the operational costs once it is operational and the Town is expecting additional users to hook up.

Each of the development opportunities available to the Town of Milton exists in a competitive environment that allows almost equal access to the regional marketplace. The attractiveness and amenities at sites located in the Town will separate the development potential of Milton from other communities. Milton needs to cultivate a development environment that is business friendly, physically and financially attractive and accessible from a transportation perspective if it is to be competitive in the regional marketplace. Lacking infrastructure, the Town is not currently as well positioned as it could be to attract many of the growing, higher-end businesses in the region. In addition, the Town lacks a management strategy for economic development recruitment, retention and marketing which puts it at a competitive disadvantage. In implementing this strategic economic development plan, the Town must focus on improving site amenities while retaining existing enterprises that are economically vital.
SECTION IV:
COMMUNITY CONCERNS AND IDEAS

The Town of Milton held two public meetings and several consultant team and individual meetings to prepare this plan for the Route 7 Corridor. The town conducted a SWOT (Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis with a focus group of officials, economic developers and business owners. The first large-scale public meeting was a visioning workshop that solicited resident input on a variety of issues affecting the Town’s future. The second public meeting was a design charrette that exposed residents to core issues and identified implementation strategies and actions.

Visioning Workshop Comments

The visioning workshop held on October 5, 2006 identified things residents wanted to preserve and protect, highlighted things that need to be changed and described the Town’s future once the first two actions were complete. This was a large group brainstorming format. The consultants also shared some basic demographic and transportation data with the participants at the session.

What is your vision of economic development in the Town of Milton during the next five years?

- There is a great opportunity to create a new town center
- It will have a beautiful town center
- Pedestrian friendly
- Milton will be described as a center for business
- Entertainment: hockey rink
- Family friendly
- Quality schools
- Highway access
- Multi-modal – that isn’t auto dominated
- Landscape accommodates more than cars
What programs/efforts should the town undertake over the next five years?

- TIF for downtown development
- Infrastructure
- Ability to interact with regional entities
- A program to reach core industry clusters
- Use economic development committee
- Need a spark plug – hire a staff person who can go out and “start swinging a club”
- Support Milton Business Association
- Retention - always maintain relationships
- Learn to earn program
- Information sharing
- Husky has been involved with elementary school – but interestingly not at the high school
- Reinforce healthy cultural environment
- Consider tourism and movie making as niches
- Farmers Market
- Consider updating the town logo or doing something else visually interesting – sometimes the visual elements can do as much as physical changes to the environment
- Lakeshore is an asset
- Consider doing a craft market
- Apple fest
- Milton doesn’t have a signature, and identify, a brand
- There is a need to keep a close eye on what Colchester is doing. They are creating hamlets all over the place and are a direct competitor. They need water/sewer capacity and are angering the Town over some development directions
- There is a preliminary planning study being done in Colchester (MPO representative)
- Don’t forget the long term project regarding the Route 17 interchange
- Colchester wants to make their development work with their transportation system.
- Need to plan for new roadways
- Look at new town logo, make design for downtown modern and interesting – create and identify around art and culture.
- Something to update the historical character of the old town – not try to create a historic –model since that is not the character of the place.

Design Charette Comments

The design charette held on December 3, 2006 featured three “stations”. One presented information and solicited feedback on proposed streetscape improvement alternatives, one discussed transportation and

Town of Milton, VT
Transportation and Land Use Plan for Route 7

Final Report

January 2008
land use on the Route 7 Corridor and the last group discussed economic development strategies. The audience divided into three groups and rotated through the stations. The comments from the Transportation group were:

**Group One**
- Ties to North South arteries – behind high school and on Railroad Street
- Options to stay off Route 7
- Roundabouts
- Railroad Street – Keep traffic off
- Route 7 as a corridor with buildings on streets off of it
- Problems with too much traffic and pedestrians on Route 7
- Spruce up south end of Route 7 – encourage new growth at entrance to Milton – maybe an Artist Guild
- Need a gateway to Milton
- What is the time-frame
- No eminent domain
- Need more than one road coming in
- Group one overwhelmingly approved of the concept Dennis Sketched
- Green space welcome – liked the park concept at current Railroad street/middle road intersection

**Group Two**
- Route 7 not a problem if traffic is controlled – if so, new roads may not be necessary
- Incorporate small park into new Hannaford Plaza
- Blend Parks with art and create excitement: flags, fountains and artwork
- Make usable pedestrian connections - especially important around the high school
- Left turn lanes at critical intersections
- Connect other side of the river to the Town Core – possibilities??
- Bikes ideally, they should be kept separate from roads - recent public hearing sentiment was not in agreement with this
- Provide another connection/bypass off Route 7
- Bike path is important – shouldn’t let one group stop it
- Waterfront access
- Bike and walking paths going through town
- Landfill area as public use area
- Access to Town Forest – maybe a bike path around it. It is a beautiful area and would be nice to be able to use it/bike it
- Ancient roads – be reused for public access/bike path
As part of the Economic Strategy, a focus group with economic developers was constructed and other individual meeting held. These meetings discussed land use choices and the vital role Route 7 plays and will play into the Towns commercial and industrial future. Four themes emerged from the sessions:

**The Town Core and DB1 Zoning District**

There was clear and strong agreement that retail and commercial uses should be concentrated in a densely compact, walkable mixed-use Town Core, and that the Town’s efforts to create the DB1 Zone for part of
the Town Core are moving in the right direction. The DB1 district, shown in Map 4, is designed to encourage commercial development by requiring the construction of mixed-use units with residential components. The area is fairly limited in size, but a build-out would provide over 120,000 square feet of new commercial space. The Downtown Business District Zoning District (DB1 Zone), shown in Map 4 below, is the area of the Town where the densest development is planned, although the Town’s growth will also occur in the adjacent zones, which together may form the Town Core. Map 5 below shows the proposed boundaries for the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District that is planned for the Town Core area, although these boundaries have not yet been formally set.

Participants felt that the Town Core needs to be developed and enhanced as a place to gather, socialize and find amenities not currently available in Milton or the surrounding communities. Participants identified traffic and underdeveloped nature of the commercial areas as detriments to businesses choosing the Town Core as a business location. There was strong agreement that a “gateway” of some sort should be developed.

There was agreement that a mix of uses in the core would create the most vitality. As the analysis above shows, the local economy will support a significant amount of new retail, including eating and drinking establishments, if parking, appearance, and mix of uses competes favorably with that of surrounding towns. It was also acknowledged that other commercial industries that are growing in the region such as small professional, health and business services firms would fit well into an improved Town Core. The design considerations for the core should accommodate both retail and commercial uses, planning parking, for example, to meet the desires of each sector.
Industrial Property

There was broad agreement that industrial property needs to have access to public infrastructure, be marketed and made more accessible to the region in order to bring jobs, retain younger families, and generate tax base. Participants felt that concentrating development around the current Catamount Park and Husky campus was advisable. There was clear agreement among residents, community leaders and members of the economic development community that the Town should expand staff and other resources for effective management and implementation of the identified economic strategy.

While a consensus was voiced about the need for improvements to industrial properties, different concerns about accessibility were raised. Many participants believed that the long-proposed Exit 17A was needed to attract businesses to Catamount Park and to encourage Husky to further develop its campus. Others worried that construction of the interchange would have an adverse impact on residential areas and create competition for the downtown (discussed below).

A diversity of opinion was also expressed regarding the specific types of industry to target in Milton’s industrial zones. Some favored high-tech manufacturing in areas recommended by the regional CEDS. Others thought that larger office or back-office uses would be more successful. The economic development partners engaged in the dialogue assured participants that many business parks now contain...
both types of industry, given that they both seek access to regional highways, campus type settings, local retail options for employees, and on-campus child-care and similar amenities.

Possible Future Exit 17A Interchange

Participants discussed the potential development of an interchange 17A off of Interstate 89 at the intersection of West Milton Road connecting Checkerberry Village and West Milton. It was recognized that development of an exit at this location is an extension of the outward growth of the Greater Burlington region. It was acknowledged that the potential new interchange would have both positive and negative economic development impacts on the region and on Milton. Participants recognized that interchange-oriented retail including big box stores, strip malls, outlet development and even shopping malls would be attracted to the destination. Some said it could attract additional development and create alternatives for local and regional commercial/retail development. Others recognized that a new mall could compete with older shopping centers in surrounding towns, as well as Milton’s Town Core. While the area is already zoned for commercial development on one corner, there is a residential community on the other that could be incompatible with large scale retail development.

Other participants felt that if the Town Core was sufficiently developed and focused on local services and niche retail that it could maintain itself in the face of new retail development. Most participants favored continuation of square footage limitations on big box development that have been in place in Milton for some time.

Milton officials favor individual communities setting limitations best suited to individual communities’ own needs, while some planners in other areas of the State have been pushing for statewide limitations. Most participants recognize that funding and construction of an Exit 17A interchange are likely many years in the future.
Tourism

Participants remarked that the potential for tourism in the Town has never been truly realized. Although seen as a regional issue, residents felt that Milton should consider the development of its own tourism assets including historic downtown elements of the old village. Tourism in the state and the region is dominated by outdoor recreation (especially skiing) and niche retail/main streets.

While the tourism industry is often considered separate from economic development strategies, in the Chittenden County region it has been a major part of the economy for many years. In addition, it is an industry cluster recommended for growth by the regional CEDS. In general, this industry usually has its own funding and marketing infrastructure both at the state and regional levels as it does in northwestern Vermont and does not require as substantial an investment of local dollars as other targeting efforts. Participants felt that the Town can engage cost effectively since there is statewide campaign and additional local resources will not be necessary. The Town will need to focus its efforts on the development of tourism related amenities and destinations (hotel, niche retail, recreation outfitters, for example) and then advocate for inclusion in regional and statewide marketing efforts.

Any discussion about tourism triggers discussion about land use. Most of the recreational areas are scattered throughout the Town without any connections to each other. Improvements at Arrowhead
Mountain Lake, a privately-owned impoundment that produces hydropower, were discussed as was the municipal purchase of open space to protect character and create opportunities for future recreation development (the Town’s recent purchase of 134 acre Bove Property is described below). Participants felt that with proper investment the Town Core could become a tourism destination in itself including a location for lodging.

In addition to the four key themes, there was discussion about the need for transitional zones between the Town Core and industrial zones, mostly along Route 7. While the current Route 7 corridor is characterized by linear development for many of these uses, a more concentrated pattern may be more appropriate.

Charette Presentation on Route 7 Downtown Core Transportation Circulation

As the existing conditions analysis was completed, it became clear to the Town and the Consultants that careful examination of transportation circulation in the Town Core was required to understand other operational and future land use issues along the Route 7 Corridor. At the community charette held on December 3, 2006 the consultants presented a circulation concept for review by the public. It was understood that much of the final decision making regarding this and other proposals for Route 7 requires coordination and input with VTrans – The Vermont Transportation Agency, since much of Route 7 is under their control. However, input received from participants reflected recent discussion and historical evidence of VTrans approvals and discussions.

Description of Downtown Core Circulation Concept

The downtown core circulation concept shown in Exhibit 2 (below) utilizes the existing street system to the fullest extent possible. Under this concept a number of partners will need to be involved and in agreement. The concept is developed on the premise that:
New transportation links are created that allow east-west movement in the core without using Route 7.
New street connections are provided to provide transportation options and create new, smaller development blocks
The system is expandable as new development occurs around the Town Core
The system aligns key components of the transportation system at key points along Route 7
The system forms public/private partnerships

These are the key design concepts of the system:

- Haydenberry Drive could be relocated to the east side of the present McDonalds Restaurant and brought into alignment with Center Drive. A new road connection could be constructed from the north side of the current Hannaford Plaza along the Shopping Center/School District property that extends west and then turns south connecting to the relocated Haydenberry Drive from the residential area to the new road connection could be re-aligned to form a new intersection. The control of this intersection would likely to need no more than a Stop sign.
- A new roadway link could be created between Route 7 at the signal with the current Hannaford Shopping Center and Railroad Street
- The existing intersection of Route 7, Middle Road and Railroad Street would be abandoned.
- Middle Road could be re-aligned as it approaches Route 7 and is directly tied to Railroad Street.
Exhibit 2: Route 7/Town Core Circulation Concept Plan
A new link could be created from Middle Road and Route 7 that forms an intersection with an entrance to the new Shopping Center.

A new Town street could be created between Bombardier Road and Middle Road to create two new blocks.

This system would be expandable in all directions to form new links and blocks to accommodate different future land use opportunities.

To the north, a more formal connection could be made between Rebecca Lander Drive and Lamoille Terrace to provide for bus circulation and utilize the intersection of Lamoille Terrace and Route 7 as a prime intersection along Route 7.

As an alternative a possible future connection corridor through the school property (should it change its use from a school to private development) could be constructed which would:

- Provide better access and egress from the Hannaford Shopping Center from parcels to the north of the site
- Provide a street link for the development of the land on either side of it
- Reduce demand of traffic on Route 7
- Provide multiple opportunities for travelers to choose routes in making a trip

The section of Route 7 between a point near Landfill Road to the south and Lamoille Terrace to the north is envisioned to be three lane roadway. This section would provide one lane in each direction with left turn lane in both directions (where intersections are 4-way) at key intersections. The intersections currently identified for possible left turn lanes are:

- Route 7 and Bombardier Road (westbound only)
- Route 7 and Center Drive/Re-aligned Haydenberry (both directions)
- Route 7 and new Hannaford Plaza driveway (both directions)
- Route 7 and old Hannaford Plaza Driveway (both directions)
- Route 7 and Rebecca Lander Drive
Route 7 and Lamoille Terrace (both directions)

A SYNCHRO model is being developed by RSG that will evaluate the transportation system and present a simulation of the operations in the current year and at a future year (2025). One of the key advantages of the future system is that it gives the users options and choice in the intersection that they use to cross Rte 7. Over a period of time the activity at three prime intersections along Route 7 under this system (Center Drive, Middle Road and Shopping Center North) are likely to balance out because they generally provide connections to the same areas on either side of Route 7.

This concept also eliminates the problem intersection of Route 7, Middle Road and Railroad Street, creating an area that is identified as a green space that could become “Town Center.”
SECTION V:
BUILD OUT ANALYSIS
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Build-out Analysis

A build-out analysis is a model of a community’s potential future, given the status of the land at the time of analysis, the dimensions and characteristics of that land that would affect development (i.e. wetlands, unsuitable soils, excessive slopes, etc.), and regulations that govern the development of the land. The analysis estimates the maximum possible development that is allowed by regulation (zoning) on a parcel and within the designated area for analysis. The analysis considers not only the development of vacant land but the potential redevelopment of existing property with the exception of “20 year parcels”. These parcels are specifically identified in each of the zoning districts and are uses considered not likely to change over the next twenty years. The capacity of infrastructure to accommodate possible development is not factored into a build-out analysis.

The consultants developed assumptions and calculations (as described below) based on the Town’s Zoning Ordinance for two build-out scenarios covering 719 parcels (approximately 16.7% of total parcels in the Town) and 2,886 acres or 7.5% of the Town’s overall acreage. The first build-out scenario projected maximum development of each parcel within the target area in accordance with allowable zoning whether the parcel was currently developed or not. The second build-out scenario considered only vacant, undeveloped parcels.

The build-out analysis focused on a targeted area along Route 7 and surrounding Milton’s Town Core that is generally described as follows:
The north to south parameter of this corridor is described as properties along and adjacent to Route 7 from the Old Towne, Main Street and Checkerberry Areas south to the Colchester Town Line.

- The east to west parameter is defined as all properties along the north-south corridor defined above, west from Route 7 to Interstate 89 and east from Route 7 to the Cobble Hill ridge line.

- The corridor also includes the parcel of property west of I-89 that is zoned Interstate Commercial (C1) and all properties that are in the Sewer Service Area #7.

