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Executive Summary

This report details the information that the student team has gathered for each of the major areas of concern for the Mariamante parcel, agreed upon with the Gill Charrette Ad Hoc Committee:

- Exploration of Possible Development Constraints and Issues

  The parcel is located very close to water and sewer infrastructure, but is not currently on the system. Costs and procedures for bringing these utilities to the parcel have been researched. The parcel also has possible archaeological significance, and the implications of this have been explored. Finally, opportunities for selling parts of the parcel, or acquiring other adjacent land have been evaluated.

- Options for Controlling and Managing the Land

  The student team was tasked with investigating the possibility of launching a Community Development Corporation (CDC) on the site. The team also investigated the details and potential for a land trust.

- Potential Uses

  Potential uses for the parcel have been separated into short-term, interim uses, and longer-term development scenarios. The various uses were selected with the assistance of the ad hoc committee, from the pool of ideas recorded at the December 2004 charrette meeting. Each scenario has been considered in light of Gill’s setting, the local market, and possible impacts.
Introduction and Purpose

In December of 2004, the small Massachusetts town of Gill took a tremendous step to influence its own future. A fifteen acre parcel of land in the south of town, near the intersection of two important town roads, had been put up for sale by its previous owners. The land had been under an agricultural preservation restriction, a program enabled by Massachusetts General Law Chapter 61A. As part of this restriction, if the land were ever sold, the town would have right of first refusal.

The town’s recent Community Development Plan has identified the parcel as a prime site for commercial or other non-residential development. It is located directly across Main Road from the town’s two largest existing commercial businesses, and is also quite close State Route 2 which runs along the southern part of Gill. By encouraging future commercial development to occur in already existing commercial areas in the town, Gill can expand its tax base while maintaining its rural characteristics. The citizens can see that such growth is occurring in small rural areas just like Gill, and the community decided that taking an active part in guiding this growth would be a wise investment. The town exercised its option to purchase the parcel for a sum of $239,000.

While the town initially planned to sell the land to a carefully selected buyer, a charrette organized by Administrative Assistant to the Gill Select Board Deb Roussel attracted widespread interest, convincing the community to more completely explore the unique opportunity at hand.

The charrette was held on December 13, 2004, and was led by Dr. John Mullin of the University of Massachusetts, along with his colleagues Dr. Zenia Kotval and Glenn Garber. An impressive turnout of citizens shared their visions for the parcel, and collaborated on S.W.O.T. (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) identification. Maintaining the existing rural character of the town is very important as future development options are explored.

Following the successful charrette, an ad hoc committee was formed to allow interested citizens of Gill to continue participating in the planning process for the parcel. Ms. Roussel arranged with Professor Mullin to have students from his regional planning studio class undertake the job of mapping out alternatives for the parcel, and working with the town to
identify the next steps in the process. The student team has met on a regular basis with the ad
hoc committee, and the committee’s input has been vital in directing the team’s research, and in
formulating this report.
The town of Gill, Massachusetts is located in the northwestern part of Massachusetts. Gill is bordered by Northfield on the northeast, the Connecticut River on the east and south, Greenfield on the west, and Bernardston on the northwest. Gill is 7 miles east of Greenfield, 36 miles north of Springfield, and 95 miles northwest of Boston. The town is located in Franklin County along the Route 2 corridor. Gill is approximately 15 square miles.
**Major employers**

According to the 2000 U.S. Census report, the town of Gill has approximately 786 people over the age of 16 in the labor force. Gill is home to the Northfield Mount Hermon School which is the town’s largest employer. The town of Gill is also a major employer for Gill residents. The Mt. Hermon School has approximately 350 employees. The town of Gill has 7 full time employees and about 93 part time employees. Many residents either work in Gill or in other towns such as Greenfield or Montague. The Town of Greenfield provides Gill residents with hospital facilities, centralized shopping, restaurants, and theaters. The Village of Turners Falls in the town of Montague also serves as an industrial center hosting paper mills, industrial parks, manufacturing companies.

**Development Pressures**

The town of Gill could eventually experience growth pressure as the Boston metro area continues to expand and the need for affordable housing continues to rise. Many people have relocated from established urban/suburban areas in Central Massachusetts such as Leominster, Gardner, Fitchburg, and Worcester to outlying rural towns such as Hubbardston, Rutland, Westminster, Phillipston, Hardwick and Barre. The towns of Hubbardston, Rutland, Westminster, Hardwick, and Barre are all located in Worcester County and are approximately 35-40 miles east of Gill, MA. People are moving from the greater Boston area to these former rural areas as the desire and the need for more affordable housing becomes an issue. (Lacy and Bliss 5). “While Massachusetts as a whole registered only a 5.5% gain in population from 1990-2000, the town of Hubbardston, located 40 miles east of Gill, experienced a 40% increase in population. The 1990 population of Hubbardston was approximately 2,797 residents in 1990 and in 2000 that population increased to 3,909 by 2000” (Lacy and Bliss 6). The town of Rutland, located 36 miles east of Gill, registered a 29% increase in population growth. The 1990 population in Rutland was approximately 4,936 and it swelled to 6,353 by 2000” (Lacy and Bliss 6). From 2000-2003 the population of Rutland further increased to 7,136 residents. As Boston area prices have raised over the last 10 years, the need for affordable single family housing has resulted in growth for the western part of Worcester County. In the future, Gill may experience
the same type of growth pressures that western Worcester County suburbs have experienced over the past decade as western Worcester County suburbs prices start to rise.

Many of the residences in the western Worcester County bedroom communities along the Route 2 corridor are often geographically isolated, rendering residents dependent upon their automobiles for almost every social, economic, and civic necessity. The Montachusett Regional Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, a report analyzing the regional economy in the western Worcester County area stated that, “one of major weaknesses of the regional economy is traffic on Route 2” (44). At the Route 2 and Route 12 intersection, Route 2 changes from a two lane highway into a one lane highway which is a problem during peak early morning and afternoon commuting times. This area in Phillipston, MA was characterized by the MRPC as “dangerous due to the increased volume of traffic and lack of safe roadways and intersections” (Montachusett Regional Planning Commission 45). The MRPC further identified the future opportunity to convert Route 2 to an Interstate Highway, which would enable the area to receive more funding for the much needed improvements (44).

Gill is located in the service area for the Franklin Regional Council of Governments. FRCOG’s service region is currently composed of the 26 towns in the upper Connecticut River Valley in mid-western Massachusetts. Bordered on the north by New Hampshire and Vermont, on the west by the Berkshires, and on the east by the central uplands, the region shares major economic, transportation and natural resource corridors with the greater Pioneer Valley to the south. The most rural area in Massachusetts, the Franklin County region covers 740 square miles and is populated by approximately 70,000 people. FRCOG advocates on behalf of communities and is sensitive to the rural nature, economic strengths, and natural resources of the region. The possible conversion of Route 2 to an interstate highway is important to Gill, Massachusetts because it would enable traffic to flow quicker through the Montachusett Valley which would make it easier and quicker to commute from Gill, MA to eastern parts in the state. The Route 2 expansion was only discussed as a future opportunity in the MRPC report but if it were to actually occur the quality of life in Gill may be directly affected. It is essential for Gill to understand the possibility of the growth pressure and the expansion of Route 2 so the town may can be prepared when and if it happens in the future. In order to better prepare for possible
growth pressures, the Town of Gill needs to work with FRCOG. Working with FRCOG will allow Gill to properly balance growth pressures and economic development.

**Recent Growth Trends**

Figure 1 shows the population growth rate in Franklin County, Massachusetts from 1970-2000. Franklin County experienced the largest population growth between 1970 and 1980. Between 1990 and 2000 Franklin County experienced the least amount of population growth. The 1970 population of Franklin County was approximately 59,233 and the 1980 population was 64,317. The population during 1970 and 1980 grew by 10%. Franklin County experienced a 9% growth in population from 1980 to 1990. The population in 1990 was 70,092 up from 64,317 in 1980.

The population growth between 1990 and 2000 was 2%. The 2000 population was 71,535 up from 70,092 in 1990.

Figure 2 shows the population growth rate in Gill, Massachusetts. Gill experienced the largest
population growth between 1980 and 1990. Gill experienced the least amount of population growth between 1990 and 2000. The 1970 population of Gill was 1,100. The 1980 population in Gill was 1,259. The population growth between 1970 and 1980 was 14%. The population in 1990 was 1,583 up from 1,259 in 1980. The population growth between 1980 and 1990 was 26%. The 2000 population was 1,630 up from 1,583 in 1990. The population growth in Gill was 3% between 1990 and 2000.

In order to assess the population growth rate in the western Worcester County, Massachusetts, region the 1970 to 2000 population of three towns were analyzed and combined. The results are shown in Figure 3. The towns of Petersham, Hubbardston and Phillipston were chosen because they border one another and are all located close to the Route 2 corridor. These towns are also located less than 35 miles east of Gill, Massachusetts. This area of Worcester County experienced the largest population growth between 1980 and 1990. The area experienced the least amount of population growth between 1970 and 1980. The combined 1970 population for this area was 3,323. The combined 1980 population for this area was 3,774. The combined population growth for this area between 1970 and 1980 was 13%. The 1990 population for the three town area was 5,413 up from 3,774 in 1980. The combined population growth for this area between 1980 and 1990 was 43%. The 2000 population for this area was 6,710 up from 5,413 in 1990. The combined population growth for this area was 23% between 1990 and 2000.

*FIGURE 3: Western Worcester County (Hubbardston, Phillipston, Petersham) Population Growth 1970-2000*
(Source: Massachusetts Regional Economic Report)
Background

Named for a former Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, Moses Gill, the Town of Gill was incorporated in 1793. (Stoughton) The history of the area, however, goes back much farther than the Revolutionary period. The residential village of Riverside and the area in general were host to Native American activity for thousands of years before the arrival of European settlers in the 17th Century.

The area was also the site of the famous Falls Fight in 1676, when Captain William Turner led a group of settlers from nearby towns in a surprise attack on the Native American camp near the falls. Turner’s group killed as many as 200 people before being routed and losing his own life.

(http://www.americancenturies.mass.edu/classroom/curriculum_5th/lesson4/bkgdessay2.html)

Over the years, Gill has remained a predominantly rural, agricultural town. The town’s densest residential area is in the Riverside District, by the river. In the upland areas, population is much more diffuse, and it is here that the majority of the town’s farming activities are based. There are a number of farms in the town, selling products from fruits and vegetables to dairy products to emu meat.

The town is also home to Northfield Mt. Hermon, a private coeducational facility with about 900 students. The school, long an important presence in the community, recently consolidated its Northfield and Gill campuses into one, located in Gill. The school is doing some expansion work on this campus, including building new dormitories. In light of the school’s current state of flux, it is unknown at this time exactly what its new role will be in the town.

The land known as the Mariamante parcel had historically been used for agricultural purposes until it was purchased several years ago by the Mariamante School, who gave the site its name. The land was intended to be used as a site for the school and was placed under Chapter 61 of the Massachusetts General Law, intended to provide tax relief to parcels in agricultural use. The school later changed its plans to build upon the site and removed it from Chapter 61 preparatory to selling it. At that point, under Massachusetts General Law, the town had right of first refusal on the land and exercised that right, purchasing the property.

-10-
The town used short-term borrowing at a fixed low interest rate (approximately two percent) to receive the $245,000 asking price on the property. Through the end of May, the town will have paid $2,754 in interest on the loan, which will be renewed in June.
Development Issues

Archeological Issues and Potential Constraints

On March 24, the ad hoc committee was fortunate enough to have as a guest Mitchell Mulholland, director of the Archaeological Services Department at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Dr. Mulholland’s familiarity with the Gill and Riverside Archaeological District areas dates back as far as 1976, when he conducted an archaeological survey for the proposed placement of Route 2.

In addition to completing a survey for the proposed (and never implemented) placement of Route 2, Dr. Mulholland worked with the Franklin County Housing Authority when they were planning the construction of Stoughton Village on Main Road, just below the Mariamante parcel. That site proved to be an exceptionally rich one in an area known for its archaeological potential. An extensive survey of the site was conducted and the remains of a Native American sweat lodge and dwelling were discovered. The relative rarity of the find ensured that its preservation was a top priority. Taking this into account, the building plans were modified such that development of the housing could continue without adversely affecting the integrity of the site. The site was recovered and a site preservation restriction was placed on the parcel. The restriction is meant to ensure that any future development on the land will leave the site unmolested.

The Gill and Turners Falls areas are well-known as historic areas of Native American activity. There are numerous sites in the area that have been identified by the Massachusetts Historical Commission as of archaeological interest. This includes one that lies partially within the Mariamante parcel, which is itself partially within the Riverside Archaeological District.

According to Dr. Mulholland, there are three levels of archaeological surveys of increasing intensity and thoroughness:

Intensive Survey. This first phase is misleadingly named, said Professor Mulholland, and refers to the research done on the known history of the site, and not to
the intensity of digging or other potentially intrusive activity. This phase includes speaking to people within the town and the area who are in a position to answer questions about the land use history of the site, what it has been used for in the past, any artifacts found on the site, etc. In this way, a prediction can be made of the likely level of archaeological significance of the site and that prediction can lead to an appropriate ranking. Also, during this phase, shovel test pits of the site are made. In about 80 percent of cases, the first phase concludes that there is insufficient reason at that time to continue with further examination. This first phase is generally between $10,000-$15,000 and takes about 40 days.

**Site Examination.** After identifying areas on the site with archaeological significance, this part of the survey focuses on exploring those areas, following the guidelines of the National Register of Historic Places.

**Data Recovery.** This is the most intensive of the three levels. The senior housing complex that instituted the site preservation restriction went to this level, which typically includes the involvement of the town historic commission. There is also an element of reciprocity with this stage, including a public involvement and education segment.

As far as the best path for the town to follow, there is no requirement at this time that the intensive survey be done. The survey is not required until one or both of the following two things occurs: 1) the town plans to conduct a large scale development on the site or allows another entity to do any development, no matter what the scale 2) the town seeks state or federal money for developing the site. Dr. Mulholland believes that the fact that Gill has no specific development plans yet is actually beneficial, as it is easier not to have to rearrange existing plans after doing a survey. Given the known archaeological history of the area and the knowledge of the residents that there have been artifacts found on the site, Prof. Mulholland believes that it is likely that there will prove to be some archaeological materials found on the Mariamante parcel.

Since the ultimate goal is to avoid damage to the site while still being able to develop on it, now is an excellent time to conduct the intensive survey. That way, when the time for development comes, that necessary component would have been completed and could be used to help guide the manner in which development occurs.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

✧ **Contact the State – 90 DAY ACTION ITEM**

Responsible Board/Entity: Administrative Assistant, Study Group

Follow up on letter sent to the Massachusetts State Historic Preservation Office to determine extent of archaeological activity in known site on the Mariamante parcel.

✧ **Seek Archaeological Expertise – 90 DAY ACTION ITEM**

Responsible Board/Entity: Ad Hoc Committee

Work with Prof. Mitchell Mulholland and the UMass Archaeological Services Office to determine if it is feasible to include further exploration of the site as part of the classes and activities undertaken by that department.

✧ **Protect the Site – 90 DAY ACTION ITEM**

Responsible Board/Entity: Administrative Assistant

Inform all Gill Fire and Police personnel of the importance of the site and that they should protect the site from trespassers.

✧ **Seek Outside Partnerships**

Responsible Board/Entity: Ad Hoc Committee, Select Board

Consider partnering with Northfield Mount Hermon School (as well as others in the area) in encouraging educational efforts that emphasize the archaeological importance of the site and the area in general.
Development Considerations

Responsible Board/Entity: Select Board, Planning Board

Consider requiring that any potential developer of the site underwrite the cost of the archaeological survey process as part of the requirements for development.
Water and Sewer Infrastructure

Any major development of the type the study group has researched for the Mariamante site will need the extension of water and sewer service. Current water and sewer service in the town is centered in the Riverside and Route 2 areas, although water extends to within 1/4 of a mile and sewer to within 1/3 of a mile.

Water service in Gill is through the Riverside Water District. The legislative district was established in 1970. Expansion of the district to an abutting property such as that of the Mariamante parcel would require a petition by that abutter (in this case, the town).

The town has expressed an interest in extending the lines to the site, but not in any further extension along Main or West Gills roads. Jim Toth, regional engineer with the Franklin Regional Council of Governments (personal communication 3/2/05), offered a tentative estimate of $35,000 for the extension of sewer service and $30,000 for water extension. It is important to note that such an estimate applies only to the cost of laying the lines, and does not take into account such additional issues such as roadwork which will be need to be done in conjunction with such a project. Such roadwork, Mr. Toth estimates, would in itself be more expensive than the laying of the water/sewer infrastructure.

Dennis Banash is chair of the three-person commission that oversees the water district. Banash says (phone conversation 4/20/05) that the district’s capacity would be more than sufficient to accommodate development on the Mariamante parcel, as its approximately 140 residential and commercial customers are using about ten percent of the capacity allotted them by Greenfield, from whom they purchase the water. According to the agreement between the district and Greenfield, the district is allotted 175,000 gallons of use per day.

The district has considered expansion in the past, said Banash, and would not be averse to doing so again, although there are some ancillary matters that would need to be addressed. These include the high likelihood that a pump station to get water up the incline on Main Road would need to be installed and maintained and the determination of who would do that. Should a petition by the town be submitted to the district, the board would consider it and submit it to the voters in the district for approval.
Through the Greater Franklin County Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS), the town has identified the extension of water and sewer service to the parcel as a priority. The CEDS report, produced by the Franklin Regional Council of Governments, is produced annually and is designed to promote economic development activity in the CEDS region (Franklin County and the adjacent towns of Amherst, Athol and Phillipston.)

According to Jessica Atwood, economic development planner for the FRCOG (email 4/28/05), having the project listed in the report puts the FRCOG in a better position to identify and be eligible for funding to complete the project, although it is by no means a guarantee of future funding. "The Town can use their presence on the listing to support the claim on funding applications that this project is recognized as a regionally significant and supported economic development project."

RECOMMENDATIONS:

❖ Cost Estimate

Responsible Board/Entity: Administrative Assistant, Study Group

Consider consulting with engineering firm Tighe & Bond to obtain a cost estimate for extension of water and sewer lines to the Mariamante parcel.

❖ Establish Development Requirements

Responsible Board/Entity: Planning Board

Consider requiring potential site developers to include cost of water and sewer improvements to the Mariamante site as part of Special Permit approval.
Adjacent Parcels & Splitting Up the Mariamante Parcel

The town of Gill owns both a 10 acre parcel and a non-contiguous 2 acre parcel along Main Road. For this section, real estate agents were consulted with to determine what the residential market rate for the 2-acre parcel along main road would be. This information is important because in the future the Town of Gill may want to sell this parcel in order to fund development, the formation a land trust or a community development corporation. Most about land trusts and community development corporations will be discussed later in the report. According to Robin Parris of Upton Massamont Realtors in Greenfield, “The market rate for a 2 acre residential parcel along main road is approximately $55-60,000.” Brian Derry of Mohawk Real Estate of Greenfield stated that, “the market rate for the parcel is somewhere between $40-50,000. Robert Cohn Broker of Cohn of Company in Greenfield stated that the rate for the residential parcel was approximately $50,000.

Real estate agents were also consulted in order to determine the asking price and characteristics of the abutting 23-acre property located at 13 West Gill Road. The 23-acre property features a 3-bedroom house and a barn. According to Brian Derry the property is currently under agreement. Although Mr. Derry could not give the exact price the property went under agreement for he was able to provide the final listing price of $240,000. This information was important to the study because the town was interested in having more control of the land around the Mariamante Parcel in order to have a larger parcel to work with for future development purposes. The town was also concerned about whether development would occur on the 23 acre parcel which could effect future development of the Mariamante parcel. After looking at the land survey provided by Mohawk Real Estate and visiting the property several times it was apparent that the parcel has poor development potential due to hilly topography of the land. In addition, the New England Power Company has a right of way in the middle of the property which further hinders the development potential of the land. Gill does not need to have control of this parcel because development would be very limited due to the poor topography and the right of way in the middle of the property. Furthermore, Gill would be unable to use this parcel for development because of the topographical constraints.
Land Control Options

Land Trusts

This section identifies the definition of a land trust, the advantages of land trusts, and the advantages of conservation easements in the preservation of land. The section will also discuss examples of other land trusts in Massachusetts, and will include specific sources that the Town of Gill can consult in order to properly form and start a Land Trust.

What is a Land Trust?

According to the Land Trust Alliance, “a land trust is a nonprofit organization, that, as all or part of its mission, actively works to conserve land by undertaking or assisting direct land transactions primarily through the purchase or acceptance of donations of land or conservation easements” (Land Trust Alliance). Land trusts are local, state, or regional nonprofit organizations directly involved in protecting land for its natural, recreational, scenic, historical, or productive value. Land trusts are independent entrepreneurial organizations that work with landowners who are interested in protecting open space (Land Trust Alliance). Land trusts often work cooperatively with government agencies by acquiring or managing land, researching open space needs and priorities, or assisting in the development of open space lands. There are also a few quasi-governmental bodies called land trusts that operate with the freedom and flexibility of a private trust, some of which have a private board or the ability to use private funds. Land trusts are not “trusts” in the legal sense, and may also be called “conservancies,” “foundations,” or any number of other names descriptive or their purpose (Land Trust Alliance).