A zoning map of the target area is presented on the following page of this report and details the actual area that was analyzed.

Based on GIS data base analysis, the target area encompasses approximately 2,900 acres, including 719 parcels in 10 different zoning districts. A summary of statistics for each of the zones is illustrated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th># of Parcels</th>
<th>Acres/Parcel</th>
<th>Assessed value per acre</th>
<th>Estimated New Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown DB1</td>
<td>172.9</td>
<td>$19,015,900</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$110,008</td>
<td>$31,636,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP Center M1</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>$8,145,800</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$127,717</td>
<td>$15,522,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP West M2</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>$9,949,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>$192,885</td>
<td>$9,949,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP Municipal M3</td>
<td>187.7</td>
<td>$1,568,400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>$8,358</td>
<td>$3,058,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkerberry M4</td>
<td>558.5</td>
<td>$21,738,500</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>$38,922</td>
<td>$39,139,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Towne M5</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>$8,173,000</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$133,699</td>
<td>$15,114,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street M6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>$6,656,800</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$263,740</td>
<td>$12,542,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential R3</td>
<td>1,213.1</td>
<td>$25,580,800</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>$21,087</td>
<td>$49,254,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Commercial C1</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>$5,548</td>
<td>$350,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Industrial I2</td>
<td>505.7</td>
<td>$24,766,800</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>$48,976</td>
<td>$33,667,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,886.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$125,855,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>719</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,603</strong></td>
<td><strong>$210,235,961</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assessed values utilized for the build-out analysis were from the 2005 grand list and therefore are pre-reappraisal numbers. In order to provide the Town with a general tool for assessing the impact of the reappraisal on the build-out analysis, we have approximated the value of the new assessment figures based on “rule of thumb” formulas provided by the Town Assessor. Essentially, residential properties are assumed to double in value less 5%; commercial properties are assumed to increase on average by 60%; industrial and other property types are assumed to retain their pre-appraisal values. The estimated current assessed values are provided in a separate column in the table above and in other tables throughout this document as appropriate.

Geographically, the target area is situated roughly in the central portion of the Town and comprises approximately 7.5% of the Town’s total land acreage, but most of its population. It is also the area most likely to experience development over the next 15 to 20 years.

Zoning is the key to projecting build-out. Zoning controls the parameters (maximum building and lot coverage, maximum building height, minimum setbacks, parking requirements, etc.) and use (types of residential, commercial, industrial uses allowed, etc.). Zoning dictates the requirements for land use.
development specific to the zone. Zoning data was utilized to calculate estimated growth potential within the affected corridor and target area.

**Sample Zoning District Analysis**

**Downtown Business District (DB1)**

The Town conducted a build-out analysis of lots within the Downtown Business Zone (DB1 Zone). Most of the lots within this zone are under an acre so Town planners set a goal to achieve maximum build-out density for each lot by setting parameters that would consistently apply to each lot. The analysis is based on the following assumptions, which includes a 20 year build-out period:

- Each lot would contain a 5-story building (the maximum height allowed) with the upper four floors multifamily residential and the first floor commercial/office (to meet the DB1's 20% commercial requirement).

- Parking requirements were set to be 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit and 4 spaces (1/employee, 3/customer) per 1,000 sf of commercial/office space.

- The first floor square footage was equally divided by thirds into General Office, Professional Office, and Small Commercial Retail.

- For a 5-story building with the above mix of residential to commercial, the following percentage ratio of lot coverage was utilized:
  - 14% building footprint
  - 12% roads, sidewalks utilities
  - 20% open space (required by zoning regulations)
  - 54% parking spaces with 2-way travel lanes
According to Town planners, this formula provides a realistic balance among the coverages stated above for a 5-story mixed use building in the DB1 District. For example, a 5-story, mixed use building on a 40,000 sf lot would require a 5600 sf building footprint; 21,600 sf parking spaces with 2-way travel lanes (72 spaces); 8,000 sf open space (required by zoning regulations); and 4,800 sf for roads, sidewalks, and utilities. This creates a total of 32 dwelling units (22,400 sf) and 5600 sf of commercial/retail space equally divided into general office, professional office, and small commercial retail space.

The Town applied the percentage ratio to the size of each of the lots that they analyzed and produced a gross square footage (GSF) for residential and commercial uses on each lot. The Town summarized their analysis by traffic analysis zones provided by the consultants. They also provided an overall spreadsheet of parcels that were analyzed within the DB1 zone for build-out (noting 20-year parcels exempt from the analysis because their use was unlikely to change). The consultants were able to utilize this overall parcel spreadsheet to generate a build-out analysis of DB1 based on the Town’s parameters. The results showed a significantly higher maximum build-out scenario than the Town’s analysis. A comparison of the build-out results are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB1 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>124,133</td>
<td>1,489,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>124,133</td>
<td>124,133</td>
<td>1,489,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Analysis</td>
<td>172.9</td>
<td>4,687,056</td>
<td>656,188</td>
<td>218,729</td>
<td>218,729</td>
<td>218,729</td>
<td>2,624,751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The detailed spreadsheets utilized by the Town and the consultant are provided in the appendix to this report.

A more conservative and perhaps more realistic build-out analysis was presented utilizing only vacant and developable land within each of the zoning districts in the target area. The outcome using this methodology obviously produced a more limited future build-out projection within each of the zones. For example, in Downtown (DB1), a total of eleven vacant parcels (approximately 40 acres) were identified.
with a development potential of approximately 1.24 million sf. This would result in build-out significantly less than projected by the Town’s analysis for DB1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB1 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof Office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town analysis</td>
<td>124,133</td>
<td>124,133</td>
<td>124,133</td>
<td>1,489,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant parcels only</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>1771,150</td>
<td>247,961</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>991,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Build-out Methodology**

Utilizing the formulas created by the Town for the Downtown (DB1) zone as a general framework, a matrix of coverage ratios for maximum build-out of the other nine zoning districts that are encompassed within the corridor target area was developed. A summary of the build-out formulas are provided in the table below. A detailed description of each of these zones and our rationale for the build-out formulas is located in Appendix I. For each of the zones, two distinct build-out scenarios were presented:

- one that considered all re-developable properties except those likely to remain for the next twenty years; and
- one that considered only development of currently vacant land suitable for development.

In both scenarios, parcels that did not meet the minimum threshold requirements of the zone (e.g. minimum lot size) were excluded.

**Build-out Analysis Formulas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Building footprint</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB1 Downtown</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 MCMP Center</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 MCMP West</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3 MCMP Municipal</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4 Checkerberry</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5 Old Towne</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6 Main Street</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 Low Density</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary – Maximum Build-out Analysis

Scenario One:
The analysis indicates that the Zoning regulations would allow maximum development in the target area of the following:

- 10,572,883 sf of new residential space (an estimated 253 single family homes and 11,713 units in multi-family structures).
- 1,042,739 sf of new retail, 7,130,323 sf of commercial and 1,042,739 sf of professional office space

NOTE: Commercial uses are all other commercial uses not defined as either retail or professional offices. This would include personal services, hotels, motels, auto service stations, movie theatres and a host of other uses described in the current zoning regulations.

- 12,822,034 sf of new industrial space.
- 306,183 sf of commercial space related to traveler services (lodging, restaurants, etc.)

Additional findings relative to maximum build-out development include:

- Checkerberry and General Industrial districts have the highest potential for development accounting for ¾ of the maximum development potential within the corridor.
- MCMP West and Main Street have the lowest potential for future development in comparison with the other districts. (These are also two of the smallest districts within the corridor).
Build-out Analysis Summary

Scenario 2:

In considering only vacant and undeveloped parcels (the 2nd build-out scenario), the analysis indicates that the Zoning regulations would allow maximum development in the target area of the following:

- 5,489,525 sf of new residential space (an estimated 253 single family homes and 5,888 units in multi-family structures).
- 543,614 sf of new retail, 5,252,655 sf of commercial and 543,614 sf of professional office space
- 10,119,228 sf of new industrial space.
- 298,931 sf of commercial space related to traveler services (lodging, restaurants, etc.)

Additional findings relative to maximum build-out of vacant parcels include:
• Checkerberry and General Industrial districts have the highest potential for development accounting for 88% of the maximum development potential within the corridor.

• MCMP Municipal and Main Street were determined to have no vacant parcels for build-out. MCMP West, MCMP Center and Old Towne have the lowest potential for future development in comparison with the other districts.

### Build-out of Developable Parcels only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Traveler Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>1,771,150</td>
<td>247,961</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>991,844</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP Center</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>265,280</td>
<td>37,139</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>111,418</td>
<td>37,139</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP West</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>431,244</td>
<td>43,124</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>86,249</td>
<td>43,124</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkerberry</td>
<td>285.1</td>
<td>12,417,649</td>
<td>1,241,765</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>3,104,412</td>
<td>620,882</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Towne</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>608,533</td>
<td>60,853</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>121,707</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>298930.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,386.5</td>
<td>53,234,458</td>
<td>7,712,710</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,252,655</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,489,525</td>
<td>10,119,228</td>
<td>298,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second build-out scenario (maximum development of currently vacant and underutilized land) generally presents the community’s likely potential for future property development over the next 20 years.

In a separate analysis as part of the Economic Development Strategy, the consultant team developed a projection of future land use for the town based on current zoning and reasonable market assumptions and population projections. Two of the key market assumptions were:
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1. that the remaining land at the Husky campus becomes available for industrial use by other companies; and

2. that necessary investment for a new interchange occurs within the next five years and that a regional mall or comparable density of retail development builds out in the area by 2015. These land use projections are summarized in the table below.

### Market Support Estimate by Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Prof. Office</th>
<th>Residential*</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Exit 17 Mall</th>
<th>SF units</th>
<th>MF units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>12,654</td>
<td>65,760</td>
<td>21,920</td>
<td>1,287,250</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>12,972</td>
<td>131,520</td>
<td>43,840</td>
<td>2,018,250</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Residential square footage is calculated based on an average of 750 sf per multi-family unit and 2,000 sf per single family home.

As the table indicates, residential units are projected to increase by 1,397 by 2025. At the current average household size of 2.84 persons per household, the projected new units would accommodate a population increase of 3,967 assuming no attrition of existing units.

It is worth noting that based on 2000 census data; Milton is experiencing a very tight housing market. The homeownership vacancy rate in 2000 was 0.4% and the rental vacancy rate was 2.2%. Typical vacancy rates for a healthy housing market are 1% and 5% respectively. This is to say that the Milton market would benefit from some additional housing construction even without a population increase. When vacancy rates increase significantly above these “standards”, home prices and rental rates are forced downward as supply greatly exceeds demand in the market place – property values decrease – owners cut back on investments in maintenance and upkeep particularly in the rental market. Prolonged disinvestment in housing eventually leads to abandonment where vacant and deteriorated housing creates health and safety problems for the community.
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At the other end of the spectrum, a tight housing market results in different problems. When vacancy rates decrease significantly below the “standards”, home prices and rental rates generally escalate as demand greatly exceeds supply. Property values increase as generally do property taxes. Ultimately, affordability and housing choice become serious problems in the community particularly for low and moderate income families.

The Town’s 2000 population was 9,479. The market support estimate is based on a projected 2025 population of 12,972. Utilizing projection data from the Town of Milton 2003 Comprehensive Plan, a 2025 population of between 13,027 (mean projection) and 17,831 (high projection) is estimated. Either of the build-out scenarios would easily support the high end population projection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build-out Scenarios</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Maximum Build-out</td>
<td>1,042,739</td>
<td>7,130,323</td>
<td>1,042,739</td>
<td>10,572,883</td>
<td>12,822,034</td>
<td>32,610,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out of vacant lands</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,551,586</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,489,525</td>
<td>10,119,228</td>
<td>22,247,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Support Estimate</td>
<td>131,520</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>43,840</td>
<td>2,018,250</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>4,243,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the obvious differences between the Market Support Estimate and the Build-out Scenarios can be seen in the projection for single family homes and multi-unit apartments. The market assessment projects a total of 777 new single family homes and 619 multi-family units by 2025. Under the build-out scenarios, only 253 single family homes and between 5,888 and 11,713 units in multi-family structures are projected. It is the conclusion of this research that the market estimate is more realistic.

By definition, the build-out analysis is based on the maximum possible development that is allowed by regulation. Single family dwellings is the primary allowed use in the R3 district. Build-out of this district within the target area accounted for the projection of 253 homes. Single family dwelling is also an allowed use in several of the other districts analyzed in the target area including DB1 (if as part of a PUD). However, all of these zoning districts also allow for much denser development including a mix of commercial, industrial and multi-family residential uses. Therefore, the build-out scenarios did not consider single family as a potential use since it would not result in maximum build-out of the districts.
SECTION VI:

LAND USE PROJECTIONS

The build-out analysis provides a good overview of the development that is possible in Milton given its current zoning regulations and existing environmental conditions. The build-out analysis considered two “maximum” development scenarios: one involving all parcels in the target area\(^1\); and one that considers only development of vacant land. This land use analysis projects the “likely” development scenarios (land uses) that will evolve in the target area over the next 20 years. It is also intended to make recommendations that enhance Milton’s opportunity to encourage the most desirable development within the corridor during this time period.

The analysis begins by examining the current land use composition of each of the zoning districts and evaluating the performance of each land use category (residential, commercial, industrial, etc.) in terms of property taxes generated. This provides an overview of both the types of land uses indigenous to the zone and an evaluation of how these uses have contributed to Milton’s tax base. From the descriptions provided in the Town’s assessment data base, the current land use was determined for approximately 86% of the parcels and determined for 80% of the acreage within the Route 7 Corridor Study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>AV/acre</th>
<th>% acres</th>
<th>% AV</th>
<th>Estimated New Assessed value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>147.1</td>
<td>$18,080,000</td>
<td>$122,918</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>$30,079,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP Center</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>$8,145,800</td>
<td>$142,984</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>$15,522,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP West</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td>$7,879</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP Municipal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>$139,900</td>
<td>$28,337</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>$272,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkerberry</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>423.4</td>
<td>$18,500,700</td>
<td>$43,692</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>$33,310,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Towne Residential</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>$7,502,400</td>
<td>$162,707</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>$13,874,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) As noted in the analysis, certain properties classified as “20 year parcels” were excluded from the redevelopment scenario. These properties are not expected to change use over the next 20 years and they are specifically defined for each of the zoning districts in the target area.
The analysis then compares the current land use composition with the build-out scenarios and makes a general assessment of the likely and/or desirable land use development for the future.

As noted previously, there are significant and not unexpected differences between the Build-out Analysis and the Market Support Analysis conducted as part of the Economic Development Strategy for this project. The Build-out analysis projects the development that is possible given the existing zoning regulations and environmental conditions. The Market analysis projects the likely development given current land use and economic trends. The market projections essentially serve as a reality check on the maximum build-out projections.