Land trusts are distinguished by their first-hand involvement in land transaction or management. This involvement can take many forms. Some land trusts purchase or accept donations of land. Land trusts also sometimes purchase or accept donation of conservation easements (permanent, binding agreements that restrict the uses of a piece of land to protect its conservation resources). Some manage land owned by trust or advise landowners on how to
preserve their land. Some land trusts help negotiate conservation transactions in which they play no other role. Land trusts often work cooperatively with government agencies by acquiring in the development of open space plans. They may also work with other nonprofit organizations and sometimes with developers. A land trust may do one, several or all of these things.

Resources protected by land trusts include forests, prairie grasslands, island, urban gardens, river corridors, farmland, watersheds, parklands, marshes, ranch land, scenic vistas, cultural landscapes, Civil War battlefields, and hiking trails. Most land trusts depend on volunteer leadership and support even if they also have a professional staff. They have the potential right to bring together a wide range of people in a community, such as naturalists, planners, farmers, landowners, community leaders, sometimes developers, and other who care about special lands in their communities (Land Trust Alliance).

What are the advantages of land trusts?

Land trusts may have many advantages as a vehicle for protecting land. Land Trusts are very closely tied to the communities in which they operate. Moreover, a land trusts' nonprofit tax status brings them a variety of tax benefits. Donations of land, conservation easements or money may qualify individuals for income, estate, or gift tax savings. Due to their private organization status, land trusts can be more flexible and creative than public agencies since they are not restrained by politics and procedures. They can hold and manage land and other assets as a corporation, rather than through individuals. Land Trusts are also able to negotiate with landowners discretely, confidentially and quickly. Properly structured land trusts are exempt from federal and state income taxes, and sometimes from local property and real estate transfer taxes as well. Nonprofit status is also an advantage in raising funds from a variety of sources. As community-based organizations, land trusts draw on community resources, including volunteer time and skills. Their community orientation is also helpful in selecting and negotiating transactions. They are familiar with the land in the area and often have the trust and confidence of local landowners who may not want to work with government agencies or entities from outside the community.
What are the disadvantages of land trusts?

Perhaps the only disadvantage to a formation of a land trust in Gill would be that the town would lose control of the Mariamante Parcel to the land trust.

Conservation Easements

Land Trusts may also accept the donation of a conservation easement, which permanently limits the type and scope of development that can take place on the land, in some cases land trusts purchase conservation easements on land (Land Trust Alliance). A conservation easement is a legal agreement between a landowner and a land trust or government agency that permanently limits uses of the land in order to protect its conservation values. A conservation easement allows the owner of the land to continue to own and use their land and sell it or pass it on to heirs. When a conservation easement to a land trust is donated some rights are given up associated with the land. For example, the owner of the property might give up the right to build additional structures, while retaining the right to grown crops. If the property is sold, future owners will also be bound by the easement’s terms. The land trust has the responsibility to monitor whether the easements terms are followed accordingly.

Conservation easements offer great flexibility. An easement does not necessarily have to apply to a whole piece of property but could also just apply to a portion of the property. Sometimes, a land owner sells a conservation easement, but usually easements are donated. If the donation meets specific tax code requirements and benefits the public it may qualify as a tax-deductible charitable donation. The amount of the donation is the difference between the land’s value with the easement and its value without the easement. When an owner places an easement on their property it may or may not result in tax savings. A conservation easement can be essential for passing land on to the next generation. By removing the land’s development potential, the easement lowers its market value, which in turn lowers estate tax. Whether the easement is donated during life or by will, it can make a critical difference in the heir’s ability to keep the land intact.
**Land Trusts In Massachusetts**

In order to gain an understanding of the different ways in which land trusts operate it was important to study examples of land trusts in Massachusetts. Land Trusts in Ashfield, Lincoln, and Attleboro were used in this section. Each land trust studied was created during different time periods and have different town specific goals. All three land trusts are members of the Land Trust Alliance which requires that each member adopt their standards and practices guidelines. The *Land Trust Standards and Practices* are guidelines for the responsible operation of a land trust, which is run legally, ethically, and in the public interest and conducts a sound program of land transactions and stewardship. The Land Trust Alliance originally developed the Standards in 1989 at the urging of land trusts, who believe a strong land trust community depends on the credibility and effectiveness of all its members. They have been since been revised in 2004.

**The Lincoln Experience**

Lincoln is a town in Middlesex, in the Boston Cambridge-Quincy metro area. The population in 2000 was about 8,056 people. Lincoln was one of the first communities in the nation to establish a private land trust, the Lincoln Land Conservation Trust, in 1957. According to Buzz Constable, President of the Lincoln Conservation Trust, “the LLCT is funded by the Rural Land foundation. The RLF receives profits from a small mall that the organization operates and all net revenues from the operation of the mall fund both the LLCT and affordable housing opportunities in the town of Lincoln.”

The Lincoln Conservation Trust was established in 1957 for the purpose of maintaining the rural character of the community by holding land in trust for the benefit of the townspeople. Membership in this nonprofit, tax-exempt, private trust is
open to all Lincoln citizens (LLCT).

The trust buys, holds and manages land and engages in active conservation and education activities. Since its inception, it has contributed to the protection of more than 1,000 acres of land in Lincoln (LLCT). The LLCT maintains more than 50 miles of trails on conservation land and private property where it has been able to obtain permission from the owner. These trails are open to the public for cross-country skiing, hiking or horseback riding, and for biking during certain times of the year.

- Recent Lincoln Land Conservation Trust Activities

  o managing 375 acres currently under its protection
  o laying out and maintaining about 60 miles of trails on its own property and on private property with the permission of the landowners
  o educating the community about Lincoln’s natural resources through programs in the schools, trail maps, and the Guide to Conservation Land in Lincoln
  o encouraging involvement in the community through a membership program, volunteer workdays and neighborhood activism
  o funding and directing research, analysis and planning for various natural resource systems in towns
  o receiving memorial donations
  o assisting in raising major acquisition funds

The Attleboro, Massachusetts Experience

Attleboro is a city in Bristol County located in the southeastern portion of the state. In 2000, the population was 42,000. The Attleboro Land Trust was founded in 1990 based on a concern for the future of Locust Valley. The land trust currently owns and manages eight conservation areas.
Colman Reservation

The Colman Reservation is a 77-acre wooded area that has a trail to a 200-year old hemlock. The reservation was donated by Adele Colman.

Larson Woodland

Larson Woodland is a 4-acre parcel on Mechanics Pond that consists of trails. The land was donated by Ray Larson.

Anthony Lawrence Wildlife Preserve

This Wildlife Preserve is about 49 acres and has woods, meadows, and marsh. The Seven Mile River runs through the property. The property was donated by Anthony Lawrence.

Phil and Ginny Leach Wildlife Sanctuary

This 19.5 acre parcel consists of mostly of wooded area with puddingstone foundations and trail. The property was donated to the trust by Phil and Ginny Leach.

Nickerson Walking Woods Preserve

This 48 acre parcel is not currently open to the public due the trails that are under development. The land was donated by Martha Nickerson.

Uriah’s Marsh

This 15 acre wooded acre is adjacent to the railroad track and provides habitat protection but no public access. The land was donated by Peter Lovenbury.

Vaughn Memorial Forest

This 32 acre wooded area features the Green Dot Trail. The land was donated in 1997 by Jean Vaughn.

Veno Overlook

This 2.8 acre wooded area has a park bench. The land was donated in 1998 by Myrtle Veno.

Attleboro set up regulations in order to ensure that the land continues to stay preserved. Most of the properties have walking trails which are open to the public.
Atteboro Land Trust activities include:

- Encouraging citizens and businesses to donate land
- Caring for donated properties
- Educating the public on the importance of preserving undeveloped land and open space

The Franklin County Land Trust

The Franklin County Land Trust is located in Ashfield, Massachusetts. The land Trust was Founded in 1987. The Franklin Land Trust is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization devoted to the preservation of the farm and forest land, and the rural character, of western Franklin County, Massachusetts. The Land Trust works to help farmers and other landowners protect their land from unwanted development. The Land trust does not seek to own land, but instead encourages private stewardship. The Franklin County Land Trust was established because property prices are on the rise and suburbanization is creeping closer to the Franklin County Region.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

✧ Decision

Responsible Board/Entity: Select Board, Ad Hoc Committee

The Town of Gill needs to identify whether forming a land trust would be beneficial in the proper management of the Mariamante Parcel, what the goals of that land trust would be, and what public interests it will serve. The Town of Gill must educate themselves on the different ways land trusts are structured and the different functions they serve. The Land Trust Alliance is a very helpful source for this information, and may be found online at <http://www.lta.org>

In order to gain a greater understanding of how to start a land trust the town may want to purchase Starting a Land Trust which is available online through the Land Trust Alliance. Starting a Land Trust is very detailed book and it goes beyond the basics and gives valuable
information about how to sustain the organization. The book includes sample documents, sample budget and straightforward advice on funding, grants, and government assistance.

• Potential use partial parcel as seed money

Responsible Board/Entity: Select Board, Town Meeting

Once the town decides they would like to form a land trust they may want to consider selling the two-acre non contiguous parcel located on main road in order to have some start up money for the formation of the land trust.
Community Development Corporations

“Community Development Corporations are non-profit groups accountable to local resident that engage in a wide range of physical, economic and human development activities. CDCs actively rebuild their communities through housing, commercial, job development and other activities. A CDC’s mission is normally focused on serving the local needs for a community” (Evanston housing glossary). CDCs are all over the map when it comes to community organizing. Stoecker gives a fairly standard definition of community organizing: "developing relationships so people can press their demands collectively and gain power through the process" (Stoecker, p. 10). Note that organizing has three parts: it brings people together; it helps people collectively make real gains on issues they have identified; and it builds power for the participants (Winkelman 2).

In order for Gill to form a CDC it is important for the town to recognize and understand that CDCs are organized in many different ways depending on community specific ideals. Lee Winkelman of the Massachusetts Association of Community Development Corporations wrote Massachusetts Community Development and Community Organizing, which lays out 7 different ways in which CDCs operate in Massachusetts. The following is an excerpt from his paper:

Interviews, annual reports, and MACDC meetings reveal that Massachusetts CDCs collectively do the following types of organizing work:

1. Resident Council Organizing

Helping residents to form and maintain councils in CDC-developed buildings is probably the most common kind of community organizing done by Massachusetts CDCs. Resident councils exist in projects with very different types of ownership situations, including rental housing owned by the CDC, cooperatives and condominiums owned by the residents, and mutual housing and other hybrid forms owned jointly by the CDC and the residents or a residents association. Though the degree of residents' ownership, control and power differ, in all cases the goal of resident council organizing is to involve residents in some manner in the management of their development.
2. Organizing to get control of development resource

Some CDCs mobilize residents to pressure public or private entities to turn over land, buildings or money necessary for development.