The table below compares the projection of future development in Milton over the next twenty years based on maximum build-out and market support. Overall, the total maximum development allowed by current conditions (22 million sf) is more than 5 times greater than the development projected by the market analysis (4.2 million sf).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build-out Projections</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build-out of vacant lands</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,551,586</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,489,525</td>
<td>10,119,228</td>
<td>22,247,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Support Estimate</td>
<td>131,520</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>43,840</td>
<td>2,018,250</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>4,243,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population increase (either local or “imported” as visitors or workers who live elsewhere) drives development. As municipal population grows, there is a typical demand for housing and community services that spurs new development in the community. Other development may occur because of its capacity to draw from a regional population base (e.g. a major shopping mall) or to entice new workers to the area because of job opportunities (e.g. a new manufacturing facility).
Summary Land Use Projections

From the property descriptions provided in the data base, land use designations could be allocated for approximately 86% of the parcels and 80% of the property acreage within the target area (see table below). Based on land use designation, nearly one-half of the acreage within the area is vacant land (1,028 acres – 48%). Single family residences comprise 766 acres or 35.8% and general commercial uses make-up an additional 5.1% of the area (108 acres).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Totals</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>AV/acre</th>
<th>% acres</th>
<th>% AV</th>
<th>New Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>766.3</td>
<td>$55,232,300</td>
<td>$72,077</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>$107,702,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>$6,071,600</td>
<td>$75,744</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>$11,839,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>$23,590,000</td>
<td>$218,305</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>$37,744,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>$5,595,800</td>
<td>$216,807</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>$8,953,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>$1,647,500</td>
<td>$145,539</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>$2,636,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>$8,753,800</td>
<td>$148,344</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>$8,753,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>$378,200</td>
<td>$6,196</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$378,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,028.0</td>
<td>$5,507,300</td>
<td>$5,357</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>$5,507,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>2,139.7</td>
<td>$106,776,500</td>
<td>$49,903</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$183,515,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of tax base, single family residential uses account for nearly 52% of the assessed property value of the target area and commercial uses 22% using pre-reappraisal numbers. Commercial use has the highest property value per acre in the target area of $218,305 followed by retail uses at $216,807 per acre. The initial build-out analysis for the target area identified approximately 1,856 acres of vacant land with a development potential of 53.6 million sf. As noted in the preceding land use analysis, a number of adjustments were made to the build-out analysis resulting in the projected build-out shown in the table below.
As described in the preceding analysis, the overall land use projections are considerably less than the build-out scenario for vacant and developable land for the various reasons stated. A comparison of the maximum build-out scenario and the future land use projections are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Traveler Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>1,771,150</td>
<td>247,961</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>991,884</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP Center</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>265,280</td>
<td>37,139</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>111,418</td>
<td>37,139</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP West</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>431,244</td>
<td>43,124</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>86,249</td>
<td>43,124.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP Municipal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkerberry</td>
<td>285.1</td>
<td>12,417,649</td>
<td>1,241,765</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>3,104,412</td>
<td>620,882</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Towne</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>608,533</td>
<td>60,853</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>121,707</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>657.4</td>
<td>21,477,911</td>
<td>1,073,896</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,073,896</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Commercial</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>1,992,870</td>
<td>298,931</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>298,930.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Industrial</td>
<td>327.6</td>
<td>14,269,820</td>
<td>4,709,041</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,418,081</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out projection</td>
<td>1,386.5</td>
<td>53,234,458</td>
<td>7,712,710</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,252,655</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,489,525</td>
<td>10,119,228</td>
<td>298,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use projection</td>
<td>1,151.2</td>
<td>37,682,014</td>
<td>5,230,005</td>
<td>539,252</td>
<td>2,379,619</td>
<td>663,233</td>
<td>2,843,266</td>
<td>4,303,467</td>
<td>298,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table also projects the expected impacts of the future land use development in terms of job growth and increased property value. Based on the future land use projections outlined, it is estimated that...
approximately 3.6 million sf of commercial-related development, 4.3 million sf of new industrial space and 2.8 million sf of residential construction will be built in the target area over the next twenty years. Total assessed value of new development is estimated at approximately $852 million within the target area. The projected development would create an estimated 17,976 new jobs, 898 new single family homes and 1,397 new residential rental apartments.

The projected residential development would increase the town’s population by 6,518 based on current average household size (see table below). Population increase also has potential impact on the local school system. Using the current percentages of school age children in the population, we have projected the increase through 2025 as shown in the table below. Although the projected population for each school age category in below the threshold for requiring new facilities, it is expected that there will be some pressure to add a new elementary school by 2025.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Impact on Schools</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># new households</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>2,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average hh size</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New population</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>6,518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-11 yr old children  
- 0.117 298 464 763 600 1 elementary schools needed

12-13 yr old children  
- 0.032 82 127 209 600 0 middle schools needed

14-17 yr old children  
- 0.059 150 234 385 1150 0 high schools needed

Total 530 826 1,356

It should be noted that these projections are based upon maximum build out scenarios described in this report, not on census population projections. The school district is currently facing declining enrollment. If maximum build out is realized, that trend would change significantly.
SECTION VII:
STRATEGIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Land Use and Transportation Recommendations

This section of the report outlines specific land use and transportation enhancements in the build-out target area that will assist the town to accommodate needed growth without compromising community character. This inventory of actions must be continuously assessed in order to address emerging issues and take advantage of positive trends. New actions will be added to this strategy over time. It is anticipated that the Selectboard and Planning Commission will agree to update the Zoning Regulations, Subdivision Regulations and Comprehensive Plan based upon the recommendations in this plan.

The most fundamental finding from all of the above research is that current zoning in the Town of Milton allows for future build-out of residential, commercial and industrial development well in excess of what the market is likely to support and/or is desirable for the community. A variety of suggestions is provided to modify the land management framework to target and achieve sustainable growth across all land use types to create a balanced tax base.

The transportation part of this assessment recommends a range of improvements to the general operational efficiency of Route 7 and specific proposals for new transportation amenities for the Town Core and adjacent areas. The cost of construction of the final suggested improvements to Route 7 and Town Core Street System can only be estimated at this time. As a part of the final report issued by RSG some estimates for the cost of construction will be provided. Typical costs include acquisition of property, survey, design, construction, construction inspection and other related costs. In some cases, the costs to construct key links can be associated with private development. It is important, however, that work done between the adoption of the plan and the actual construction of the new street systems is done in compliance with the identified improvements. As an example, should the decision be made to reserve
sixty feet of right of way for the new local street between Bombardier Road and Middle Road, any utility work done in the corridor should be completed in such a way so as not to conflict with the construction of the new street.

**Strategy 1: Modify Zoning Districts to Achieve Sustainable Growth**

As stated in the introduction above, the build out analysis and land use projections concluded that the current land management framework that allows residential, commercial and industrial development well in excess of what the market is likely to support or the community (including imported visitors and workers) would desire or require. The actions in Strategy One focus on changes to the existing land management framework to enable the Town to achieve sustainable growth.

**Action Items:**

1-1) Consider downzoning height requirements in many of the districts in the Route 7 Corridor area. Today many of the districts allow building heights significantly greater than what presently exists – DB1 and M1 districts allow 5 story construction; M2 and M4 allow 4 story construction; M6, I2 and C1 allow 3 stories. The majority of buildings in town are one and two stories in height and modern infill and formula retail do not exceed two stories. Allowing new development significantly out of scale with existing buildings would disrupt the existing character of Milton. The Town does not want to limit growth. It wants to encourage downtown development that might eventually result in the need for taller buildings that could become the norm through infill development and parcel assembly. The town has significant vacant, developable land to accommodate future growth even while limiting new building constructions to a scale compatible with existing structures. The Town should adjust building heights for each district as follows:
## Zone District Name Current Building Height Allowed Recommended Building Height Allowed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Current Building Height Allowed</th>
<th>Recommended Building Height Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB1</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>5 Stories</td>
<td>4 Stories*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>MCMP Center</td>
<td>5 Stories</td>
<td>3 Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>MCMP West</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>MCMP Municipal</td>
<td>Currently Parkland</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Checkerberry</td>
<td>4 Stories</td>
<td>3 Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Old Towne</td>
<td>4 Stories</td>
<td>3 Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>General Industrial</td>
<td>3 Stories</td>
<td>3 Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Interstate Commercial</td>
<td>Currently Vacant</td>
<td>2 Stories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Four usable stories are allowed, with an additional level of at grade or below ground parking as appropriate.

1-2) Limit the allowable uses within certain zones on the Route 7 Corridor. For example, a number of districts (DB1, M1 and M4) allow for a wide array of residential, commercial and some industrial uses. (Commercial uses include personal and professional service uses currently allowed by the current zoning.)

In the build-out analysis and land use projections for the Downtown (DB1), we did not consider light industrial use as a viable option. Retail storefront use and upper floor commercial office and residential development would be most appropriate to create and enhance a vibrant downtown environment. Being specific about the types of residential development that can occur in each zone will help to harness the aggressive housing market and ensure that new residential projects met established Town goals (additional recommendations about residential development follow).
As noted in the analysis a number of the large vacant parcels in this district are also adjacent to existing residential uses. It was assumed that about 75% of the vacant land could be developed for commercial and industrial allowing 25% of the land to serve as buffer between the residential neighborhoods. It should also be noted that that are 76 acres of existing residential property in the I2 district that would also require some buffering as new industrial/commercial projects are developed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Recommended Changes to Zoning Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB1</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Emphasize commercial development – perhaps with development incentives or density bonuses and better define the allowed types and densities of residential uses. Eliminate light industrial as an allowed land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>MCMP Center</td>
<td>Encourage multi family residential uses. Restrict retail and industrial use in the district in order to concentrate it in the core. Encourage development of upper two floors of 3-story buildings as residential apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>MCMP West</td>
<td>Encourage development of single family homes unless there is a realistic expectation that the school will relocate from its parcel in this district in which case a range of uses should be considered. If the school is expected to expand in its present location, existing vacant parcels should be reserved for that use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>MCMP Municipal</td>
<td>No change anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Checkerberry</td>
<td>Encourage commercial and retail uses on lands that front Route Seven with professional offices or residential apartments on the upper floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Old Towne</td>
<td>Commercial and retail on the first floor with residential apartments above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Maintain Single Family Residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Maintain Single Family Residences. Due to some limiting environmental conditions in this district, encourage use of Planned Residential Development guidelines to encourage flexibility of design and development that promotes the most appropriate use of land for development while preserving sensitive environmental areas for open space or less intrusive uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>General Industrial</td>
<td>75% of land should be developed for commercial and industrial use. 25% should serve as a buffer of either open space or residential use adjacent to existing residential properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Interstate Commercial</td>
<td>No change anticipated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1-3) Review the performance of each zoning district annually to determine the success of local land management and achievement of 20 year impact targets. The land use projections offer 20 year impact targets for job creation, residential unit growth and increase in assessed value by zoning district. The Town should complete an annual report card on the efficiency of their land management approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>New Jobs Created</th>
<th>New Residential Units Created</th>
<th>Total Assessed Value of New Development pre-reappraisal</th>
<th>Total Assessed Value of New Development post reappraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB1</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>$39.3 Million</td>
<td>$66.9 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>MCMP Center</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$3.1 Million</td>
<td>$5.9 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>MCMP West</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$2.0 Million</td>
<td>$6.0 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>MCMP Municipal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Checkerberry</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>$170.0 Million</td>
<td>$300.6 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Old Towne</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$1.4 Million</td>
<td>$2.7 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>$28.7 Million</td>
<td>$56.2 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>General Industrial</td>
<td>10,931</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$251.0 Million</td>
<td>$391.7 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Interstate Commercial</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$14.0 Million</td>
<td>$27.4 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-4) Reduce the number of zoning amendment requests by ensuring that the existing zoning meets the Towns goals and that the rationale for each district definition and allowed uses is clear and widely understood. Where requests for amendments are potentially appropriate, the Town should require a series of special studies to enable evaluation of the request. These studies could include:

- An assessment of how the project specifically advances the Towns goals as described in the comprehensive plan and all other studies that are relevant.
- A market assessment (whether residential, commercial or industrial) in a format selected by the Town.
A cost of services analysis describing the potential community, tax base and school district impacts of new development

A business plan outlining the feasibility and financing plan/commitments for the proposed project

A complete analysis of possible environmental constraints and the impact of development on environmental conditions both on the property and on affected properties (which could be a huge number of properties if the change, for example, affected a farm located over an aquifer or adjacent to a water supply.

A complete transportation and traffic analysis, particularly if the property is located on the Route 7 Corridor

1-5) For multi unit projects and multi family projects, allow flexibility in density requirements to allow for density bonuses for certain types of development to increase cost effectiveness and create scale.

1-6) Adopt design or subdivision standards that require new site infrastructure which reduces sprawl and development costs by requiring narrower roadways, shared driveways, sidewalks, green space and pedestrian amenities

1-7) Adjust the definition and requirements of visibility triangles to provide for buildings to be placed close to the road in areas where maintaining the street edge and building wall is appropriate including the downtown core. Several of the zoning districts in the Route 7 corridor area (Old Towne, Checkerberry, Main Street, Downtown, MCMP Center and MCMP West) have minimum front setbacks less than 25 feet and in some case zero setbacks. In these districts, existing buildings are situated fairly close to the street right of way and the visibility triangle requirements should not apply.
1-8) Develop an “official map” showing all planned and new streets, highways, right-of-ways, drainage systems, parks, infrastructure and other physical features describing where infrastructure will be and where it will not be.

1-9) Modify subdivision requirements to provide for Cluster Development to preserve the maximum amount of open space by clustering development on smaller lots in concentrated areas of a parcel closer than would otherwise be allowed in a conventional subdivision. The approach creates open space or protects environmental features on the remainder of the property without increasing density for the parcel as a whole. Cluster development has the added advantage of reducing the cost of infrastructure. Cluster development can be used on parcels where there are no critical environmental features to create density. It is particularly useful to create urban scale adjacent to town core areas. The appropriate type of open space in the Town Core would be neighborhood parks.

1-10) Modify subdivision requirements to provide for Conservation Subdivisions as an enhancement of cluster development. A conservation subdivision accomplishes community goals through a creative design process that identifies primary and secondary conservation areas. Wetlands, floodplains, and steep slopes, in addition to a large portion of the flat, dry, and otherwise buildable land is set aside on each parcel. Lot sizes are reduced and the allowed development is arranged to “fit” onto the unconstrained land. It is also necessary to develop an approach to manage set-aside lands associated with conservation subdivisions. Conservation subdivisions require that clustering be located on less sensitive portions of a parcel.

1-11) Provide for the use of incentive zoning which provides an incentive, such as a density bonus, in exchange for specific amenities from a developer. A density bonus allows for the development of more units in a zoning district than would normally be allowed in exchange for enhancing or preserving a designated resource, such as an open space or recreation area or providing some other...
public benefit such as park amenities or workforce housing. Some communities charge a fee to
developers in exchange for a density bonus. The Town should develop an open space plan for the
management of public lands including set aside lands resulting from cluster and conservation
subdivisions and use of local PRD’s.

1-12) Use a buffering overlay to protect existing and planned residential uses from planned commercial
and industrial expansion

1-13) Adopt subdivision requirements to protect and maintain natural landscapes and rural character
such as requiring protection of mature trees or habitat areas

1-14) Develop design standards for new developments addressing streetscape expectations and
architectural features and create design districts to address the different character of different parts
of the Town Core including Main Street and other parts of the Route 7 Corridor

1-15) Provide an array of programs and incentives to encourage growth in the DB1 district including
perhaps façade and streetscape programs; loan and grant programs to encourage economic
development and the mix of commercial and residential uses desired in the Downtown; property
tax abatement on new construction

Strategy 2: Increase Operational Efficiency Along the Route 7 Corridor

The Town of Milton would like to encourage significant growth along the Route 7 Corridor, with special
emphasis on increasing density and a mix of uses in the DB1 Zone. The impacts of future development
are dependent not only on the amount of square footage developed, but also on the types of trips
associated with this development. The impacts of traffic from new land uses could be substantial. If, for
example, new uses draw visitors or shoppers using automobiles, this could reverse the typical traffic
pattern at high commuting times and create excessive volumes. However, if some or all of the following
actions are integrated into the “system,” then transportation impacts can be improved.
Action Items:

2-1) Employ strategies suggested for the Town Core including access control, and circulation options through the development of parallel road systems and traffic signals at selected intersections.

2-1) Create a transportation system that encourages other modes such as walking, bicycles, etc. with a scale that allows people to park at one location and walk to other destinations that are components of their trip and increase the “person carrying” ability of the corridor

2-3) Encourage land uses that attract trips in the “off direction” during peak hours

2-4) Create a transportation system that provides “options” to users in their choice of route from source to destination (home to shopping, etc.)

2-5) Implement an “access management” strategy that encourages the collection of driveways to common locations

2-6) Examine opportunities to provide traffic controls at strategic intersections that both allow “progression” along Route 7 while creating “adequate gaps” for unsignalized intersections upstream and downstream of the control devices

2-7) The Town should examine necessary rights of way to accommodate the transportation system over both the short term and long term. In establishing a “necessary right of way” the Town should examine width for highway geometry (short term and long term), parking, sidewalks, other modes, land for streetscapes, utility easements, land for top or toe of slopes, snow storage etc.

2-8) Integrate transportation recommendations into the planning and zoning process so that development projects brought before the Town will be required to be achieving the transportation goals for access, parking, circulation and safety.
Town of Milton, VT
Transportation and Land Use Plan for Route 7

Strategy 3: Make Attractive Transition Zones Available for Other Industries

There are active and growing industries that do not fit easily into existing industrial and downtown zones including the construction industry, home improvement goods and services. The town also has an active used car sector that usually likes to operate near similar businesses concerns. These industries provide employment to current residents and may serve an important function in the development process if they are properly located and designed with concern for aesthetic integration into adjacent areas. These industries should be located in transition zones that are carefully crafted to prohibit haphazard development. The zones should be located along key commercial corridors outside of the DB1 district.

Action Items:

3-1) Develop transition zones along the Route 7 corridor to encourage development of businesses that are important to the economy but do not fit in downtown or in an industrial park.

3-2) Enforce current regulations to improve the appearance of properties along the Route 7 corridor.

3-3) Discourage a linear development pattern along the Route 7 corridor, and provide a minimum set of standards for road frontage appearance. The current pattern clashes with the need for an appealing gateway to the Town Core.

3-4) Encourage the relocation of existing businesses into transition areas designed to mitigate the problems caused by the current pattern of automobile oriented sprawl on Route 7.

3-5) Pursue development of a park and ride lot in the Town Hall area along the Route 7 corridor.

Strategy 4: Update Land Use System to Manage Industrial & Large Scale Commercial Development
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The Town must ensure flexibility in industrial zones and transitional zones to accommodate larger commercial businesses that are not appropriate in the Town Core, along a rejuvenated Route 7 corridor.

Action Items:

4-1) Implement the extension of municipal wastewater to the Catamount Industrial Park using USEDA grant funds. The need for infrastructure has led GBIC to stop taking inquiries for certain types of development at the park. The current level of municipal services supports lower value-added development, mostly warehousing.

4-2) Complete the municipal wastewater treatment plant capacity expansion to 1,000,000 GPD and hire personnel needed to operate the expanded system. Establish sewer service areas designed to promote and enhance the Town’s mixed-use Town Core and industrial areas.

4-3) Update the Town Comprehensive Plan to enable zoning alternative locations for companies that are in-between commercial and industrial entities such as research facilities, back-office services such as digital printing.

4-4) To help simplify and streamline the Town’s regulations, they should be amended as necessary to allow Staff to assume a greater role in reviewing applications for development. Pre-application meetings with the Technical Advisory Committee, which consists of key Staff members, should be encouraged to assist applicants in navigating the permit process. The Technical Advisory Committee should incorporate the elements of this Land Use and Transportation Study into its review process, in addition to the tasks already performed.

4-5) The Town has recently secured state authorization for an additional 10-year term for each of the existing Tax Increment Financing districts. The Town needs growth of taxable property in the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) areas on the Husky Campus, in the Catamount Industrial Park and on
the Sanderson properties in order to help pay for the wastewater treatment and collection system project and future infrastructure investments. This project will create a highly valued municipal service and vitally essential economic development infrastructure. The next step for the Town is to pursue establishment of a TIF for the Town Core area, as soon as VEPC initiates this process on a statewide basis.

4-6) Examine the allowed uses in industrial zones and determine locations and amenities that are suitable for larger commercial operations. Encourage industrial parks to expand amenities that are attractive to both light industrial and non-industrial operations such as childcare, small food stores, small restaurants and walking paths.
Strategy 5: Continue to Refine Residential Uses Along the Route 7 Corridor

The Town should continuously monitor land use trends along the corridor and adjust the land use strategy to manage emerging opportunities.

Action Items:

5-1) Modify zoning surrounding the DB1 zone as necessary to include higher density residential building where appropriate along the rest of the Route 7 corridor, allowing more units to be accessible by walking or biking. The areas around the DB1 zone should be gradually reduced in density as it get further away from the core. The town will continue to enable accessory apartments within owner-occupied single family dwellings and buildings that accommodate home occupations, as these are State requirements.

5-2) Revise the Town zoning to replace all Planned Residential Developments with Planned Unit Developments, as appropriate. Planned Unit Developments permit flexibility in the application of land development regulations for the purposes consistent with State statutes (Title 24, Chapter 117, and Section 4302). Encourage Planned Unit Developments outside the Town Core to conserve open space and diversify housing choice. Provide density bonuses for Planned Unit Developments that provide exemplary protection of rural characteristics.

5-3) Continue to make use of phasing when appropriate and impact fees when appropriate for residential development to help ensure that the pace of housing development does not overburden roadways, municipal services, including schools and recreational facilities.
Strategy 6: Implement the proposed Route 7 Town Core Circulation Project

All of the current planning activities have highlighted development in the Town core as the greatest opportunity available to the Town today. As the existing conditions analysis for this study was completed, it was determined that improvements to the road system in and adjacent to the downtown core should be considered. If resources are not available to pursue these projects, the Town should plan for their future development and coordinate streetscape improvements in a manner that would encourage other roadway improvements and new amenities. Other Town core transportation and streetscape requirements are addressed in the companion Streetscape and Accessibility Design Study.

Action Items:

6-1) Haydenberry Drive, should be realigned to line up with Center Drive across Route Seven. This will likely be a new road, and Haydenberry will likely remain in its current form or as a limited-access version. The traffic study will provide more guidance on what to do with the existing Haydenberry Drive.

6-2) Construct a new street connection between Bombardier Road and Middle Road in phases as specific land development proposals come before the Town. The Town must identify the location of the street and the right of way necessary to accommodate the street. As development projects come before the Town, property can be reserved for the street and it could be constructed under a schedule that accommodates needs of the Town and property owners.

6-3) Plan for connections between Middle Road and Route 7 and the connection between Railroad Street and Route 7. The first connection, Middle Road to Route 7, is the more important connection. If this connection is constructed as part of the new Shopping Center, and the new connection between Middle Road and Railroad Street is provided, a major component of the system is in place.
6-4) Define the remaining portion of the circulation system behind the shopping center that connects Route 7 to Haydenberry Road, dependent upon identification of right of way and cooperation with the land owners.

6-5) Plan for development of a new street parallel to and south of Route 7 roughly between Bombardier Road and Racine Road. This new street is important to development along the south side of Route 7 because it permits access from the back and connects these uses to the eastern part of the Town without the need to use Route 7. In addition, it provides important value to Route 7 by permitting “good” access control along Route 7 and a chance to properly plan the best Route 7 intersections.

6-6) Identify the potential corridors and plan for future street additions through the reservation of adequate right of way that allows proper transportation system design and land for utilities, highway construction and proper setbacks.

**Strategy 7: Advance Town Core Development by Supporting a Range of Land Uses**

The strength of the Town Core as a retail and commercial destination will be its diversity. The potential for retail development to satisfy local needs alone is substantial. There is also significant commercial development market demand if design and traffic improvements are accomplished. The DB1 Zoning District is where the densest development will occur, although the Town’s growth will also occur in the adjacent zones, which together may form the Town Core.

**Action Items:**

7-1) Pursue expansion of public infrastructure including water, wastewater, sidewalks, and an expanded road network throughout the Town Core and into immediately adjacent areas.
7-2) Enhance pedestrian friendly environments incorporating streetlights, street trees, signage and public spaces and develop guidelines for these streetscape elements.

7-3) Encourage passenger rail service to Milton and develop potential station locations in the Main Street Area and consider the development of other public transportation and transit resources if funding can be identified.

7-4) Implement the storm water management strategy developed in 2006. Due to the sandy soils and high infiltration rate present in the core, the town will have to be creative about storm water management, for example, recommending onsite management whenever possible and using infiltration measures such as rain gardens and grass swales. The town should ensure that its approach is consistent with emerging State statutes, including those regulating designated downtowns, village centers, and new town centers, especially as they relate to requirements for amenities such as curbing.

7-5) Develop a multi-modal center in the Town Core as recommended by the 2006 Streetscape Study to include bus, taxi, automobile, bicycle and pedestrian amenities.

7-6) Develop a Town Core parking strategy to accommodate a mix of users. Consider development of public-private partnerships to support additional parking lots, shared parking arrangements and perhaps construction of a parking structure alone or as part of a future hotel development.

Strategy 8: Plan for the Potential Exit 17A - I-89 Interchange and its Effect on the Route 7 Corridor

The possible development of Exit 17A creates some uncertainty about the competitive advantages of currently available business sites in the Town. The best way to minimize this uncertainty is for the Town
to define policy, monitor the project and share relevant information with residents and other partners. Should this major infrastructure investment take place, the Town must be prepared to manage land in the area to ensure controlled and efficient growth, balancing the potential for increased tax base with impacts on the Town Core and Route 7 corridor.

Part of this planning examined the potential for a new interchange along I-89 at West Milton Road. Analysis of the potential project involved two components: the effect on existing traffic of a new interchange at this location and the effect on land use around the interchange and along the Route 7 corridor to the east. In general, information about traffic characteristics suggests that its impact on existing traffic is not likely to be significant from West Milton Road through the Town of Milton. It is likely to reduce traffic on Route 7 between the southern Town line (Catamount Industrial Park) to West Milton Road.

**Action Items:**

8-1) Closely monitor the demand for and potential planning and recommendations for development of the 17A interchange. It is generally recognized that any new interchange at this location, if approved, would likely take at least a decade before construction was complete.

8-2) Continue dialogue with residents about the desirability of large scale development surrounding any future interchange.

8-3) Carefully define the appropriate scale and character of land use around a future interchange and update zoning and building standards to ensure suitability of development. How much traffic is drawn to the area around a new interchange is directly related to the type and density of development permitted by the Town. The important relationship is that the “capacity,” or ability of
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the highway system to carry a given volume of traffic, differs greatly between an interchange (Exit 17A) and an urban arterial (Route 7) with the interchange carrying substantially more traffic.

8-4) Advocate for the reservation of right of way along Route 7 to accommodate any increase in volume a potential new interchange may generate.

8-5) Should the Exit 17A interchange be funded, the Town should participate actively in the design process. The type of interchange has not been identified so the land required to construct the ramps and provide intersection operation at the interchange is not yet known. Federal Highway Administration, and possibly Vtrans may require that lands in close proximity to the interchange be controlled “without access”. “Without access” restricts opportunities for adjacent privately owned properties to access the State highway system. This does not restrict the development of the privately owned land. It only restricts the point in which traffic associated with any private development can access public highways.

Strategy 9: Regional Cooperation and Monitoring on Long Term Trends

The Town should work cooperatively to participate in and implement regional transportation plans. It should monitor regional economic development strategies and adjust land use and transportation plans to ensure that they can control, shape or serve as an incentive to new development. By cooperating on a regional basis, Milton will be able to leverage scarce resources.

Action Items:

9-1) Work with regional marketing and economic development entities such as GBIC and Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, and the Lake Champlain Regional Chamber of Commerce, and planning resources such as the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
and the Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization to continuously evaluate economic opportunities and the associated land use and transportation opportunities

9-2) Advocate on the Town’s behalf to the State regarding transportation policies and initiatives.

9-3) Ensure that all projects identified in this plan are ultimately designed and implemented in conformance with State statutes. This will require that the town monitor the ever-changing planning landscape in the state and continuously update the plan to keep pace with changes. This is a particular concern for the Town Core that may in the future be nominated for designation as a “new town center” or “growth center”, processes with an extensive set of planning and public process requirements.

9-4) Review current zoning and business regulations to determine their impact on the tourism industry and modify them as appropriate to allow small inns and bed & breakfast hotels in residential zones.
Appendix I

Complete Build Out Analysis Narrative

Town of Milton, Vermont

Build-out Analysis

A build-out analysis is a model of a community’s potential future, given the status of the land at the time of analysis, the dimensions and characteristics of that land that would affect development (i.e. wetlands, unsuitable soils, excessive slopes, etc.), and regulations that govern the development of the land. The analysis estimates the maximum possible development that is allowed by regulation (zoning) on a parcel and within the designated area for analysis. The analysis considers not only the development of vacant land but also the potential redevelopment of existing property with the exception of “20 year parcels”. These parcels are specifically identified in each of the zoning districts and are uses considered not likely to change over the next twenty years. The capacity of infrastructure to accommodate possible development is not factored into a build-out analysis.

The build-out analysis focused on a targeted area surrounding Milton’s Town Core that is generally described as follows:

- The north to south parameter of this corridor is described as properties along and adjacent to Route 7 South from the Old Towne, Main Street and Checkerberry Areas south to the Colchester Town Line.
- The east to west parameter is defined as all properties along the north-south corridor defined above, west from Route 7 to Interstate 89 and east from Route 7 to the Cobble Hill ridge line.
- The corridor also includes the parcel of property west of I-89 that is zoned Interstate Commercial (C1) and all properties that are in the Sewer Service Area #7.
A zoning map of the target area is presented on the following page of this report and details the actual area that was analyzed.

Based on GIS data base analysis, the target area encompasses approximately 2,900 acres, including 719 parcels in 10 different zoning districts. A summary of statistics for each of the zones is illustrated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th># of Parcels</th>
<th>Acres/Parcel</th>
<th>Assessed value per acre</th>
<th>Estimated New A. V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown DB1</td>
<td>172.9</td>
<td>$19,015,900</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$110,008</td>
<td>$31,636,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP Center M1</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>$8,145,800</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$127,717</td>
<td>$15,522,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP West M2</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>$9,949,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>$192,885</td>
<td>$9,949,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP Municipal M3</td>
<td>187.7</td>
<td>$1,568,400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>$8,358</td>
<td>$3,058,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkerberry M4</td>
<td>558.5</td>
<td>$21,738,500</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>$38,922</td>
<td>$39,139,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Towne M5</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>$8,173,000</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$133,699</td>
<td>$15,114,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street M6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>$6,656,800</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$263,740</td>
<td>$12,542,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential R3</td>
<td>1,213.1</td>
<td>$25,580,800</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>$21,087</td>
<td>$49,254,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Commercial C1</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>$5,548</td>
<td>$350,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Industrial I2</td>
<td>505.7</td>
<td>$24,766,800</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>$48,976</td>
<td>$33,667,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,886.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$125,855,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>719</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,603</strong></td>
<td><strong>$210,235,961</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assessed values utilized for the build-out analysis were from the 2005 grand list and therefore are pre-reappraisal numbers. In order to provide the Town with a general tool for assessing the impact of the reappraisal on the build-out analysis, we have approximated the value of the new assessment figures based on “rule of thumb” formulas provided by the Town Assessor. Essentially, residential properties are assumed to double in value less 5%; commercial properties are assumed to increase on average by 60%; industrial and other property types are assumed to retain their pre-appraisal values. The estimated current assessed values are provided in a separate column in the table above and in other tables throughout this document as appropriate.

Geographically, the target area is situated roughly in the central portion of the Town and comprises approximately 7.5% of the Town’s total land acreage, but most of its population. It is also the area most likely to experience development over the next 15 to 20 years.