3. Grassroots Community Planning

Many CDCs have organized residents in various kinds of community planning processes. In some cases, these have been elaborate processes, involving surveys, one-to-one meetings, small group discussions, and large community meetings, over the period of a year or more. The Neighborhood of Affordable Housing (NOAH) is nearing the end of one of these planning processes, which will produce a final plan addressing the following issues identified by neighborhood residents: economic development, housing, community safety, human services, education, open/green space, health, arts/culture/heritage, and transportation. Other CDC grassroots planning processes are not so elaborate. They might focus on only one issue (housing is common) and use a more targeted, smaller scale approach (Winkelman 3).

4. Issue Organizing

While organizing on issues related to the development and management of affordable housing is the most common type of community organizing, some CDCs have organized around other neighborhood issues not directly related to CDC development projects. These issues have including crime and police behavior, tenants rights (including both landlord/tenant issues with for-profit landlords and policy issues, like rent control and just cause eviction legislation), city or town services, youth issues, open space and environmental justice issues, community gardens, welfare reform, immigrant rights, jobs, community control of development and many more issues.

5. Political Organizing

By and large, CDCs have tended to stay clear of the political process. Many CDC staff and board members have worked for candidates in their hours off the job in order to develop relationships that will benefit their CDC. Though many CDC people have volunteered as individuals, rarely have CDCs as institutions become involved in electoral campaigns beyond scattered voter registration work. Ballot initiatives are an exception to this general rule. In 1990
many CDCs worked to help defeat a state-wide ballot initiative that would have drastically cut state taxes and services.

6. Community Building Events

Many CDCs use community events, annual meetings, ethnic or multi-cultural festivals, neighborhood clean ups, barbecues, picnics, and street fairs, to build community ties and present a public face of the CDC to neighborhood residents. In most CDCs, staff plan the event, and it is not part of some larger campaign. However, some CDCs use these community events as part of their organizing work, bringing together a group of residents to plan and run the event and using it to build relationships and leadership skills as part of a campaign to build power. (Winkelman 4)

7. Organizing as support for development

In some CDCs, organizing ends up playing a support role to development. Organizers in these CDCs do community planning at the beginning of a development cycle. They mobilize support for CDC development projects when the projects are in danger. They organize resident councils to help with the on-going management of CDC developments. They organize community events, put out a newsletter, and plan a voter registration day. CDCs that organize residents into residents’ council will often help these residents organize around issues that are not directly related to management of the building, such as crime and city services. Political organizing is often tied with issue organizing, organizing for development resources or sometimes both. This inter-relatedness makes sense since building political power helps residents win victories around issues and development resources (Winkelman 4).

Organizational Structure

In order for the Town of Gill to form a CDC, Gill would have to determine the way in which the town would want to structure the CDC. CDCs not only do different types of organizing, but they create different kinds of organizational structures as ways to handle the organization of the CDC. There are various ways Massachusetts Community Development Corporations are structured. Some of the different organizational structures used by Massachusetts CDCs include:
I. Board Committee

Some CDCs use Board Committees as the vehicle for their organizing. Each organizing campaign is run as a committee chaired by a Board member. Residents involved in the campaign (most likely they are not board members) serve as members of the committee. (Winkelman 5)

2. Neighborhood Association

Some CDCs organize residents into a neighborhood association that is separate from the CDC.

3. Ward/Precinct

Some CDCs divide neighborhoods into subregions and each subregion is broken into blocks. Each block has a captain, and all the block captains make up the subregion committee. This structure is then used for voter registration and mobilization, issue campaigns, and exchange of information between the neighborhood and the CDC. (Winkelman 5)

4. Partnerships

Some CDCs work in partnerships. For example, City Life organizes against an absentee landlords, and, through City Life's organizing, JPNDC takes over the building and develops it as affordable housing. JPNDC organizes the residents during and after the development process. “Community planning is done jointly by the two groups usually two separate groups work together that have their own history, organizational culture, goals, funding and staffing--neither organization is a "front group" of the other--yet both groups do community organizing in a coordinated way” (Winkelman 6).

5. Coalitions

Other CDCs do most of their organizing through coalitions. Virtually all CDCs are involved in coalitions. Some CDCs work together with neighboring social service providers, hospitals, and universities to win services and support for low income families. (Winkelman 6).

6. Institution-Based

Some CDCs have begun to investigate whether a church- or institution-based model can work in a CDC setting. While many CDCs have relationships with local churches and other institutions, it is still unclear whether CDCs can be effective at reaching grassroots members of
churches and other institutions and involving them in neighborhood organizing campaigns (Winkelman 6)

**Specific Examples of Community Development Corporations**

Three different CDCs were analyzed in this section in order to better evaluate varying goals, mission statements, and purposes of CDCs. The first CDC that was used in this analysis is located in Brattleboro, VT and is a rural based CDC. Brattleboro is located approximately 16 miles from Gill, MA just over the Vermont/Massachusetts state line. The other two CDCs are located in Massachusetts, one in Fitchburg and the other in Greenfield. The Twin Cities CDC in Fitchburg is more of a suburban based CDC whereas the Franklin County CDC in Greenfield is more rural based.

**The Brattleboro Community Development Credit Corporation**

Brattleboro is a town in Windam County, VT located approximately 16 miles from Gill, MA. The Brattleboro Development Credit Corporation (BDCC) is a private, non-profit economic development organization that serves as a catalyst for industrial and commercial growth in Windham County. The Brattleboro Development Credit Corp. works in partnership with businesses to keep the Windham County area economy vigorous, and to create progressive advancements in commerce wherever it is possible. Partner programs are central to BDCC’s success in Vermont, and are designed to offer services to support existing and/or incoming businesses with managerial, technical, regulatory and financial guidance. In addition, BDCC also offers low cost viable rental space as well as developmental acreage in an industrial park Brattleboro. BDCC serves the following towns in southeastern Vermont: Athens, Bellows Falls, Brattleboro, Brookline, Dover, Dummerston, Grafton, Guilford, Halifax, Jamaica, Londonderry, Marlboro, Newfane, Putney, Readsboro, Rockingham, Searsberg, Somerset, Stratton, Townshend, Vernon, Wardsboro, Westminster, Weston, Whitingham, Windham and Wilmington.

**Mission**

The primary objective for the BDCC is to create and retain a flourishing business community that supports vibrant fiscal activity, and improves the quality of life of all its
residents. Since 1954, BDCC has been at the hub of economic progress in Windham County; they have successfully worked for local business growth and expansion, as well as attracting new businesses to the Southeastern Vermont region, for over fifty years. BDCC’s efforts have played a pivotal role in creating over 10,000 new regional jobs in service and industrial trades combined. The BDCC goals are to assist startup companies, growing companies, and global businesses alike.

BDCC works in close partnership with ten state and federal agencies, all of whom are represented at BDCC’s offices in Brattleboro, Vermont.

The BDCC offers assistance to area communities and residents. Brattleboro Development Credit Corp.'s capabilities and program offerings include:

- Tax Credit Assistance
- Power Rate Incentives
- Marketing Strategy Design
- Aid in Federal Contract Procurement
- Immigration Support
- Engineering Assistance
- Site Selection
- Permit Expedition
- Recycling and Waste Reduction
- Local Relationship Building
- Training Programs
- Rental Space

**Twin City Community Development Corporation**

Twin City Community Development Corporation is located about 50 miles east of Gill, MA along the Route 2 corridor. The Twin City Community Development Corporation was renamed from the Community Development Corporation of Fitchburg, formally incorporated in 1985, which was originally the Cleghorn Neighborhood Development Corporation, incorporated
in 1982 and unofficially formed in 1979. The Twin City CDC has responded to the changing needs of low income neighborhoods we have served since the beginning in 1979 by engaging in a variety of community economic development strategies. As a community-based organization, the CDC is particularly concerned with the revitalization of neighborhoods. In community organizing, the CDC's goals are to develop leaders who work to obtain resources to meet local needs and affect policy changes that yield solutions to neighborhood problems. The CDC's homeownership program was started to respond to the rash of foreclosures and abandonments that gripped Fitchburg in the wake of the inflated speculative real estate market in the mid 1980s.

Mission

The Twin City Community Development Corporation (TCCDC) is a non-profit organization working in partnership with local government, businesses and residents to improve the quality of life of persons with low moderate incomes in the cities of Fitchburg and Leominster through housing and economic development.

Activities and Accomplishments

- Provided 223 families with pre and post purchase housing counseling
- Rehabilitated or repaired 46 rental or owner occupied units
- Assisted 66 families in purchasing a home through homeownership counseling, down payment, closing cost or financing assistance.
- Owned or managed 39 rental units.
- Invested money in the community through Twin Cities Community Development Corp.'s revolving loan fund, which leveraged $8,761,588 from conventional lenders and other sources.
- Total Direct investment in the community is $8,761,588.

Franklin County Community Development Corporation

The Franklin County Community Development Corporation is located in Greenfield, MA about 3 miles from Gill, MA. The purpose of the corporation is to stimulate a more vital, rural
economy, to maximize community control over the future economic situation in the area, and to expand opportunities for low and moderate income residents.

The FCCDC serves a potential community of approximately 26 towns in Franklin County plus four towns in the north Quabbin area. The FCCDC is community driven because the CDC wants to help residents and other stakeholders in the area identify what they need and use resources and skill-sets to achieve goals. The FCCDC supports economic development though community organizing methods, facilitating self empowerment of individuals and local groups.

Activities

Food Processing Center

The FCCDC was a central figure in the development of a food processing center in Greenfield for food producers and entrepreneurs. The Western Massachusetts Food Processing Center mission is to promote economic development through entrepreneurship, provide opportunities for sustaining local agriculture, and promote best practices for food producers. The food processing center also has professional development programs in order to better assist its member. Classes, workshops, and seminars are offered in order to help start your business and expand your capabilities as a food entrepreneur.

First National Bank Renovation Project

In addition to the development of a food processing plant the FCCDC was a key figure in the First National Bank renovation project. The FCCDC accepted ownership of the First National Bank in downtown Greenfield in November 2002. The building was erected in 1929 and had been vacant for over 25 years. The building is located in an important commercial site on Bank Row facing the town common at Court Square and directly opposite the town hall and it is part of the main street historic district. The building was named as one of ten most dangerous historic resources in MA. During the past 20 years the building has deteriorated to a point that private developers did not want to take on the renovations. Since taking ownership the FCCDC has secured $950,000 for stabilizing and renovating the property. The current vision is to have several retail shops and possibly a restaurant in the building. The CDC will continue its effort of seeking a combination of grants to complete the renovations.
Gill

Through the evaluation of these three CDCs it is clear that each offer something different to their specific community. Gill may want to create their own CDC or work with the FCCDC in a partnership. Since Gill is located in Franklin County and is one of the communities served by the FCCDC it may be possible for Gill and the FCCDC to work together in order to develop the Mariamante Parcel. The town of Gill would have to decide what the goals for the parcel development would be and whether they would be willing to work with the FCCDC. If Gill decides it would like to work with the FCCDC they should contact them in order to assess whether a relationship could be possible in addressing the creation of new businesses and other community issues related to the parcel. More information about the FCCDC and membership can be found on their website: http://www.fccdc.org.

Advantages of CDC for Gill

If Gill were to form a CDC to manage the parcel, the CDC would be able to make decisions more quickly than the town. The CDC would be able to make decisions more quickly because the CDC would be less politically involved because it is a private organization and not the town of Gill.

Disadvantages of CDC for Gill

If Gill were to form a CDC the town would lose control over the parcel and would no longer be able to make decisions on the parcel.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

• Decision

Responsible Board/Entity: Select Board, Ad Hoc Committee

The town needs to determine whether the residents would be interested in forming a CDC, what the goals of the CDC will be, and how the CDC will benefit the Town of Gill. Alternatively, the town may decide to work with FCCDC.
Interim Uses

As the town goes through the process of identifying and assessing the options for the site's long-term development, it wanted to explore the option of receiving some return on the investment made on the land. Whatever development plan is eventually adopted will take into account not just the current needs of the town, but also development pressures both within and outside of Franklin County in the years to come. Therefore, development on the site may be years away and the town would like to capitalize on their investment by exploring the potential to reap benefits as well as the exploring the possibility of greater future returns.

Towards that end, the prospect of interim uses was introduced. Three possible uses were identified that would have minimum impact on the future usability of the site as well as conforming with the character of the town.

As the site was mostly recently used for agricultural purposes, and has prime farmland potential, the two most logical uses are agriculturally-oriented, leasing of the site for a continuation of previous farming activities, and the establishment of a farmers market. The slightly more intensive construction of a small storage facility was also explored.

Both agricultural options would take advantage of the existing agricultural activities in the town by offering Gill farmers either additional growing space or a venue within the town to sell produce and other agricultural products.

Although there are a number of farmers markets in the towns of Hampden, Hampshire and Franklin County, including in the adjoining towns of Greenfield and Turners Falls, the prime location of the Mariamante parcel approximately a half mile from Route 2, as well the strong farming heritage of the town, made exploration of a farmers market in Gill worthwhile.
Agricultural Leasing

A very simple option for getting some financial return off the parcel with a minimum of investment is leasing it out for farming. The land had previously been used to grow corn, and there is still relatively little wild growth on the flat, easily plowed field.

According to initial research done by Administrative Assistant to the Gill Select Board Deb Roussel, the price of a farming lease on the land would be far less than $25,000 annually, which frees the town from the obligation of going through a full procurement process. The town plans to deal directly with local farmers to determine interest in the parcel.

The types of crops grown on the site are an important consideration. Some possible crops, such as asparagus, take several growing seasons to become productive. Since the town may want to maximize its flexibility for beginning further development on the site, short leases and more immediately productive farming options are preferable.

Corn is a proven option. Interest has already also been expressed in haying the land. Hay can be cut on a very flexible schedule, sometimes multiple times per year, and does not require multiple growing seasons.

Interim leasing of the land for farming is also useful for maintaining the parcel’s condition. If it is farmed, it will not become overgrown and unattractive to potential developers. However, the financial return to the town is minimal. Going rates for rental farmland in the Gill area indicate that a parcel of approximately ten acres is only likely to bring in a few hundred dollars per year. The flexibility of this option makes it very attractive as a short-term option, despite the low return.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Contract with local farmers – 90 DAY ACTION ITEM

Responsible Board/Entity: Administrative Assistant, Select Board

Continue to talk with local farmers, and sign a contract for this season’s use of the land before the growing season is fully in swing.
Farmers Market

In order to best assess whether a farmer’s market is a good fit for Gill, we sought the advice of people and entities who help create and sustain farmers markets. Our questions and possible points of contact were suggested and refined by the assistance of Margaret Christie of Community Involved in Sustaining Agriculture (CISA) and David Webber of the Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources. Deb Roussel of the Town of Gill was also invaluable in identifying the proper people to contact.

Webber works with the Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources, which offers resources and information on starting and maintaining farmer’s markets. They also publish a brochure, “How to Organize and Run a Successful Farmer’s Market,” by Julia Freedgood.

Mr. Webber identified some good steps to take in researching the possibility of starting a market, the first of which is to (email 3/16/05) assess the demand for the market – on the part of consumers as well as farmers – as well as researching existing markets and farmstands.

Once questions had been formulated, sources in several categories were contacted:

1. Agencies and entities who help to establish and support organic agriculture and farmers markets

   What does it take to start a farmers market?
   Are there guidelines as to ideal distance between markets?
   What are the regulations governing markets?
   What are the potential drawbacks to starting a market?

2. Interviews were conducted with managers of adjacent markets.

   How long have you been established?
   How busy are you?
   What is your clientele?
What day of the week/time of day is ideal for a market?
Is proximity to other markets a factor in the success of a market?
How do you recruit vendors/customers?

3. Farmers in Gill were surveyed to assess whether there was a need or demand for a market in Gill, or if existing markets were sufficient.

What is the current level of interest in farmers markets in Gill?
If there were one, would you participate?
What are your retail activities?

4. Other agencies and interested parties (Friends of Gill)

Would you participate in a farmer’s market in Gill?

What kind of amenities would you need to make it worthwhile to move from your current location?

What is a farmer’s market?

“Farmers markets can help bring activity into public spaces, often being used by city planners as a way to revitalize downtown areas, or to preserve the historic heritage of old buildings, public squares and parks.” (Freedgood pg. 1)

Depending on its location and clientele, farmer’s markets vary as to their exact makeup. All farmer’s markets, however, are intended to showcase fresh produce, grown in the area of the market and sold by its grower or representative. (http://www.farmersmarkets.net/) Products can range from fresh fruits and vegetables to honey, flowers and meat and dairy products. Local craftsmen and home-based businesses can also take advantage of farmers markets.

According to Freedgood, a farmer’s market not only allows the farmer to maximize his profits by eliminating the middleman but can “foster social gathering and community activity” (Freedgood pg. 1)
Assessing Demand

Among farmers, the reaction to the notion of opening a market of some kind in Gill was mixed. The consensus among the farmers in Gill contacted for the project is that while a market in Gill is not necessarily a bad idea, it would take a great deal of time and energy and would need to take a number of factors into account, as described below. Getting a market established is a long process and requires a dedicated, skilled manager. Ryan Cohen, manager of the fledgling Northfield operation, is getting ready to start the second year of his market, based at Linden Hill School (phone conversation 3/18/05).

Business was slow last year, as the market looked for its niche and worked on advertising efforts. The market doesn’t require any outside water source, although the school has agreed to let visitors and vendors use the restrooms. Cohen believes that there could be a niche for a new market in Gill, as competition between markets is not a decisive factor in success. Rather, choosing a day of the week when other markets are not operating is a more effective way to draw in customers. Although, “it is important to be respectful” of other efforts, he said. Other aspects such as advertising are key to a developing markets success, he added. “Shade is helpful, and parking is key,” he said, and “if you have the town behind you, that is half the battle.”

The Northfield market eventually settled on Thursdays from 4-7 for their open hours, said Cohen, which is not the most ideal time for a market. Weekend mornings are considered optimal, but those times are already “taken” by other efforts. Older, more established markets such as those in Amherst and Northampton (which occupy the coveted Saturday morning slots) are incredibly popular and often have waiting lists for vendors who wish to participate.
Farmers Markets in the Region

- Saturdays May - October
- Thursdays June - October
- Wednesdays May - October
- Saturdays May - November
- Wednesdays June - September
- Tuesdays May - October
- Thursdays May - October
- Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays Various Locations May - October
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Saturdays May - October

Wednesdays (Florence) May - October

Saturdays (Downtown) May - November

Tuesdays May - October

Thursdays May - October

Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays Various Locations May - October
Dee Dec Mares of Songline Emu Farm is not as optimistic about the chances for a Gill farmer’s market as Cohen, although she agreed that shade is a vital component of success. Songline Farm specializes in raising emus and selling emu products from feathers to meat to toenails. In response to an email gauging level of interest in farmers markets, Mares wrote, “Turners and Greenfield both have farmers markets already. I’m not sure that the Gill site would support another one - unless there was some real marketing effort to carry it off - or some additional advantage - like a fully undercover - all weather type of set-up that would attract farmers and customers alike” (email 4/12/12). Mares added that, to the best of her knowledge, the farmers of Gill have carved out for themselves niches that work well in promoting and distributing their goods, and unless a farmers market was a cut above as far as service, advertising and management, it would not be advantageous to them to participate (email 4/13/05). Songline Farm also does a great deal of its business online, either retail or wholesale.

In addition to Songline Farms, other farmers have carved niches out for themselves that make participation in a market superfluous.

Roger Augustine is a beekeeper who sells honey and homemade candies out of his home and at various crafts fairs, particularly in South Deerfield (phone conversation 4/2/05). His agricultural activities are only part-time, but he says that he doesn’t have any retail needs that aren’t being met and that a farmers market would serve.

Cliff Hatch of Upingill Farm has participated in farmers markets sporadically in the past, but has found that he does best with the retail location he has on his own property (phone conversation 4/1/05). In the three weeks of early summer that comprise his peak strawberry season, Mr. Hatch estimates that he will make half of his income for the year.

“I’ve got the money coming in without loading up the truck and standing in the hot sun for six hours,” said Mr. Hatch. Participating in a farmers market, says Mr. Hatch, is a lot of effort without a corresponding level of return. Hatch can’t spare the manpower it takes to have someone at a farmer’s market all day for an unsure return on that investment, when there are people flooding his farm to pick their own strawberries. “It’s risky,” he says of his participation in farmer’s markets.
“It takes a long time to develop a good market,” he said. “And it’s hard to get people interested in specialty food.” Rather than starting a new market, he says, it might make more sense to move the one now operating in Turners Falls up the hill to the Mariamante site.

What area a market is in can definitely affect its success, says Hatch. “[The] Turners Falls farmers market is in a dead zone,” he says. In addition, the relative low income of the residents of the Turners Falls area means that they are less likely to take advantage of markets. In contrast, Hatch cites the Amherst market as an example of success, with its interest in “new and trendy” items and impulse buys such as honey and maple syrup. Greenfield is also a less successful market location. “I make half of the money in Greenfield as I would in Amherst on the same sunny day,” he said. In addition, Saturday, the best day of the week for markets, is taken.

Often, although not every time, says Hatch, farmer’s markets draw vendors who are just starting up and looking to get established, and those who are well enough established to be able to spare the produce and manpower to devote to a day at a market and are looking for a little extra income.

Joe and Barbara Elliott are members of the Friends of Gill, a charitable organization that runs the annual Gill Craft Fair to raise funds for various projects in the town (personal communication 4/11/05). Past projects include new jackets for the Gill Fire Department, purchase of playground equipment for a handicapped child and scholarships for high school students.