Zoning is the key to projecting build-out. Zoning controls the parameters (maximum building and lot coverage, maximum building height, minimum setbacks, parking requirements, etc.) and use (types of residential, commercial, industrial uses allowed, etc.) and dictates the requirements for land use development specific to the zone. We have utilized this data to calculate estimated growth potential within the affected corridor and target area. A zone by zone analysis of the build-out projections follow.
Downtown Business District (DB1)

The Town conducted a build-out analysis of lots within the Downtown Business Zone (DB1 Zone). Most of the lots within this zone are under an acre so Town planners set a goal to achieve maximum build-out density for each lot by setting parameters that would consistently apply to each lot. The analysis is based on the following assumptions, which includes a 20 year build-out period:

- Each lot would contain a 5-story building (the maximum height allowed) with the upper four floors multifamily residential and the first floor commercial/office (to meet the DB1's 20% commercial requirement).

- Parking requirements were set to be 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit and 4 spaces (1/employee, 3/customer) per 1,000 sf of commercial/office space.

- The first floor square footage was equally divided by thirds into General Office, Professional Office, and Small Commercial Retail.

- For a 5-story building with the above mix of residential to commercial, the following percentage ratio of lot coverage was utilized:
  
  - 14% building footprint
  - 12% roads, sidewalks utilities
  - 20% open space (required by zoning regulations)
  - 54% parking spaces with 2-way travel lanes

According to Town planners, this formula provides a realistic balance among the coverages stated above for a 5-story mixed use building in the DB1 District. For example, a 5-story, mixed use building on a 40,000 sf lot would require a 5,600 sf building footprint; 21,600 sf parking spaces with 2-way travel lanes (72 spaces); 8,000 sf open space (required by zoning regulations); and 4,800 sf for roads, sidewalks, and utilities. This creates a total of 32 dwelling units (22,400 sf) and 5600 sf of commercial/retail space equally divided into general office, professional office, and small commercial retail space.
The Town applied the percentage ratio to the size of each of the lots that they analyzed and produced a gross square footage (GSF) for residential and commercial uses on each lot. The Town summarized their analysis by traffic analysis zones provided by the consultants. They also provided an overall spreadsheet of parcels that were analyzed within the DB1 zone for build-out (noting 20-year parcels exempt from the analysis because their use was unlikely to change). River Street was able to utilize this overall parcel spreadsheet to generate a build-out analysis of DB1 based on the Town’s parameters. Our results showed a significantly higher maximum build-out scenario than the Town’s analysis. A comparison of the build-out results are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB1 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town analysis</td>
<td>124,133</td>
<td>124,133</td>
<td>124,133</td>
<td>1,489,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant analysis</td>
<td>172.9</td>
<td>4,687,056</td>
<td>656,188</td>
<td>218,729</td>
<td>218,729</td>
<td>218,729</td>
<td>2,624,751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The detailed spreadsheets utilized by the Town and the consultant are provided in the appendix to this report.

We also conducted a more conservative and perhaps more realistic build-out analysis utilizing only vacant and developable land within each of the zoning districts in the target area. The outcome using this methodology obviously produced a more limited future build-out projection within each of the zones. For example, in Downtown (DB1), we identified a total of eleven vacant parcels (approximately 40 acres) with a development potential of approximately 1.24 million sf. This would result in build-out significantly less than projected by the Town’s analysis for DB1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB1 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town analysis</td>
<td>124,133</td>
<td>1,771,150</td>
<td>247,961</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>991,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant parcels only</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>1,771,150</td>
<td>247,961</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>991,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Build-out Methodology

Utilizing the formulas created by the Town for the Downtown (DB1) zone as a general framework, River Street developed a matrix of coverage ratios for maximum build-out of the other nine zoning districts that are encompassed within the corridor target area. A summary of the build-out formulas are provided in the table below. A detailed description of each of these zones and our rationale for the build-out formulas follow. For each of the zones, we prepared two distinct build-out scenarios:

- one that considered all re-developable properties except those likely to remain for the next twenty years; and
- one that considered only development of currently vacant land suitable for development.

In both scenarios, we excluded parcels that did not meet the minimum threshold requirements of the zone (e.g. minimum lot size).

Build-out Analysis Formulas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Building footprint</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB1 Downtown</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 MCMP Center</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 MCMP West</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3 MCMP Municipal</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4 Checkerberry</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5 Old Towne</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6 Main Street</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 Residential</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2 General Industrial</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Commercial</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Milton Crossroads Market Place (MCMP) Center (M1)

Reflecting its central location within the downtown, the M1 District allows for the tallest buildings, highest density and the greatest extent of mixed uses including residential, commercial and some industrial uses. The Dimension requirements for the M1 zone are nearly identical to the DB1 zone. We therefore assumed that the percentage ratio of lot coverage will be similar to DB1:

- 14% building footprint
- 12% roads, sidewalks utilities
- 20% open space (required by zoning regulations)
- 54% parking spaces with 2-way travel lanes

The M1 District within the target corridor encompasses 74 parcels and approximately 64 acres. Most of the lots within this zone (80%) are under an acre in size. Most of these parcels are also developed, generally improved with a house and garage. We identified only two parcels (approximately 6 acres) that are currently vacant land. The average value of property within the M1 District is $127,717 per acre.

Whether property is currently developed or not, we set about to determine the maximum build-out density for each lot by setting parameters (based on the dimension requirements of the zone described above) that would consistently apply to each lot. In the first build-out scenario, we excluded only four properties (a senior housing complex, an apartment complex, and two commercial buildings) that would not be re-developed during the 20 year build-out period. The analysis is based on the following additional assumptions:

- Each lot would contain a 5-story building (the maximum height allowed) with the upper four floors primarily multifamily residential (3 floors on average) with some light manufacturing uses (one floor on average) and the first floor commercial/office.
Parking requirements were set to be 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit and 4 spaces (1/employee, 3/customer) per 1,000 sf of commercial/office/light manufacturing/research space.

The first floor square footage was equally divided by thirds into General Office, Professional Office, and Small Commercial Retail.

Based on the build-out formulas and assumption stated above, we have projected build-out scenarios for the M1 zone within the corridor target area as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M1 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Lt industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum build-out</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>2,276,010</td>
<td>318,641</td>
<td>106,214</td>
<td>106,214</td>
<td>106,214</td>
<td>955,924</td>
<td>318,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant parcels only</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>265,280</td>
<td>37,139</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>111,418</td>
<td>37,139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Milton Crossroads Market Place (MCMP) West (M2)**

The purpose of the M2 District is to allow for a mix of residential and commercial uses, including larger retail buildings such as supermarkets and department stores. The Dimension requirements for the M2 zone are more limiting than the DB1 or M1 zone. Minimum lot size is 20,000 sf instead of 5,000 sf. Maximum building height is 4 stories instead of 5 stories and maximum lot coverage is 70% rather than 80%. We therefore assumed that the percentage ratio of lot coverage for M2 zone as follows:

- 10% building footprint
- 10% roads, sidewalks utilities
- 30% open space (required by zoning regulations)
- 50% parking spaces with 2-way travel lanes
The M2 District within the target corridor encompasses 8 parcels and approximately 52 acres. The primary property in this zone is Milton High School (42 acres) which has been excluded from the build-out analysis. The other seven parcels are vacant and each meets the minimum size requirement of 20,000 sf. The average value of property within the M2 District (excluding the High School) is approximately $11,000 per acre.

For the seven vacant parcels, we determined the maximum build-out density for each lot by setting parameters (based on the dimension requirements of the zone described above) that would consistently apply to each lot. The analysis is based on the following additional assumptions:

- Each lot would contain a 4-story building (the maximum height allowed) with the upper three floors primarily multifamily residential (2 floors on average) with some light manufacturing uses (one floor on average) and the first floor commercial/office.

- Parking requirements were set to be 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit and 4 spaces (1/employee, 3/customer) per 1,000 s.f. of commercial/office/light manufacturing/research space.

- The first floor square footage was equally divided by thirds into General Office, Professional Office, and Small Commercial Retail.

There is a single build-out scenario for the M2 zone since all of the parcels are vacant. Based on the build-out formulas and assumption stated above, we have projected the following build-out scenario for the M2 zone within the corridor target area.
Milton Crossroads Market Place (MCMP) Municipal/Recreation (M3)

The purpose of the M3 District is to allow for institutional establishments and recreational facilities. Although this zone permits planned unit development, we assumed that lands in this zone would remain in recreational or institutional use over the next twenty years. Since we determined that the likelihood of residential, commercial or industrial development in this zone was remote, we did not conduct a build-out analysis of this area.

The M3 District within the target corridor encompasses 3 parcels and approximately 188 acres. The primary property in this zone is the municipal park on Bombardier Road (138 acres).

Checkerberry (M4) District

The purpose of the M4 District is to allow for a mix of residential, commercial and limited industrial uses. The Dimension requirements for the M4 zone are similar to the M2 zone except that the maximum lot coverage is 60% rather than 70%. We therefore assumed that the percentage ratio of lot coverage for M4 zone as follows:

- 10% building footprint
- 10% roads, sidewalks utilities
- 40% open space (required by zoning regulations)
- 40% parking spaces with 2-way travel lanes

The M4 District within the target corridor encompasses 154 parcels and approximately 559 acres. Most of the lots within this zone (70%) are under an acre in size. Most of these parcels are also developed, generally improved with a house and garage or a commercial building. The average value of property within the M4 District is $38,922 per acre.
Whether property is currently developed or not, we set about to determine the maximum build-out density for each lot by setting parameters (based on the dimension requirements of the zone described above) that would consistently apply to each lot. In the first build-out scenario, we excluded eleven properties (six parcels listed as common land, the landfill, a gas terminal, a vet clinic, American Legion Hall, and one commercial building) that would not be re-developed during the 20 year build-out period. We also excluded 56 parcels that did not meet the minimum lot size requirement of 20,000 sf. The second build-out analysis considered vacant parcels only – 22 in total, encompassing 308 acres. The analysis is based on the following additional assumptions:

- Each lot would contain a 4-story building (the maximum height allowed) with the upper three floors primarily multifamily residential (2 ½ floors on average) with some light manufacturing uses (½ floor on average) and the first floor commercial/office. From these assumptions, the resultant mix would be 87 ½% residential, 25% commercial and 12 ½% light manufacturing.

- Parking requirements were set to be 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit and 4 spaces (1/employee, 3/customer) per 1,000 s.f. of commercial/office/light manufacturing/research space.
The first floor square footage was equally divided by thirds into General Office, Professional Office, and Small Commercial Retail.

Based on the build-out formulas and assumption stated above, we have projected build-out scenarios for the M4 zone within the corridor target area as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M4 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF Acres</th>
<th>footprint</th>
<th>Retail GSF</th>
<th>Commercial GSF</th>
<th>Prof office GSF</th>
<th>Residential GSF</th>
<th>Lt industrial GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum build-out</td>
<td>412.1</td>
<td>17,949,334</td>
<td>1,794,933</td>
<td>488,733</td>
<td>488,733</td>
<td>488,733</td>
<td>4,487,333</td>
<td>897,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant parcels only</td>
<td>308.2</td>
<td>13,424,756</td>
<td>1,342,476</td>
<td>447,492</td>
<td>447,492</td>
<td>447,492</td>
<td>3,356,189</td>
<td>671,238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Old Towne Residential/Commercial (M5) District**

The purpose of the M5 District is to allow for mainly residential uses and some limited commercial uses. The Dimension requirements for the M5 zone differ from the M4 zone in several respects: the maximum lot coverage is 50% rather than 60%; maximum building height is 3 stories rather than 4 stories; maximum density is 4 units per acre instead of 7 units per acre; and minimum lot area is 10,000 sf versus 20,000 sf for the M4 zone. We therefore assumed that the percentage ratio of lot coverage for M5 zone as follows:

- 10% building footprint
- 10% roads, sidewalks utilities
- 50% open space
- 30% parking spaces with 2-way travel lanes

The M5 District within the target corridor encompasses 72 parcels and approximately 61 acres. Most of the lots within this zone (78%) are under an acre in size. Most of these parcels are also developed, generally improved with a house and garage. We identified only 6 parcels (5.42 acres) that are currently vacant land. The average value of property within the M5 District is $133,699 per acre.
Following the general methodology utilized with the other zones, we set about to determine the maximum build-out density for each lot by setting parameters (based on the dimension requirements of the zone described above) that would consistently apply to each lot. For the maximum build-out scenario, we excluded six properties (the waste water pump station, the phone building, a restaurant/apartment complex on River Street, senior apartments, the public works garage, and the church museum) assuming that these properties would not be re-developed during the 20 year build-out period. We also excluded 3 parcels that did not meet the minimum lot size requirement of 10,000 sf. For the alternate build-out scenario, we considered only the nine vacant parcels within the zone (approximately 14 acres). The analysis is based on the following additional assumptions:

- Each lot would contain a 3-story building (the maximum height allowed) with the upper two floors multifamily residential and the first floor commercial/office.

- Parking requirements were set to be 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit and 4 spaces (1/employee, 3/customer) per 1,000 s.f. of commercial/office space.

The first floor square footage was equally divided by thirds into General Office, Professional Office, and Small Commercial Retail.

Based on the build-out formulas and assumption stated above, we have projected build-out scenarios for the M5 zone within the corridor target area as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M5 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>2,499,037</td>
<td>249,904</td>
<td>83,301</td>
<td>83,301</td>
<td>83,301</td>
<td>499,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant parcels only</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>608,533</td>
<td>60,853</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>121,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main Street (M6) District

The purpose of the M6 District is to allow for continued use and reuse of existing historic buildings, including new buildings that are sensitive to the existing character of the area. The Dimension requirements for the M6 zone are essentially the same as the M5 zone except that there is not a maximum density for residential unit development. We have assumed that the percentage ratio of lot coverage for M6 zone as follows:

- 10% building footprint
- 10% roads, sidewalks utilities
- 50% open space
- 30% parking spaces with 2-way travel lanes

The M6 District within the target corridor encompasses 33 parcels and approximately 25 acres. Most of the lots within this zone (91%) are under an acre in size. All of these parcels are also developed, generally improved with a house and garage. There are no parcels within the zone that are currently vacant land. The average value of property within the M6 District is $263,740 per acre.

We followed the same methodology to determine the maximum build-out density for each lot by setting parameters (based on the dimension requirements of the zone described above) that would consistently apply to each lot. We excluded five properties (two churches, Masonic temple, a cemetery and a restaurant/apartment complex) that would not be re-developed during the 20 year build-out period. All of the remaining parcels met the minimum lot size requirement of 10,000 sf.

The analysis is based on the following additional assumptions:

- Each lot would contain a 3-story building (the maximum height allowed) with the upper two floors multifamily residential and the first floor commercial/office.

- Parking requirements were set to be 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit and 4 spaces (1/employee, 3/customer) per 1,000 s.f. of commercial/office space.
The first floor square footage was equally divided by thirds into General Office, Professional Office, and Small Commercial Retail.

Based on the build-out formulas and assumption stated above, we have projected build-out scenarios for the M6 zone within the corridor target area as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M6 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum build-out Vacant parcels only</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>875,556</td>
<td>65,427</td>
<td>21,809</td>
<td>21,809</td>
<td>21,809</td>
<td>130,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant parcels only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Density Residential (R3) District

The purpose of the R3 District is to allow for low density development in an area close to the core and with easy access to community services and facilities but which has not yet experienced significant residential development. While this zone allows warehousing within existing agricultural structures, we did not identify any such existing structures within the R3 zone in the target area. We have therefore assumed that the likely build-out scenario for the R3 zone would be residential development, primarily single family. The key Dimension requirements for residential development in the R3 zone are: minimum lot area of 120,000 sf and maximum building coverage of 40%.