The craft fair has been held on the grounds of Riverside School for at least 13 years on the third weekend in October. Since 1999, when the fair had 17 craftspeople, it has grown to over 50, from all over New England.

According to the Elliots, the fair is hoping to include more food vendors and would definitely be interested if a farmers market were started in Gill. This is particularly true if their current success continues, as they will soon outgrow their current site at Riverside and would enjoy more room to expand at the Mariamante parcel.

“If there were a place to have that fair [at Mariamante] it might be better for us than Route 2,” said Barbara Elliott.
Ryan Kretzenger sits on the board of the Greenfield farmer's market and was one of the founders of the market in Turner's Falls (personal communication 4/18/05). Kretzenger says that there is definitely a space for a market in Gill, echoing Cohen's assertion that the day of the week is a far greater consideration than the geographic proximity of a new market. In fact, the potential location of the Gill market is a bonus. "The fact that you're on a main road is going to help you," he said.

**Analysis**

Would a farmer's market be successful at the Mariamante site? The site itself is an ideal one for such a market, with its flat topography and proximity to Route 2. There is some interest on the part of market managers, who were optimistic about the possibility for success of such a market, provided the day on which it is held is not in competition with existing markets. Farmers were not so sanguine, saying that such a market would have to be well-established and managed before they could consider participating.

The interest expressed by the Friends of Gill would offer a built-in clientele and number of vendors. The drawback is that the Friends of Gill craft fair is only held one weekend a year, not on the weekly basis that a farmers market would be held on.

In short, the interest in such a market is there, but would need to be cultivated and encouraged in order to make it work. The time it takes for a market to become well-established will work against Gill, but there is the possibility that piggybacking on existing craft fair and market efforts will eliminate some of the growth time needed. Having a competent and
enthusiastic manager will be key to a market’s success as will working with the Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources and CISA.

CISA offers technical assistance and advice on how to start a town agricultural commission and supports the Local Hero Campaign, which assists farmers. Program Coordinator Margaret Christie’s office is in South Deerfield and she can be reached at:

Program Coordinator
Community Involved in Sustaining Agriculture (CISA)
1 Sugarloaf Street
South Deerfield, MA 01373
(413) 665-7100, (413) 665-7101 (fax)
margaret@buylocalfood.com

In addition to their excellent guide on how to establish a farmers market, the Department of Agricultural Resources also offers assistance to farmers, including running the Massachusetts Farmers’ Market Coupon Program, which “provides women and children in the Federal Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), elders, and other low-income families with coupons redeemable at farmers markets for fresh fruits and vegetables.”
http://www.mass.gov/agr/markets/farmersmarkets/coupons.htm

David Webber, who administers the program, can be reached at:
David.Webber@state.ma.us

The success of a farmer’s market on the site will also serve the ancillary benefit of raising awareness of the Mariamante parcel and the eventual development that will be placed there. The market could be continued after development by the inclusion of a village green or other open space with sufficient space for the market to continue.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

❖ **Select Board Resolution – 90 DAY ACTION ITEM**
   
   Responsible Board/Entity: Select Board, Ad Hoc Committee
   
   Present the Select Board with a resolution that the town further research the feasibility of establishing a farmers market as an interim use on the Mariamante parcel.

❖ **Seek Expert Advice – 90 DAY ACTION ITEM**
   
   Responsible Board/Entity: Administrative Assistant, Study Group
   
   Contact Margaret Christie and David Webber for guidance on the feasibility of establishing a farmer’s market in Gill.

❖ **Solicit Participation**
   
   Responsible Board/Entity: Ad Hoc Committee
   
   Seek to establish a subcommittee of the current Gill ad hoc committee to meet with the Friends of Gill and discuss the practical aspects of moving the craft fair to the Mariamante parcel.

❖ **Solicit Participation**
   
   Responsible Board/Entity: Administrative Assistant, Study Group
   
   Contact CISA Executive Director Annie Cheatham to receive a CD-ROM with information on starting an agricultural commission for the town of Gill. Forming such a commission will serve to generate interest in the formation of a farmers market.
Solicit Participation

Responsible Board/Entity: Administrative Assistant, Ad Hoc Committee

Work with the managers of existing area markets such as Ryan Cohen and Peter Kretzenger to establish an appropriate time for a Gill market to operate and to exchange lists of interested vendors.
Self-Storage Facility

The final of the three interim uses we explored was the possibility of a self-storage facility with movable plastic storage containers.

Methodology

- Self-storage facilities were consulted for specifics concerning the number and size of units offered, the size of the parcel, and the average number of customers that each facility served during their normal hours of operation.
- Articles from “Inside Self-Storage” magazine were also analyzed in order to determine construction concerns and the financial feasibility of developing a self-storage facility.

Assessing Demand

We spoke with owners of self-storage facilities in the Greenfield, MA in order to assess demand. There are approximately 5 self storage unit facilities located in Greenfield and all are located less than 10 miles from the Mariamante Parcel. Jim Wood, of Wisdom Way Self Storage, stated that his facility has 160 steel one level units totaling approximately 18,000 square feet of rentable space. His facility also has a parking area and was between 4 and 5 acres. He stated that his facility does have space available and it not fully rented.

In addition to speaking with Mr. Wood, we were able to interview Mr. Christopher Marriatty of Greenfield Self Storage. Mr. Marriatty stated that his facility had 269 steel one level units and outside parking available. The total amount of rentable square footage at Greenfield self storage is approximately 35,460 square feet. Mr. Marriatty stated that the facility is not fully rented and that space was currently available. Although he could not give the exact size of the parcel in which his facility is located on he did say his parcel was larger than that of Wisdom Way Storage. He further stated that “most of the facilities in Greenfield are not fully rented and have space available.”
When developing a storage facility there is some construction concerns and the financial feasibility of the project needs to be analyzed in order to determine whether the facility will be profitable. In an article from Inside Self Storage magazine, Andrew Donaldson, founder and chief executive officer of Active Supply and Design, stated that “the ideal site is situated on a busy main road with excellent prominence. Being close to a central city full of retailers and offices is a further bonus. In a nutshell, the denser the area’s surrounding population, the more demand there is for self-storage.” (Foxwell 1). The article also quoted Phillip Kirk, proprietor of Steelclad Systems, who stated that, “through increased competition among operators, location as predicted by the US experience has become the most important factor when selecting a site. Fast fill-up rates are more or less guaranteed for facilities close to shopping areas where drive by traffic is high and there is plenty of opportunity for signage” (Foxwell 2).

Moreover, a developer of a self-storage facility needs to be fully aware of the profitability of the facility. In order to determine the potential profitability of a storage facility, developers need to make sure the zoning laws allow for development of self storage facilities. The next step is for a market analysis to be performed, which formally establishes the unit mix and pricing while construction costs are bid. A market analysis would entail researching the supply and demand of the real estate market and specific properties in a specific area to discover future trends (Oakley 2). A developer would look to see how many facilities there are in the region, whether there is a demand for storage units, and whether there is a market for storage units. Before a facility is designed it is essential for the designers to understand the financial criteria and limitations in advance of the design. The designer should know before hand the financial sensitivity to construction quality as it interacts with rental rates, unit mix and allowable square footage (Oakley 2).

The Mariamante Parcel is located on Main Road with excellent prominence less than a mile from Route 2. There are five storage facilities located in the nearby town of Greenfield already and it appears that each facility still has available rental space. Since there is available space in the area for storage units, the demand for more storage facilities may not be great. Moreover, the surrounding population in Gill is not extremely dense. The only area of Gill that could be considered somewhat dense is the Riverside Area which located about a mile from the Mariamante Parcel. There could be a need for a storage facility due to the close proximity of the site to the Riverside neighborhood but since Gill is a rural town it is unlikely that there is a need
for this type of facility in the area. Moreover, the 10-acre parcel may be considered too large to develop solely as a storage facility because there would not be enough demand for this type of facility in town of approximately 1,600 residents.
Development Scenarios

Methodology

One of the primary tasks in this report is to evaluate several potential long-term development scenarios for the Marimante parcel. The pool of ideas was drawn directly from the public comments made at the original charrette meeting in December of 2004. During our first meetings with the Charrette Ad Hoc Committee, we solicited citizen input to select which scenarios were most interesting to the town. Once the final three candidates were selected, we began our research.

Methods of exploring and evaluating the development scenarios included:

- Touring small Massachusetts towns to find visual examples of the various development types.
- Reading the town’s recent Community Development Plan and considering how the scenarios fit the plan’s recommendations.
- Researching innovative zoning by-laws in Massachusetts towns to find examples of supportive regulatory techniques.
- Examination of the site and its surroundings in mapping programs, with information from the Franklin Regional Council of Governments, and the Office of Geographic and Environmental Information (MassGIS), Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs.
- Ongoing discussion about each type of development in biweekly meetings with the Charrette Ad-Hoc Committee in Gill.
- Because residents indicated concern about the levels of traffic, especially on Main Road, traffic impacts were analyzed using traffic count information provided by the Franklin Regional Council of Governments. Projections for trips generated by the proposed uses were calculated using the standard reference from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE).
Basic fiscal impacts to the town's budget were computed for each scenario using techniques provided by Zenia Kotval of the Center for Economic Development at the University of Massachusetts. Gill financial data was provided by Deb Roussel, Administrative Assistant to the Gill Selectboard, with some supplemental information acquired from the online Municipal Data Bank of the Massachusetts Department of Revenue.
Commercial or Medical Office Building

Because the Mariamante parcel is located in close proximity to the two largest commercial uses already in Gill, the idea of maximizing the use of the land with commercial office space has been proposed. General office space is a possibility, as well as a small clinic with medical office space. A medical clinic is an attractive option not only for the commercial tax revenue, but also because it would be convenient for the residents of Gill.

A large use such as an office building can be overwhelming in a rural, residential setting. To combat this, office buildings are often designed to blend in with surrounding uses. Some office complexes are made to resemble residential buildings, such as the development in Amherst, Massachusetts, pictured below.
To predict the potential financial impact of such a development, we envisioned a two-story building with a footprint of 6,000 square feet, for a total of 12,000 square feet of office space. This size of building would be small enough to leave plenty of open space on the parcel, after accounting for the structure itself and necessary parking. This open space could be used for landscape buffers to protect nearby residential uses, or to work around sites of potential archeological sensitivity. Robert Cohn, a local broker, provided us with an approximate value of $65 to $75 per square foot for this type of structure. If such a building were built, it would have a net annual fiscal benefit to the town of just under $7,000.

Traffic is a concern with this potential development. Office buildings are high generators of automobile trips, and medical office buildings are especially high generators. A 12,000 square foot medical office building would generate 434 new automobile trips per day, 225 of which would be on Main Road between the site and Route 2. Although this would raise the level of traffic by under five percent, the residents along this stretch of road are already unhappy with the number of vehicles passing their homes every day.