We also note that severe environmental limitations affect portions of this zone according to language in the zoning regulations. Typically, environmental constraints can include problem soils not conducive to development, wetlands and related areas, and excessive slopes. We did not have detailed data layers to map environmental conditions for this area and while most environmental conditions can be mitigated, we felt that the increased cost of mitigation would decrease the likelihood of future development in portions of this zone. For this reason, it makes sense to “lower the ceiling” on the amount of land within the zone available for maximum build-out. Therefore, for build-out purposes,
we have assumed that 25% (on average) of the property within this zone is not buildable. Therefore, for calculation purposes, GSF is 75% of the actual acreage for each parcel. We have also assumed that the percentage ratio of lot coverage for R3 zone as follows:

- 5% building footprint
- 15% roads, sidewalks utilities
- 70% open space
- 10% parking spaces with 2-way travel lanes

The R3 District within the target corridor encompasses 193 parcels and approximately 1,213 acres. Most of the lots within this zone (77%) are under an acre in size. Most of these parcels are also developed, generally improved with a house and garage. There are twelve parcels within the zone (657 acres) that are currently vacant or substantially vacant land. The average value of property within the R3 District is $21,087 per acre.

We followed the same methodology to determine the maximum build-out density for each lot by setting parameters (based on the dimension requirements of the zone described above) that would consistently apply to each lot. We excluded 150 parcels that did not meet the minimum lot size requirement of 120,000 sf. The analysis is based on the following additional assumptions:

- Each parcel would be developed for single family homes in accordance with the process and requirements described for Type A Planned Residential Developments (with assumed 25% non-buildable).
- Parking requirements were set to be 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R3 Zoning Maximum build-out</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>footprint</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th># Single family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,213.1</td>
<td>35,759,275</td>
<td>1,787,964</td>
<td>1,787,964</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vacant parcels
only  657  21,477,911  1,073,896  1,073,896  152

General Industrial (I2) District

The purpose of the I2 District is to provide adequate space for industries with room for expansion and outdoor storage space. These areas are not intended for industries that will create retail traffic. Planned Unit Development is encouraged in the zone to cluster development in order to preserve and maintain agriculture, open space and natural areas and to maintain separation and buffering of adjacent residential neighborhoods. The key Dimension requirements for development in the I2 zone are: minimum lot area of 100,000 sf and maximum building coverage of 75%. We have assumed that the percentage ratio of lot coverage for I2 zone as follows:

- 33% building footprint
- 12% roads, sidewalks utilities
- 25% open space
- 30% parking spaces with 2-way travel lanes

The I2 District within the target corridor encompasses 72 parcels and approximately 506 acres. Most of the lots within this zone are larger than 1 acre in size and only 18% of the parcels are under an acre. There are 16 parcels within the zone that are currently vacant land (approximately 190 acres). The average value of property within the I2 District is $48,976 per acre.

Whether property is currently developed or not, we set about to determine the maximum build-out density for each lot by setting parameters (based on the dimension requirements of the zone described above) that would consistently apply to each lot. For the maximum build-out scenario, we excluded 13 properties (12 industrial/commercial buildings and 1 parking lot) that we assumed would not be re-developed during the 20 year build-out period. We also excluded 21 additional properties that did not meet the zone’s minimum lot size requirement of 100,000 sf. For the alternate build-out scenario, we
included only the 16 properties that are currently vacant. The analysis is based on the following additional assumptions:

- Each lot would contain a 3-story building (the maximum height allowed is 35 ft).
- Parking requirements were set to be 1 space per 3 employees for manufacturing, 1 space per employee for research and development facilities, 2 spaces per 3 employees for warehousing operations and 3 spaces per 1,000 s.f. of personal or professional services.
- The overall floor square footage was equally divided by thirds into light industrial, general industrial (manufacturing) and commercial (personal and professional services) uses.

Based on the build-out formulas and assumption stated above, we have projected build-out scenarios for the I2 zone within the corridor target area as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I2 Zoning Maximum build-out Vacant parcels only</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>footprint</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Gen industrial</th>
<th>Lt industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>505.7</td>
<td>17,780,756</td>
<td>5,781,401</td>
<td>5,781,401</td>
<td>5,781,401</td>
<td>5,781,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>14,269,820</td>
<td>4,709,041</td>
<td>4,709,041</td>
<td>4,709,041</td>
<td>4,709,041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interstate Commercial (C1) District**

The purpose of the C1 District is to reserve space for the provision of services to users of the proposed Milton Interstate Access. The key Dimension requirements for development in the C1 zone are: minimum lot area of 40,000 sf and maximum building coverage of 15%. We have assumed that the percentage ratio of lot coverage for C1 zone as follows:

- 15% building footprint
- 12% roads, sidewalks utilities
- 23% open space
The C1 District within the target corridor encompasses 2 parcels and approximately 47 acres. This area is mostly vacant land and contains 1 commercial building. The average value of the 2 parcels is $5,548 per acre.

We determined the maximum build-out density for each lot by setting parameters (based on the dimension requirements of the zone described above) that would consistently apply to each lot. The analysis is based on the following additional assumptions:

- Each lot would contain a 3-story building (the maximum height allowed is 35 ft).
- Parking requirements were set to be 4 spaces (1/employee, 3/customer) per 1,000 s.f. of commercial development space (motels and traveler services).

Based on the build-out formulas and assumption stated above, we have projected build-out scenarios for the C1 zone within the corridor target area as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>footprint</th>
<th>Traveler services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum build-out</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>2,041,222</td>
<td>306,183</td>
<td>306,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant parcels only</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>1,992,870</td>
<td>298,931</td>
<td>298,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary – Maximum Build-out Analysis**

A build-out analysis is a model of a community’s potential future, given the status of the land at the time of analysis, the dimensions and characteristics of that land that would affect development (i.e. wetlands, unsuitable soils, excessive slopes, etc.), and regulations that govern the development of the land. The analysis estimates the maximum possible development that is allowed by regulation (zoning) on a parcel and within the designated area for analysis. The capacity of infrastructure to accommodate possible development is not factored into a build-out analysis.
This task involved the collection and analysis of local data relative to zoning and land use; infrastructure systems and environmental conditions; demographic and development for the Town and region – for the purpose of integrating this data into a project Geographic Information System. This system displays the potential land use patterns based upon the assessed impacts, identifying those areas most susceptible to change and creating a data base from which the consequences, as well as the costs and benefits of future development (build-out).

River Street developed assumptions and calculations (as described above) based on the Town’s Zoning Ordinance for two build-out scenarios covering 719 parcels (approximately 16.7% of total parcels in the Town) and 2,886 acres or 7.5% of the Town’s overall acreage. The first build-out scenario projected maximum development of each parcel within the target area in accordance with allowable zoning whether the parcel was currently developed or not. The second build-out scenario considered only vacant, undeveloped parcels. The summary results of the maximum build-out analysis are delineated in the table below.
The analysis indicates that the Zoning regulations would allow maximum development in the target area of the following:

- 10,572,883 sf of new residential space (an estimated 253 single family homes and 11,713 units in multi-family structures).
- 1,042,739 sf of new retail, 7,130,323 sf of commercial and 1,042,739 sf of professional office space
- 12,822,034 sf of new industrial space.
- 306,183 sf of commercial space related to traveler services (lodging, restaurants, etc.)

Additional findings relative to maximum build-out development include:
• Checkerberry and General Industrial districts have the highest potential for development accounting for ¾ of the maximum development potential within the corridor.
• MCMP West and Main Street have the lowest potential for future development in comparison with the other districts. In terms of area, these are also two of the smallest districts within the corridor.

In considering only vacant and undeveloped parcels (the 2nd build-out scenario), the analysis indicates that the Zoning regulations would allow maximum development in the target area of the following:

• 5,489,525 sf of new residential space (an estimated 253 single family homes and 5,888 units in multi-family structures).
• 543,614 sf of new retail, 5,252,655 sf of commercial and 543,614 sf of professional office space
• 10,119,228 sf of new industrial space.
• 298,931 sf of commercial space related to traveler services (lodging, restaurants, etc.)

Additional findings relative to maximum build-out of vacant parcels include:

• Checkerberry and General Industrial districts have the highest potential for development accounting for 88% of the maximum development potential within the corridor.
• MCMP Municipal and Main Street were determined to have no vacant parcels for build-out. MCMP West, MCMP Center and Old Towne have the lowest potential for future development in comparison with the other districts.
## Build-out of Developable Parcels Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Traveler Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>1,771,150</td>
<td>247,961</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>82,654</td>
<td>991,844</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP Center</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>265,280</td>
<td>37,139</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>111,418</td>
<td>37,139</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMP West</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>431,244</td>
<td>43,124</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>86,249</td>
<td>43,124</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkerberry</td>
<td>285.1</td>
<td>12,417,649</td>
<td>1,241,765</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>413,022</td>
<td>413,022</td>
<td>3,104,412</td>
<td>620,882</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Towne</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>608,533</td>
<td>60,853</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>121,707</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>657.4</td>
<td>21,477,911</td>
<td>1,073,896</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,073,896</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>1,992,870</td>
<td>298,931</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>298930.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>327.6</td>
<td>14,269,820</td>
<td>4,709,041</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,709,041</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,418,081</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,386.5</td>
<td>53,234,458</td>
<td>7,712,710</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,252,655</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,489,525</td>
<td>10,119,228</td>
<td>298,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second build-out scenario (maximum development of currently vacant and underutilized land) generally presents the community’s likely potential for future property development over the next 20 years.

In a separate analysis as part of the Economic Development Strategy, the consultant team developed a projection of future land use for the town based on current zoning and reasonable market assumptions and population projections. Two of the key market assumptions were: 1. that the remaining land at the Husky campus becomes available for industrial use by other companies; and 2. that necessary investment for a new interchange occurs within the next five years and that a regional mall or comparable density of retail development builds out in the area by 2015. These land use projections are summarized in the table below.
Market Support Estimate by Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Prof. office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Exit 17 Mall</th>
<th>SF units</th>
<th>MF units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>12,654</td>
<td>65,760</td>
<td>21,920</td>
<td>1,287,250</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>12,972</td>
<td>131,520</td>
<td>43,840</td>
<td>2,018,250</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Residential square footage is calculated based on an average of 750 sf per multi-family unit and 2,000 sf per single family home.*

As the table indicates, residential units are projected to increase by 1,397 by 2025. At the current average household size of 2.84 persons per household, the projected new units would accommodate a population increase of 3,967 assuming no attrition of existing units. It is worth noting that based on 2000 census data; Milton is experiencing a very tight housing market. The homeownership vacancy rate in 2000 was 0.4% and the rental vacancy rate was 2.2%. Typical vacancy rates for a healthy housing market are 1% and 5% respectively. This is to say that the Milton market would benefit from some additional housing construction even without a population increase. When vacancy rates increase significantly above these “standards”, home prices and rental rates are forced downward as supply greatly exceeds demand in the market place – property values decrease – owners cut back on investments in maintenance and upkeep particularly in the rental market. Prolonged disinvestment in housing eventual leads to abandonment where vacant and deteriorated housing creates health and safety problems for the community.

At the other end of the spectrum, a tight housing market results in different problems. When vacancy rates decrease significantly below the “standards”, home prices and rental rates generally escalate as demand greatly exceeds supply. Property values increase as generally do property taxes. Ultimately, affordability and housing choice become serious problems in the community particularly for low and moderate income families.

The Town’s 2000 population was 9,479. The market support estimate is based on a projected 2025 population of 12,972. Utilizing projection data from the Town of Milton 2003 Comprehensive Plan, we can estimate a 2025 population of between 13,027 (mean projection) and 17,831 (high projection). Either of the build-out scenarios would easily support the high end population projection.
One of the obvious differences between the Market Support Estimate and the Build-out Scenarios can be seen in the projection for single family homes and multi-unit apartments. The market assessment projects a total of 777 new single family homes and 619 multi-family units by 2025. Under the build-out scenarios, only 253 single family homes and between 5,888 and 11,713 units in multi-family structures are projected. Clearly, the market estimate is more realistic.

By definition, the build-out analysis is based on the maximum possible development that is allowed by regulation. Single family dwellings is the primary allowed use in the R3 district. Build-out of this district within the target area accounted for the projection of 253 homes. Single family dwelling is also an allowed use in several of the other districts analyzed in the target area including DB1 (if as part of a PUD). However, all of these zoning districts also allow for much denser development including a mix of commercial, industrial and multi-family residential uses. Therefore, the build-out scenarios did not consider single family as a potential use since it would not result in maximum build-out of the districts.

The Town may want to consider a modified build-out scenario that assumes a certain percentage of the districts are developed for single family homes. This would have the effect of decreasing the maximum build-out potential of the other primary residential, commercial and industrial uses.
Appendix II

Land Use Projections

The build-out analysis provides a good overview of the development that is possible in Milton given its current zoning regulations and existing environmental conditions. The build-out analysis considered two “maximum” development scenarios: one involving all parcels in the target area; and one that considers only development of vacant land. In this land use analysis, we are looking to project the “likely” development scenarios (land uses) that will evolve in the target area over the next 20 years. Furthermore, the study is intended to make recommendations that enhance Milton’s opportunity to encourage the most desirable development within the corridor during this time period.

We start by examining the current land use composition of each of the zoning districts and evaluate the performance of each land use category (residential, commercial, industrial, etc.) in terms of property taxes generated. This provides an overview of both the types of land uses indigenous to the zone and an evaluation of how these uses have contributed to Milton’s tax base. From the descriptions provided in the Town’s assessment data base, we were able to determine current land use for approximately 86% of the parcels and 80% of the acreage within the Route 7 Corridor Study area.

Next, we compare the current land use composition with the build-out scenarios and make a general assessment of the likely and/or desirable land use development for the future. Finally, we make recommendations in terms of zoning and land use planning that will insure the desirable future development in Milton.

As noted previously, there are significant and not unexpected differences between the Build-out Analysis and the Market Support Analysis conducted as part of the Economic Development Strategy for this project. The Build-out analysis projects the development that is possible given the existing zoning regulations and environmental conditions. The Market analysis projects the likely

---

2 As noted in the analysis, we classified certain properties as “20 year parcels” which were excluded from the redevelopment scenario. These properties are not expected to change use over the next 20 years and they are specifically defined for each of the zoning districts in the target area.
development given current land use and economic trends. The market projections essentially serve as a reality check on the maximum build-out projections.

The table below compares the projection of future development in Milton over the next twenty years based on maximum build-out and market support. Overall, the total maximum development allowed by current conditions (22 million sf) is more than 5 times greater than the development projected by the market analysis (4.2 million sf).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build-out Projections</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build-out of vacant lands</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,551,586</td>
<td>543,614</td>
<td>5,489,525</td>
<td>10,119,228</td>
<td>22,247,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Support Estimate</td>
<td>131,520</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>43,840</td>
<td>2,018,250</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>4,243,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What typically drives development is population increase either local or “imported”. As municipal population grows, there is a typical demand for housing and community services that spurs new development in the community. Other development may occur because of its capacity to draw from a regional population base (e.g. a major shopping mall) or to entice new workers to the area because of job opportunities (e.g. a new manufacturing facility).

**Downtown Business District (DB1)**

Surprisingly, the dominant land use (by acreage) in the Downtown is vacant land that comprises 45.4 acres or 30.8% of the total acreage in the district. Commercial and residential uses make up the next highest percentage of land coverage. General commercial uses comprise 30.3 acres (20.6% of total Downtown acres) and single family residential uses cover another 28 acres (19%). Retail uses (20.6 acres – 14%), multi-family residential (15.7 acres – 10.7%) and professional offices (4.6 acres – 3.1%) make up most of the remaining acreage in the Downtown.