Zoning

Gill’s Community Development Plan of 2004 recommends examining and potentially revising the town’s zoning bylaws to encourage business development. Gill’s zoning bylaws presently have no provisions for commercial or industrial uses. Commercial uses are handled on a case-by-case basis by a special permit process. While this does give the town broad control over development, it can also confuse and discourage developers. In order to have a better idea of whether their plans will be approved, developers often want more guidance or clearer directives.

If the town created a commercial zoning district, they would not need to sacrifice all control over commercial development in those districts. Many or most commercial establishments could still require a special permit. Alternatively, any development over a certain size could be classified as a Major Development requiring a special permit. With this regulatory tool, Gill could assure that commercial or industrial development remains contained to selected areas. Such containment is especially important in a town with only partial sewer and water
distribution, such as Gill. More intensive uses could be guided to areas with existing or easily extended utilities, or suitable soil for septic systems.

Site plan review, also called site plan approval, is also available as a regulatory tool in Massachusetts. Extensive design guidelines can be put into a site plan review bylaw, and the approving body may require detailed descriptions of how a development will be constructed, as well as what measures will be taken to blend with the surroundings. Community character, and how to fit harmoniously with it, is a very complicated concept to describe in a bylaw. Illustrations and tables of building details are often used. Such visual aids increase the likelihood of consistent application of the rules, and decrease the likelihood of court challenges (Duerksen and Goebel, p. 9). The site plan review board may reject any plan that provides insufficient information, or impose reasonable conditions in connection with site plan approval, even at the expense of the applicant. (*Prudential Ins. Co. v. Board of Appeals of Westwood*, 23 Mass. App. Ct., 1986)

To assist the Gill Planning Board with their consideration of an appropriate commercial district, the following examples are included of the descriptions of commercial zoning districts in small towns in Massachusetts, from their bylaws.

**Regulatory Example: Commercial Zoning Districts in Smaller Massachusetts Towns**

**From the Town of Grafton Zoning Bylaw (September 2003):**

3.1.5 *District Intents and Purposes*

<...>

3.1.5.5 *Neighborhood Business (NB): To provide sites for small scale business development for local and transient services compatible with low and medium density residential development within village settings which through landscaping and design or through preservation, enhance the natural landscaping and historic environs; at the same time protecting*
any existing views, minimizing the visibility of parked cars, avoiding the appearance of commercial strips as well as congestion in the abutting streets and ways, and retaining the character and the quality of life in the small New England village. The above purposes are, however, mitigated by the overriding goal of protecting the town's ground water resources.

3.1.5.6 Community Business (CB): To provide sites for businesses that serve the entire town which, through proper siting, landscaping and design, create amenities and avoid the appearance of commercial strips, and adverse impacts on abutting streets and uses. The above purposes are, however, mitigated by the overriding goal of protecting the town's ground water resources.

From the Town of Ipswich Zoning Bylaw (October 20, 2003):

B. Intent of Districts

<...>

3. The General Business (GB) District is intended primarily for retail, trade, service, and other commercial uses with some compatible light industrial uses. Multi-family residential uses may be permitted. The District is generally served by municipal water supply and sewerage facilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

✦ Zoning Changes – 90 DAY ACTION ITEM

Responsible Board/Entity: Planning Board

Draft language for a new base or overlay district for commercial and/or industrial activity in Gill, as described above. Consider the conservation of groundwater resources and the minimization of new expenditures for water and sewer.
Draw up regulations for sign controls, to protect the visual aspects of Gill's character and encourage compatibility between existing and newer development. Further details on sign control are covered in the following section on mixed-use development.

- Regulate Curb Cuts

Responsible Board/Entity: Planning Board

Consider adopting curb cut regulations modeled after those of the Cape Cod Commission Model Bylaws and Regulations, which includes requirements that “provide a maximum of one driveway for up to 50 feet of frontage, two driveways for 51 to 150 feet of frontage and three driveways for 151 to 500 feet of frontage.” These requirements are designed to maximize the flow of traffic while allowing for ease of access to the area in question. The regulations further require that the highway superintendent or town department of public works approve all curb cut requests.

- Save This Development Plan for Later

Responsible Board/Entity: Select Board

Unfortunately, the market is not very good right now for this type of development. Our conversation with local real estate broker Mr. Cohn indicated that the Franklin County market for office space is saturated right now, especially in nearby Greenfield. This scenario should be considered a longer-term possibility. If the town retains the parcel, and one of the interim uses is implemented, it may be possible to pursue this strategy when the market for commercial office space is better. If the senior population of Gill grows, especially as a result of more senior housing being added, the market for local medical office space may pick up.
Mixed-Use Development

Small-scale mixed-use developments are an increasingly popular option in small towns. Mixed-use promotes pedestrian accessibility, and can contribute to a “village center” feel. In addition, certain arrangements on uses can save money in development. Since small town commercial development is often a single story, providing “over the shop” housing on a second story can maximize the investment in land, foundation, and roofing costs (Arendt et al, p. 173). This can lower the cost of the resulting housing units, which is especially important in the market of senior tenants on fixed incomes. As a result, two of the development types mentioned often by residents during the Mariamante charrette, small retail and senior housing, could be attractively combined. The scenario that we consider in this section combines 6,000 square feet of small retail storefronts with 5 independent apartment units designated for senior citizens.
The annual fiscal impact on Gill's town budget of such a development would be a benefit of just over five thousand dollars. This assumes an approximate value of $70/square foot for commercial space in Franklin County, as quoted by local broker Robert Cohn. The impact also assumes a conservative housing unit value of $100,000.

Many potential uses for these small retail and commercial spaces have been discussed with the Charrette Ad Hoc Committee. Small daycare centers, convenience stores, and farming supply stores have all been mentioned as services the town would appreciate.

Other potential uses are connected to Gill's economy of home-based businesses. Gill has many such small entrepreneurs, and a survey was done as part of the 2004 Community Development Plan to evaluate their needs. Respondents frequently mentioned a desire for better access to telecommunication facilities, photocopiers and other office equipment, a meeting room, and a U.S. Post Office. An excellent facility for inclusion in a mixed-use development scenario would be a community resource room for local business owners. The Mariamante parcel is in the denser part of town, and generally has access to better utilities than other neighborhoods, so the better telecommunications infrastructure could be shared. Meeting rooms and office equipment would benefit local entrepreneurs and local activity groups, who could rent the facilities for a fee. Only a couple of the home-based business owners who responded to the survey indicated that they would like alternate locations to expand their operations, but this number may increase as the town grows, and the small retail storefronts of this development would be ideal sites.

Traffic projections for this development predict an addition of 61 trips per day on the streets of Gill, which raises the traffic rate on Main and West Gill Roads by only 3%. Higher trip rates would occur if certain uses are included, especially a U.S. Post Office or a daycare facility.
Rural-scale commercial development can follow a very traditional, old-fashioned aesthetic, as it does in the Bolton development pictured above. It can also be built in a more modern style, while still being appropriately sized to blend in with the surrounding community, as shown in the Lincoln development below.
An issue of great concern to small, rural towns is the excessive or disruptive business and advertising signs that may come with commercial development. Towns may wonder if it is within their power to impose controls on signs. While some signs, such as political campaign signs, are given more protection as expression under the law, commercial signs may be regulated. In the past, there have been legal challenges to the use of aesthetics in land-use regulation. Most courts these days, however, accept this use (Duerksen & Goebel, p. 89). In Massachusetts, as a home rule state, towns have especially broad discretion in drawing up land-use regulation.

Good sign controls are written with explicit justifications relating them to the public good, are not overly broad, and leave open ample alternative means of communication. This is the essence of the "Central Hudson test", named after the first case regarding commercial sign control in which a test of constitutionality was formulated (Duerksen & Goebel, p. 91). In other words, you cannot prohibit all signs. But carefully written regulations can ensure that business signs are compatible with a community’s character. A sample by-law is presented here, from the town of Duxbury, Massachusetts.
ARTICLE 600 SPECIAL REGULATIONS

601 SIGN REGULATIONS

The provisions of Section 601 shall apply to all zoning districts.

The purpose of the following regulations to all types of signs is to reasonably regulate the size, location, illumination and types of materials in order to:

- Encourage signs that have locations, materials and designs that are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and buildings;
- Eliminate excessive and confusing signs; and
- Eliminate potential hazards to motorists and pedestrians.

601.2 Procedure

A written application for the installation of all types of signs shall be submitted at the office of the Zoning Enforcement Officer, including signs requiring special permits. The application shall include all information necessary to determine compliance with the regulations of this Bylaw.

601.3 General Requirements

1. In all districts, all exterior signs or advertising devices erected or maintained must, unless expressly provided, conform to the following requirements.

2. The information contained on all signs for business shall be limited to the type of business, goods or service offered and name of business and/or owner.

3. Whenever possible, a flush mounted sign attached to the wall of the building shall be used. The method of attaching the sign must be approved by the Zoning Enforcement Officer.

4. If, in the opinion of the Board of Appeals a flush mounted sign would not be adequately visible from a public way, a special permit may be sought from the Board of Appeals for the erection of one freestanding sign of not more than two faces. The special permit may be conditional upon restrictions that regulate design, illumination, size, colors and construction.
5. Private signs shall not be placed on publicly owned property unless authorized by the Board of Selectmen.
6. Signs not exceeding one square foot containing cautionary or directional information for traffic flow require the approval of the Zoning Enforcement Officer. Informational, directional and traffic signs owned and installed by a government agency are permitted by right.
7. Sign materials should be durable and easy to maintain. Materials such as wood, brass or bronze are most appropriate.
8. In the case of a sign for business use, a primary sign containing information on the name of the business, owner, and goods or services offered shall be limited to one that is located on the same side of the building as the main entrance. In addition, one accessory sign may be erected on any other side of the building in view of a parking area or public way.

Further information on sign controls, including detailed design guidelines and additional model by-laws, may be found in the publication *Dealing with Change in the Connecticut River Valley: A Design Manual for Conservation and Development, Volume Two*, which was published by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Management and the Center for Rural Massachusetts.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- **Zoning Changes – 90 DAY ACTION ITEM**

  Responsible Board/Entity: Planning Board

  Draft language for a new base or overlay district for commercial and/or industrial activity in Gill, as described in the previous section on office development. Consider the conservation of groundwater resources and the minimization of new expenditures for water and sewer.

  Draw up regulations for sign controls as outlined above, to protect the visual aspects of Gill’s character and encourage compatibility between existing and newer development.
• **Decide Between Outside Developers and Holding the Land –**

   **90 DAY ACTION ITEM**

   Responsible Board/Entity: Ad Hoc Committee, Select Board

   This development scenario could be managed directly or indirectly by the town, if the land were to be retained in a land trust or placed under a Community Development Corporation (CDC). For further information and action items for these options, see the Land Trust and CDC sections of this report.