---

3 Land use analysis based on 85% of the acreage within the district where sufficient data was available to appropriately categorize the current land use.
From a tax base perspective, the existing commercial uses combined generate over 2/3 of the assessed property value of the Downtown district based on pre-reappraisal assessment figures. General commercial uses have the highest property values averaging $250,129 per acre in assessed valuation. This is followed by retail uses ($214,030 per acre) and professional offices ($206,825 per acre). Single family uses in the district generate an average assessed value of $137,082 per acre while multi-family uses only $38,929 per acre. Using estimates of the new post re-appraisal assessed values, General commercial uses still have the highest property values averaging $400,206 per acre in assessed valuation. This is followed by retail uses ($342,448 per acre) and professional offices ($330,920 per acre). Single family uses in the district generate an average assessed value of $267,310 per acre under the new assessment formula while multi-family uses only generate $75,912 per acre.

Understanding the existing composition of land uses within the Downtown and their impact on the tax base combined with the knowledge of potential build-out scenarios, can help the Town make some strategic land use decisions regarding future development.

As described in the build-out analysis, we recommended using the more conservative and realistic development scenario utilizing only vacant and developable land within each of the zoning districts in the target area. The outcome using this methodology for the Downtown identified a total of eleven vacant parcels (approximately 40 acres) with a development potential of 1.24 million sf resulting in the projected build-out shown in the table below.
For land use projections, we also assumed that the likely development would be 3 story buildings instead of 5 story structures allowed by current district zoning. Most of the existing buildings in the Downtown are one and two story structures. We have also assumed that the development strategy should encourage increased commercial uses in the Downtown and downplay residential development.

As noted above, commercial uses in the Downtown generate the highest property tax return to the town on a per acre basis. The land use projections are based on first floor space being equally divided by retail and general commercial uses. The upper floors would be developed as an equal mix of professional offices and residential apartments. A comparison of the maximum build-out scenario and the future land use projections are presented in the table below.

The table also projects the expected impacts of the future land use development in terms of job growth, increased property value and new residential units. Based on the future land use projections outlined, it is estimated that 1,550 new jobs would be created from commercial development over the next twenty years and 331 new residential apartment units. Total assessed value of new development is estimated at approximately $69.9 million within the Downtown district.
MCMP Center District (M1)

The dominant land use (by acreage) in the M1 district is single family residential that comprises 41.4 acres or 72.7% of the total acreage in the district. Multi-family residential contributes 4.5 acres and 7.9% of the district. Vacant land makes up 5.7 acres and 10.1% of the land use. Professional office use (3 acres – 5.3%) and General commercial uses (2.3 acres – 4%) comprise the remaining acreage in the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCMP Center</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV/acre</th>
<th>% acres</th>
<th>% AV</th>
<th>New A.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>$5,991,900</td>
<td>$144,732</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>$11,684,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>$1,284,000</td>
<td>$284,701</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>$2,503,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$671,600</td>
<td>$293,275</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>$1,074,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>$102,900</td>
<td>$33,960</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>$164,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>$95,400</td>
<td>$16,620</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>$95,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>$8,145,800</td>
<td>$142,984</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$15,522,605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a tax base prospective, the existing single family uses generate nearly ¾ of the assessed property value of the M1 district based on pre-reappraisal assessment figures. Coupled with the existing multi-family uses, residential uses account for about 90% of the assessed value of property in the district. General commercial uses have the highest property values averaging $293,275 per acre in assessed valuation. This is followed by multi-family residential uses ($284,701 per acre), single family residential ($144,732 per acre) and professional offices ($33,960 per acre). Using estimates of the post re-appraisal assessed values, Multi-family residential uses now are estimated to have the highest property values averaging $555,166 per acre in assessed valuation. This is followed by General commercial uses ($469,240 per acre) and Single family uses with an average assessed value of

---

4 Land use analysis based on 89% of the acreage within the district where sufficient data was available to appropriately categorize the current land use.
$282,227 per acre under the new assessment formula while professional office uses only generate $54,337 per acre.

In the build-out analysis, we recommended utilizing only vacant and developable land within each of the zoning districts in the target area for projecting future development. The outcome using this methodology for the M1 District identified a total of three vacant parcels (6.1 acres) with a development potential of 285,280 sf resulting in the projected build-out shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M1 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof Office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build-out projection</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>285,280</td>
<td>37,139</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>111,418</td>
<td>37,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use projection</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>285,280</td>
<td>37,139</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>111,418</td>
<td>37,139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For land use projections, we also assumed that the likely development would be 3 story buildings instead of 5 story structures allowed by current district zoning. Similar to the Downtown, most of the existing buildings in the M1 district are one and two story structures. Since the district is predominately single family residential, we expect that at least ½ of the vacant land will be developed as single family homes. As general commercial and multi-family generate the highest returns in terms of assessed value per acre, we also recommend encouraging these uses in the M1 district. There is not any retail or industrial uses in the district and although the current zoning allows these uses, we assume that actual development of these uses within the district is unlikely. The land use projections (except for the single family homes) are based on first floor space being allocated to general commercial uses. The upper 2 floors would be developed as residential apartments. A comparison of the maximum build-out scenario and the future land use projections are presented in the table below.
The table also projects the expected impacts of the future land use development in terms of job growth, increased property value and new residential units. Based on the future land use projections outlined, it is estimated that 62 new jobs would be created from commercial development over the next twenty years and 56 new residential units. Total assessed value of new development is estimated at approximately $5.9 million within the MCMP district.

### MCMP West District (M2)

The primary land use in this district is the Milton High School that comprises approximately 42 acres and has been excluded for development purposes. The remaining 7 parcels in the M2 district are all vacant land. These parcels comprise a total of 9.9 acres.

---

**MCMP Center Zoning District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Land uses by Building square footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1</strong> Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Build-out/Vacant parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use by % acreage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Land Use from new development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected new jobs by use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected new assessed value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new residential units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The existing vacant parcels in the district generate $78,000 in assessed value, or $7,879 per acre. The build-out analysis for this district showed development of 431,244 sf consisting of a mix of commercial, residential and industrial uses as noted in the table below.

For land use projections, we assumed that the likely development would be single family homes. This district borders the Old Towne Residential District that is predominantly single family residential. Multi-Family development adjacent to the high school is probably less desirable and should be discouraged. A comparison of the maximum build-out scenario and the future land use projections are presented in the table below.
Based on the future development outlined, it is estimated that 22 new single family homes would be built in the district over the next twenty years. Total assessed value of new development is estimated at approximately $6 million within the MCMP West district.

**Municipal / Recreation (M3)**

This district contains only two identifiable parcels only one of which is a taxable parcel – the single family listed in the table below. The other parcel is the 138 acre municipal park located on Bombardier Road. There is no vacant land in the Municipal / Recreation District and therefore we did not project new land use development within the district.
Checkerberry District (M4)

The dominant land use (by acreage) in the M4 district is vacant land that comprises 283.2 acres or 66.9% of the total acreage in the district. Single family residences make up 85 acres (20.1% of the district) and multi-family residential contributes 27.6 acres and 6.5% of the district. General commercial uses make up 19 acres and 4.5% of the land use. Retail uses (4.4 acres – 1.0%), industrial uses (3.6 acres - 0.9%) and professional office use (0.8 acres – 0.2%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checkerberry</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>acres</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV/acre</th>
<th>% acres</th>
<th>% AV</th>
<th>New A.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>$12,515,600</td>
<td>$147,242</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>$24,405,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>$907,200</td>
<td>$32,881</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>$1,769,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>$2,769,100</td>
<td>$145,589</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>$4,430,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>$461,700</td>
<td>$104,932</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>$738,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$199,200</td>
<td>$265,600</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$318,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
<td>$34,890</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>283.2</td>
<td>$1,520,900</td>
<td>$5,370</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>$1,520,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>423.6</td>
<td>$18,500,700</td>
<td>$43,675</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$33,310,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of tax base, the existing single family uses generate 67.6% of the assessed property value of the M4 district based on pre-appraisal assessment figures. Commercial uses contribute 15% and vacant land about 8.2% of property value. Professional office use has the highest property value per acre ($265,600) but it based on only one property located within the district. Single family residences have the next highest property values averaging $147,242 per acre in assessed valuation followed by general commercial uses ($145,589 per acre) and retail use($104,932 per acre). Using estimates of the new re-appraisal assessed values, Professional office uses still have the highest property values averaging $424,960 per acre in assessed valuation. This is followed by single family uses ($287,123 per acre) and general commercial uses ($232,942 per acre). Retail uses in the district generate an average assessed value of $167,891 per acre under the new assessment formula.

---

5 Land use analysis based on 76% of the acreage within the district where sufficient data was available to appropriately categorize the current land use.
In the build-out analysis for the M4 district, we identified a total of 308 acres of vacant land with a development potential of 1.3 million sf resulting in the projected build-out shown in the table below. In the build-out analysis, there was one parcel (parcel # 7-11) that was counted as vacant land and is actually residential and six smaller parcels that were listed as vacant but can not be confirmed. These seven parcels were therefore discounted for the land use projections (Parcel ID’s are 11-103-38, 25-4-1, 25-13, 26-4, 26-14-1, 26-30 - The six parcels total 3.56 acres)

The existing vacant parcels in the district generate $1.5 million in assessed value, or $5,370 per acre. The build-out analysis for this district showed development of approximately 5 million sf consisting of a mix of commercial, residential and industrial uses as noted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M4 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build-out projection</td>
<td>308.2</td>
<td>13,424,756</td>
<td>1,342,476</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>3,104,412</td>
<td>620,882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use projection</td>
<td>285.1</td>
<td>12,417,649</td>
<td>1,241,765</td>
<td>411,206</td>
<td>411,206</td>
<td>411,206</td>
<td>740,172</td>
<td>616,810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Single family residences comprise 60% of the developed land in this district. Most of the vacant land in the district does not front directly on Route 7 and is generally surrounded by other single family homes. However, most of the larger landowners are or will be proposing commercial and mixed-use with the residential components being multi-family. For these reasons, we expect a diverse mix of residential and commercial uses including some single family homes. We also see some opportunity for development of light industrial uses primarily in single story buildings.

For the vacant land parcels fronting on Route 7, we assumed that the likely development would be a mix of commercial uses with some upper floor residential apartments. We expect primarily 2 story buildings instead of 4 story structures allowed by current district zoning. The land use projections are similar to the build-out analysis with first floor space being allocated to a mix of retail, general commercial and professional office uses. The upper floor would be developed as mostly residential apartments with some professional office uses.
A comparison of the maximum build-out scenario and the future land use projections are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checkerberry Zoning District</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential SF</th>
<th>Residential MF</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M4 Maximum Build-out/Vacant parcels</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>413,922</td>
<td>3,104,412</td>
<td>620,882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use by % acreage</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Land Use from new development</td>
<td>411,206</td>
<td>411,206</td>
<td>411,206</td>
<td>1,110,257</td>
<td>740,172</td>
<td>616,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected new jobs by use</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>30.07%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected new assessed value</td>
<td>$30,840,450</td>
<td>$47,288,690</td>
<td>$47,288,690</td>
<td>$99,923,130</td>
<td>$44,410,320</td>
<td>$30,840,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new residential units</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table also projects the expected impacts of the future land use development in terms of job growth, increased property value and new residential units. Based on the future land use projections outlined, it is estimated that 4,592 new jobs would created from commercial and industrial development over the next twenty years and 1,542 new residential units. Total assessed value of new development is estimated at approximately $301 million within the Checkerberry zoning district.

**Old Towne Residential / Commercial District (M5)**

The dominant land use (by acreage) in the M5 district is single family residential that comprises 24.9 acres and 54.0% of the total acreage in the district. Multi-family residences make-up an additional 10.5 acres (22.7% of the district) and General commercial uses make up 4.8 acres and 10.4% of the land use. Professional office use (2.9 acres – 6.3%) and Vacant land (2.8 acres – 6.1%) make-up most of the remaining acreage in the district.6

---

6 Land use analysis based on 75% of the acreage within the district where sufficient data was available to appropriately categorize the current land use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Towne</th>
<th>parcels</th>
<th>acres</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV/acre</th>
<th>% acres</th>
<th>% AV</th>
<th>New A.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>$3,686,600</td>
<td>$148,056</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>$7,188,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>$1,924,100</td>
<td>$183,773</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>$3,751,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>$1,218,500</td>
<td>$254,384</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>$1,949,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$130,300</td>
<td>$66,522</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>$208,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$387,800</td>
<td>$133,265</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>$620,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>$155,100</td>
<td>$55,196</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>$155,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>$7,502,400</td>
<td>$162,707</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$13,874,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of tax base, the existing residential uses combined (single family and multi-family) account for nearly 75% of the assessed property value of the M5 district. Commercial uses contribute 16.2% and professional office uses about 5.2% of property value. Retail use has the highest property value per acre ($566,522) based on pre-reappraisal assessment figures but it is based on only one property located within the district. Commercial uses have the next highest property values averaging $254,384 per acre in assessed valuation followed by multi-family residential ($183,773 per acre) and single family residential ($148,056 per acre). Using estimates of the post re-appraisal assessed values, the retail use is still projected to have the highest property value at $906,435 per acre in assessed valuation. This is followed by general commercial uses ($407,015 per acre), multi-family residential ($358,357) and single family uses ($288,710 per acre). Professional office uses in the district generate an average assessed value of $213,223 per acre under the new assessment formula.

The build-out analysis for the M5 district identified a total of 14 acres of vacant land with a development potential of 608,533 sf resulting in the projected build-out shown in the table below. In the build-out analysis, there were five parcels that were counted as vacant land but can not be confirmed as such by land use descriptions. These five parcels were therefore discounted for the land use projections.

The existing vacant parcels in the district generate $155,100 in assessed value, or $55,196 per acre. The build-out analysis for this district showed development of 182,559 sf consisting of a mix of commercial and residential uses as noted in the table below.
For land use projections, we assumed that the likely development would be 3 story buildings instead of 4 story structures allowed by current district zoning. The land use projections are similar to the build-out analysis with first floor space being allocated to a mix of retail, general commercial and professional office uses. The upper 2 floors would be developed as residential apartments. A comparison of the maximum build-out scenario and the future land use projections are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Towne Zoning District</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M5 Zoning</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Build-out/Vacant parcels</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>121,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use by % acreage</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Land Use from new development</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>24,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected new jobs by use</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected new assessed value</td>
<td>$304,950</td>
<td>$467,590</td>
<td>$467,590</td>
<td>$1,463,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new residential units</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table also projects the expected impacts of the future land use development in terms of job growth, increased property value and new residential units. Based on the future land use projections outlined, it is estimated that 38 new jobs would be created from commercial development over the next twenty years and 33 new residential units. Total assessed value of new development is estimated at approximately $2.7 million within the Old Towne zoning district.
Main Street (M6)

This district is dominated by two land uses: single family residential which comprises 10.4 acres and 67% of the total acreage in the district and Multi-family residential uses which make-up an additional 3.7 acres (24% of the district). There is no vacant land in the Main Street District and therefore we did not project new land use development within the district.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Street</th>
<th>parcels</th>
<th>acres</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV/acre</th>
<th>% acres</th>
<th>% AV</th>
<th>New A.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>$2,485,800</td>
<td>$239,019</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>$4,847,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>$782,900</td>
<td>$209,332</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>$1,526,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$167,100</td>
<td>$196,588</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>$267,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$590,500</td>
<td>$1,054,464</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>$944,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>$4,026,300</td>
<td>$258,926</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$7,586,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Density Residential District (R3)

This district is dominated by two land uses: single family residential, which comprises 495.6 acres and 49% of the total acreage in the district and Vacant, land which make-up an additional 445.2 acres (44% of the district). Agricultural uses (54.7 acres – 5.4%) and Multi-family residential uses (16.3 acres – 1.6%) make-up the remaining acreage in the district.\(^7\)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Density Residential</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>acres</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV/acre</th>
<th>% acres</th>
<th>% AV</th>
<th>New A.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>495.6</td>
<td>$24,375,900</td>
<td>$49,185</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>$47,533,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>$427,100</td>
<td>$26,219</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>$832,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) Land use analysis based on 83% of the acreage within the district where sufficient data was available to appropriately categorize the current land use.
In terms of tax base, single family residences account for nearly 96% of the assessed property value of the R3 district. There are minor contributions by multi-family, agricultural and vacant land uses as shown in the table above. This district has the lowest assessed value per acre at an average of $25,166 per acre. Within the district, single family uses have the highest property value per acre ($49,185) followed by multi-family residential at $26,219 per acre based on pre-reappraisal assessment numbers. Using estimates of the new post re-appraisal assessed values, single family uses still have the highest property values averaging $95,910 per acre in assessed valuation followed by multi-family uses ($51,126 per acre).

The build-out analysis for the R3 district identified a total of 657 acres of vacant land with a development potential of 35.8 million sf resulting in the projected build-out shown in the table below. In the build-out analysis, there were eight parcels that were counted as vacant land but can not be confirmed as such by land use descriptions. These parcels (approximately 84 acres) were therefore discounted for the land use projections.

The existing vacant parcels in the district generate $464,900 in assessed value, or $1,044 per acre. The build-out analysis for this district showed development of 1.7 million sf of single family residential development as noted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R3 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build-out projection</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>21,477,911</td>
<td>1,073,896</td>
<td>1,073,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use projection</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>12,479,940</td>
<td>623,997</td>
<td>623,997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the land use projections, we took a closer look at the environmental limitations present in this district and downgraded our estimate of the developable vacant land within the district from 75% to
50%. A comparison of the maximum build-out scenario and the future land use projections are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Density Residential R3 Zoning District</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential SF</th>
<th>Residential MF</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Build-out/Vacant parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,073,896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use by % acreage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Land Use from new development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>623,997</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected new jobs by use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected new assessed value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56,159,730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new residential units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table also projects the expected impacts of the future land use development in terms of job growth, increased property value and new residential units. Based on the future land use projections outlined, it is estimated that 312 new single family homes will be built in the district over the next twenty years. Total assessed value of new development is estimated at approximately $56.2 million within the R3 zoning district.
General Industrial District (I2)

This district is dominated by vacant land that comprises 190 acres and 50.4% of the acreage within the district. Single family residential is the next largest use at 76 acres and 20.2% of the total acreage followed by Industrial uses (52.9 acres – 14%) and Commercial uses (49.7 acres – 13.2%).

Note: Commercial uses encompass all other commercial uses not defined as either retail or professional offices. This would include personal services, hotels, motels, auto service stations, movie theatres and a host of other uses described in the current zoning regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General industrial</th>
<th>parcels</th>
<th>acres</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV/acre</th>
<th>% acres</th>
<th>% AV</th>
<th>New A.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>$2,198,300</td>
<td>$28,887</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>$4,286,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>$135,500</td>
<td>$72,460</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>$264,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>$11,028,800</td>
<td>$221,997</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>$17,646,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>$8,608,100</td>
<td>$162,693</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>$8,608,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>$184,700</td>
<td>$29,087</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>$184,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>190.1</td>
<td>$2,426,600</td>
<td>$12,766</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>$2,426,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>377.0</td>
<td>$24,582,000</td>
<td>$65,204</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$33,416,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of tax base, general commercial uses account for nearly 45% of the assessed property value of the I2 district followed by industrial uses that generate 35% of the district’s property value. Vacant land uses contribute 9.9% of the property value and single family residences 8.9%. Within the district, commercial uses also have the highest property value per acre ($221,997) followed by industrial uses at $162,693 per acre based on pre-reappraisal assessment figures. Using estimates of the new post reappraisal assessed values, General commercial uses still have the highest property values averaging $355,195 per acre in assessed valuation. This is followed by industrial uses ($162,693 per acre) and multi-family residential ($141,297 per acre). Single family uses in the district generate an average assessed value of only $56,330 per acre under the new assessment formula.

8 Land use analysis based on 75% of the acreage within the district where sufficient data was available to appropriately categorize the current land use.
The build-out analysis for the I2 district identified a total of 330 acres of vacant land with a development potential of 14.3 million sf resulting in the projected build-out shown in the table below. In the build-out analysis, there were four parcels (# 3-3, 3-3.1, 3-4 and 3-4.1) that were incorrectly identified as vacant land and are actually commercial/industrial uses (13.9 acres). There were also five other parcels that were counted as vacant land but can not be confirmed as such by land use descriptions. These nine parcels (approximately 140 acres) were therefore discounted for the land use projections.

The existing vacant parcels in the district generate $2.4 million in assessed value, or $12,766 per acre. The build-out analysis for this district showed development of 4.7 million sf of commercial development and 9.4 million sf of industrial development split between general industrial and light industrial uses (See table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I2 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>General industrial</th>
<th>Light industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build-out projection</td>
<td></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>14,269,820</td>
<td>4,709,041</td>
<td>4,709,041</td>
<td>4,709,041</td>
<td>4,709,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use projection</td>
<td>190.1</td>
<td>8,280,756</td>
<td>2,732,649</td>
<td>1,821,766</td>
<td>1,821,766</td>
<td>1,821,766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For land use projections, we assumed that the likely development would be 1 or 2 story buildings instead of 3 story structures allowed by current district zoning. For estimation purposes, we assume a two story structure. A number of the large vacant parcels are also adjacent to existing residential uses. For this reason, we assumed that about 75% of the vacant land could be developed for commercial and industrial allowing 25% of the land to serve as buffer between the residential neighborhoods. The land use projections are similar to the build-out analysis in that the projected developed space would be equally divided between commercial, general industrial and light industrial uses. A comparison of the maximum build-out scenario and the future land use projections are presented in the table below.
The table also projects the expected impacts of the future land use development in terms of job growth and increased property value. Based on the future land use projections outlined, it is estimated that 1,821,766 sf of commercial use and 3,643,532 sf of industrial use will be built in the district over the next twenty years. Total assessed value of new development is estimated at approximately $392 million within the I2 zoning district and would create an estimated 10,931 new jobs.

**Interstate Commercial District (C1)**

This district contains only 2 parcels and is dominated by vacant land that comprises 45.8 acres and nearly 98% of the acreage within the district. The other parcel is Commercial (1.1 acres and 2.4% of the acreage within the district).
In terms of tax base, the commercial use accounts for 58% of the assessed property value of the C1 district and the vacant property generates 42% of the district’s property value. Within the district, the commercial use has a property value per acre of $136,036 and the vacant parcel at $2,383 per acre based on pre-reappraisal assessment numbers. The build-out analysis for the C1 district identified the one parcel of 45.8 acres of vacant land with a development potential of 1.9 million sf resulting in the projected build-out shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interstate commercial</th>
<th>parcels</th>
<th>acres</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV/acre</th>
<th>% acres</th>
<th>% AV</th>
<th>New A.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$151,000</td>
<td>$136,036</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>$241,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>$2,383</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$5,548</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$350,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this zoning district, we assume the land use projections to be identical to the build-out scenario for the vacant parcel in play. A comparison of the maximum build-out scenario and the future land use projections are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1 Zoning</th>
<th>GIS Acres</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
<th>Traveler Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build-out projection</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>1,992,870</td>
<td>298,931</td>
<td>298,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use projection</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>1,992,870</td>
<td>298,931</td>
<td>298,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interstate Commercial Zoning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Prof office</th>
<th>Residential SF</th>
<th>Residential MF</th>
<th>Traveler Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Maximum Build-out/Vacant parcels: 298,931
- Existing Land Use by % acreage:
  - 0%
  - 2.4%
  - 0%
  - 0%
  - 0%
  - 0%
- Projected Land Use from new development: 298,931
  - 100%
- Projected new jobs by use: 747
- Projected new assessed value: $22,419,825
- Number of new residential units

The table also projects the expected impacts of the future land use development in terms of job growth and increased property value. Based on the future land use projections outlined, it is estimated that approximately 300,000 sf of commercial traveler-related services will be built in the district over the next twenty years. Total assessed value of new development is estimated at approximately $22.4 million within the C1 zoning district and would create an estimated 747 new jobs.

**Summary Land Use Projections**

From the property descriptions provided in the database, we were able to allocate land use designations for approximately 86% of the parcels and 80% of the property acreage within the target area (see table below). Based on land use designation, nearly one-half of the acreage within the area is vacant land (1,028 acres – 48%). Single family residences comprise 766 acres or 35.8% and general commercial uses make-up an additional 5.1% of the area (108 acres).
### Land Use Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AV/acre</th>
<th>% acres</th>
<th>% AV</th>
<th>New A.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>766.3</td>
<td>$55,232,300</td>
<td>$72,077</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>$107,702,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>$6,071,600</td>
<td>$75,744</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>$11,839,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>$23,590,000</td>
<td>$218,305</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>$37,744,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>$5,595,800</td>
<td>$216,807</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>$8,953,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>$1,647,500</td>
<td>$145,539</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>$2,636,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>$8,753,800</td>
<td>$148,344</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>$8,753,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>$378,200</td>
<td>$6,196</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$378,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,028.0</td>
<td>$5,507,300</td>
<td>$5,357</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>$5,507,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>2,139.7</td>
<td>$106,776,500</td>
<td>$49,903</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$183,515,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of tax base, single family residential uses account for nearly 52% of the assessed property value of the target area and commercial uses 22%. Within the target area, commercial use has the highest property value per acre of $218,305 followed by retail uses at $216,807 per acre based on pre-reappraisal assessment figures. Using estimates of the new post re-appraisal assessed values, general commercial uses still have the highest property values averaging $349,287 per acre in assessed valuation. This is followed by retail uses ($346,892 per acre), professional offices ($232,862 per acre) and industrial uses ($148,344). Single family uses in the district generate an average assessed value of $140,549 per acre) under the new assessment formula which is slightly less than the average for multi-family uses ($147,700 per acre).

The initial build-out analysis for the target area identified approximately 1,856 acres of vacant land with a development potential of 53.6 million sf. As noted in the preceding land use analysis, we have made a number of adjustments to the build-out analysis resulting in the projected build-out shown in the table below.
As described in the preceding analysis, the overall land use projections are considerably less than the build-out scenario for vacant and developable land for the various reasons stated. A comparison of the maximum build-out scenario and the future land use projections are presented in the table below.
The table also projects the expected impacts of the future land use development in terms of job growth and increased property value. Based on the future land use projections outlined, it is estimated that approximately 3.6 million sf of commercial-related development, 4.3 million sf of new industrial space and 2.8 million sf of residential construction will be built in the target area over the next twenty years. Total assessed value of new development is estimated at approximately $852 million within the target area. The projected development would create an estimated 17,976 new jobs, 898 new single family homes and 1,397 new residential rental apartments.

The projected residential development would increase the town’s population by 6,518 based on current average household size (see table below). Population increase also has potential impact on the local school system. Using the current percentages of school age children in the population, we have projected the increase through 2025 as shown in the table below. Although the projected population for each school age category in below the threshold for requiring new facilities, it is expected that there will be some pressure to add a new elementary school by 2025.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Impact on Schools</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># new households</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>2,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average hh size</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New population</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>6,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-11 yr old children</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13 yr old children</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17 yr old children</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>1,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Observations

As demonstrated through the preceding analysis, current zoning in the Town of Milton allows for future build-out of residential, commercial and industrial development well in excess of what the market is likely to support and/or is desirable for the community.

The Town should consider general “downzoning” in many of the districts in the Route 7 Corridor area. For example many of the districts allow building heights significantly greater than what presently
exists – DB1 and M1 districts allow 5 story construction; M2 and M4 allow 4 story construction; M6, I2 and C1 allow 3 stories. The majority of buildings in town are one and two stories in height. Allowing new development significantly out of scale with existing buildings would likely disrupt the existing character of Milton. The Town does not want to limit growth. It wants to encourage downtown development that might eventually result in the need for taller buildings that could become the norm through infill development and parcel assembly. The town has significant vacant, developable land to accommodate future growth even while limiting new building constructions to a scale compatible with existing structures.

The other consideration for potential zoning changes should focus on perhaps limiting the extent of allowable uses within certain zones within the corridor. For example, a number of districts (DB1, M1 and M4) allow for a wide array of residential, commercial and some industrial uses. In the build-out analysis and land use projections for the Downtown (DB1), we did not consider light industrial use as a viable option. Retail storefront use and upper floor commercial office and residential development would be most appropriate to create and enhance a vibrant downtown environment.

The General Industrial zone (I2) is being promoted by the town for future industrial development but the market support estimates seem to rely on build out of the Husky campus to achieve these goals. The Husky Campus is located outside of the Route 7 Corridor target area and therefore development of the site was not included in the land use projections.
Appendix III

Summary Stormwater Funding Scenarios
Prepared by Stone Environmental, Inc. January 2006

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Milton is well positioned as a result of thoughtful past actions to address the current need to improve stormwater services. The need to enhance such services has come about predominately due to a portion of the community being designated as needing to comply with the federally mandated MS4 Phase 2 program, though Vermont’s recent legal and regulatory turmoil related to stormwater and local requests for services have created additional pressure. There are many options available to the town in determining what level of services to provide in differing parts of town. Similarly, many methods exist that the town could implement to pay for these enhanced services.

In considering the level of service the town may choose to provide, the complexity of the systems needed to deliver service, to bill and collect funding, and to be understood by tax and or rate payers are important considerations. As a result of these factors, Scenario 2 is recommended to the Town. This scenario blends the requirements the Town is under to provide services in six program areas within the MS4 area with the general needs for enhanced maintenance services town-wide. All property owners would see sweepers on their streets and ditching and erosion control measures occurring in their part of town. In short, it would be a program that is easy to understand that would enhance water quality town-side, while providing important educational benefits as residents see the services provided.

This scenario does treat the administrative types of services required by MS4 differently. Enhanced levels of these services would be provided only in the MS4 area. The thinking is that these are predominately behind the scenes services, which while adding value, add less to the overall community and thus represent an area to save important resources at a time when the services are not yet required.

The estimated cost of the various scenarios is presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Elements</th>
<th>Scenario's Current</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,650</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>$ 52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$ 39,355</td>
<td>$ 58,900</td>
<td>$ 81,400</td>
<td>$ 81,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
<td>$ 7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget</td>
<td>$ 50,005</td>
<td>$ 107,900</td>
<td>$ 130,400</td>
<td>$ 148,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 129,550</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 175,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$ 170,555</td>
<td>$ 287,900</td>
<td>$ 305,400</td>
<td>$ 348,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen, the recommended scenario would require approximately $80,000 of new operating resources. While significant, this investment is affordable for residents, if there is agreement on the need for the services. Fees of $20 - $25 dollars for residents within the MS4 area and about half of that for those outside of the area would be required to generate the needed resources. Business costs would be higher based on the size of the business.

We recommend the Town carefully consider creating a user fee as the appropriate mechanism to pay for these services. While the dollar volumes are small, the competition for these dollars is intense. With the regulatory pressure applied by MS4, the Town needs a funding source for stormwater programming that is consistent both in its dollar volume and its support. Continuing to fund stormwater through general property taxes leaves the fiscal programming and thus the Town’s ability to comply with MS4 at risk.

To develop an appropriate user based system, the Town should advance the next phase of analysis begun by this project. Finalizing details of the program budget, gaining agreement from appropriate stakeholders as to the need for the services and budget, and developing the appropriate mechanisms to apply and collecting a user fee through a stormwater utility represent the important work of this next phase of work.

Should the Town agree that a user fee is the appropriate mechanism to pay for this work, we strongly encourage you to look at the ideas presented here, and others that may come forward, to consider methods to use surrogates to impervious cover to develop your fees. Impervious cover models have historically been very expensive to develop and simply represent “the way we’ve always done it” and “what the courts have approved”. If Milton were a community of 50,000 this model would be affordable, but it is not. We believe there are appropriate surrogates that can be cost effectively developed to assure the town’s rate system would pass the rational nexus test should you be challenged.