   Alternatively, the town could decide to sell the land to a carefully selected developer through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process.

• **Explore the Creation of a Local Business Owners Resource Center**

   Responsible Board/Entity: Ad Hoc Committee, Select Board

• **Regulate Curb Cuts**

   Responsible Board/Entity: Planning Board

   Curb cut regulation may also be important in this scenario. Suggestions are detailed in the previous section on office development.
Assisted Living Housing

Moderate predictions from the Massachusetts Institute for Social Economic Research show the senior population of Gill increasing 41% by the year 2020. Higher predictions show an increase as great as 52%. (MISER, Dec 2003) These patterns are in evidence throughout the region and the state.

Gill’s Community Development Plan predicts that more senior housing may be needed in Gill in the coming years. The town is recommended to identify potential locations to build another senior housing complex, after the recent construction of the 14-unit Stoughton Village development.

The Mariamante parcel is located one quarter of a mile down Main Road from Stoughton Village. Locating additional senior housing in such close proximity to existing units would facilitate the sharing of transportation services, such as a senior ride van. Design standards for senior housing strongly encourage the location of a food store and a drugstore within 1,500 feet.
to best serve residents (Carstens, p. 32). The Mariamante parcel's location would make it easy to place such small commercial establishments that would be accessible to both groups.

Assisted living senior housing units can be quite small. One facility in Chicopee, Massachusetts fits 90 units in a two-story complex of buildings situated on five acres. Another facility located in Amherst has 78 units situated on 12 acres, with a great deal of outdoor recreation space. Our scenario will consider a small development of 40 units of assisted living housing.

The small size of this development fits well with our parcel for many reasons. Converting more than five acres of the parcel to impervious surface would exceed a Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act threshold triggering the mandatory filing of an Environmental Notification Form (ENF). A small complex would also fit better into the rural
context of Gill. A development of 40 units would generate only an average of 86 new auto trips per weekday, raising the level of traffic on the nearby roads by less than 1%.

Fiscally, assisted living housing would have a positive impact on Gill. This type of housing produces taxable real property value, without any added educational cost that would come from new schoolchildren living in other types of housing. If a unit of this housing is valued at $100,000, the town could see a net annual boost to the budget of over $13,000.

Gill’s Community Development Plan also recommends that the town pursue public grants and other funding sources to encourage the development of affordable senior housing in particular. While Stoughton Village is affordable due to its association with local housing authorities, provisions for affordability could be made at a Mariamante development even if it were built by a private developer. For example, the city of Gloucester, Massachusetts has chosen to regulate assisted living facilities in its zoning ordinance. All assisted living developments require a special permit, and various conditions are set forth. Not only is a certain amount of affordable housing assured, but local residents are granted priority in the facility, as far as the law will allow. Although Gloucester is a city, and substantially larger than Gill, this example’s language is unique and interesting.
Regulatory Example: Excerpt from Gloucester Zoning Ordinance

(City of Gloucester, June 1, 2002)

Section 5.7.5(g)

In addition to the above-stated criteria, except 5.7.5(f), the following criteria shall apply to Assisted Living Facilities: (Adopted by City Council 6/20/00)

1. Twenty (20)% of the units of all assisted living facilities, twenty (20) units or greater in size, shall be designated for low to moderate income persons. Low and moderate income persons shall be defined by the most recent income guidelines established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

2. The developer/manager of the Facility shall annually certify to the Gloucester Community Development Director that the income of the residents meets the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development qualifications. At the discretion of the SPGA, this requirement will be fulfilled in one of the following ways:

   (A) 20% of the units onsite shall be designated for low to moderate income persons;

   (B) The equivalent value of these units will provide for housing services for low to moderate income persons offsite.

3. Gloucester residents or their relatives shall be given priority in admission so long as all federal, state or local rules, laws, regulations, or ordinances are satisfied.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

❖ **Zoning Changes – 90 DAY ACTION ITEM**

Responsible Board/Entity: Planning Board

Consider adding language into the zoning by-law to set guidelines for assisted living development as outlined above, before such developments are proposed and grandfathered into existing zoning.

❖ **Decide Between Outside Developers and Holding the Land – 90 DAY ACTION ITEM**

Responsible Board/Entity: Ad Hoc Committee, Select Board

This development scenario could be managed directly or indirectly by the town, if the land were to be retained in a land trust or placed under a Community Development Corporation (CDC). For further information and action items for these options, see the Land Trust and CDC sections of this report.

Alternatively, the town could decide to sell the land to a carefully selected developer through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process.

❖ **Parking Requirements**

Responsible Board/Entity: Planning Board

Gill’s zoning by-law currently mandates two parking spaces per dwelling unit for all development. For senior housing, especially assisted living, this amount of parking would be excessive. Recommendations from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority and the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation of Canada go no higher than a 1:1 ratio of parking lots to units (Carstens, p. 41). A development in Chicopee, Massachusetts indicated that they get by with very little parking, as very few of their
residents drive. In a more rural setting such as Gill, though, it can be expected that more automobiles will be needed.

**Pedestrian Improvements**

Responsible Board/Entity: Planning Board, Select Board

Currently, the intersection of Main Road and West Gill Road is controlled by two-way stop signs, and there are no sidewalks in the area. If elderly residents are to walk from their homes, either to Stoughton Village or other locations, improvements will need to be made.

Considerations to keep in mind for the intersection include increasing visibility, and accommodating the slower walking speeds of the elderly and handicapped. If there is any expectation that residents will want to cross Main Road, a highly visible crosswalk should be added, as well as warning signs for drivers. If the intersection were to one day be controlled by a traffic signal, the length of the cycle will need to accommodate slower walkers.

It is possible that the costs of these intersection improvements might be shared with a cooperative and enthusiastic developer. Since the market for assisted living is very strong in Franklin County right now, such developers will be easier to find.

Sidewalks in the area should be at least five feet wide, if possible, so that nonhandicapped pedestrians are able to pass slower walkers. Special attention should be paid to making the sidewalk surfaces even and smooth, to avoid tripping the less agile, or catching canes and wheelchairs (Carstens, p. 144).


**Exploration of Shared Facilities**

Responsible Board/Entity: Ad Hoc Committee

There is an excellent opportunity in this development to combine town amenities with senior facilities. Although a certain amount of the housing's common space must be private and secure to ensure the safety of the residents, some facilities could be shared.

For example, a large assembly hall could be used for meetings of the entire resident group, dinners or theater events, or community meetings. A public green could be constructed on the remaining open space of the parcel. This would provide a location for outdoor walking and exercise for the elderly residents, and could also be used for town festivals and celebrations. An attractively landscaped park area would beautify a very visible location in Gill.
Conclusion

The town’s guidance and recommendations were invaluable as we went about the research process. With the information gathered from the charrette process, as well as the ongoing guidance of the ad hoc committee, the study group researched and explored interim and long-term development scenarios before making a recommendation to the town.

The first 90 days after the presentation of the report will be the most crucial for the town in making a final determination of which development option to adopt. With that in mind, the study group divided its action items into 90-day and long-term action items. Depending on what path the town chooses to take with the Mariamonte parcel, a series of initial and secondary steps have been identified to guide Gill during the process.

Interim Uses

Although it has the lowest potential for income generation, leasing the parcel for agricultural use is the most likely interim use. There is known demand for the site’s use for agriculture, and such a use would not place a strain on the personnel resources of the town. We recommend that the town immediately move forward with the agricultural leasing option while they determine which long-term development scenario to pursue.

Although a farmers’ market is a more attractive option, the town simply does not have the resources to organize and run a farmers’ market at this time, particularly in light of the relatively slow growth and success rate to be expected from such a use. The other interim use explored, that of a self-storage facility, does not have sufficient demand to justify its recommendation.
Development Scenarios

The study group explored three development scenarios for this project – mixed-use commercial and residential, general office space or an assisted living facility.

Of the three, an assisted living facility is the most likely alternative for Gill at this time. Such a facility would be a solid means of tax generation, without having an attendant drain on services. It would also serve an identified need within the town, which has an aging population.

The two other options are more time-intensive, with a softer identified market. The pursuit of either of these scenarios would require the town to wait until market conditions were more favorable for their success.

Final Recommendations

The town should move forward with the agricultural leasing option in order to receive some return on their investment while they choose which development scenario – or no development scenario – to pursue. The town should immediately look at implementing the 90-day action items for the assisted living scenario. The completion of an archaeological survey as well as extension of water and sewer service should be included in requirements for whoever eventually develops the site.
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TRANSCRIPTION OF FLIPCHARTS
FROM DECEMBER 2004 CHARRETTE
Town of Gill
December 2004 Charrette
Flipchart Transcripts
(Transcribed by James Doyle, Sigrid Hughes, and Cana McCoy)

Group 1

Strengths
- Location
- Acreage – large lot
- close to Rte. 2
- Possible zoning change – commercial
- Quality of land – excellent farm land
- Helping with tax burden
- Lower lot – good spot for water pump
- utility development “pump house”
- access to major transportation – rte 2 and 91 (traffic: 12,700 cars/day)
- access to all of Gill
- possibly scenic parcel
- allow flexible development
- 2 sep. lots flexible development
- town owned
- readily developable
- frontage – lots
  - 2 road/sides of frontage
- lack of good soil ledge stones

Weaknesses
- lack of services
- needs water and needs sewer
- 2 lots – divided parcel
- needs natural screening/topography
- needs landscaping
- road safety
- road expansion possibility
- possible archaeological site
- current zoning: split ag/resid (req. SP)

Opportunities
- Possible rezoning – light industrial
- Grants – bring sewer to site
- Taxable land/opportunity
- Positive cash flow
- Comm. Development possibility
  - town owned/leased
  - maximize site for town purposes
    (bank, small community grocery, dr. offices)
- Keep under town control to make $$$
  - ex. Rural development corp.
  - lease back to businesses
- Flea Market Site
- Community market – low cost to try out

Threats
- Sell-loose control (something town doesn’t want) lose potential tax base
- Losing open space to development
- Non-profit development (not profit making)
- Another transport facility (traffic congestion and pollution)
- Industrial use

Actions
- Commitment
- Contact comm. development entities (CDCs)
- form committee: with time line and an agenda
- put for sale sign on prop.
- research local dev. Success/trands
- Do site assessment – include archaeological study
- Get technical assistance groundtruthing (do this, don’t do this ex. Groton)
- Report to town
- Do it yesterday appropriate funds for actions esp. groundtruthing
- create action oriented committee
- set up timeline for development
- accountable to town/selectmen
- rezone to commercial/mixed use/multi-use
- develop plan for site

Group 2

Strengths
- Flat
- No stones
- well located
- proximity to route 2
- access to major transportation routes
- under town control
- prime agricultural land
- flexible zoning
- open land
- scenic if left undeveloped
- sandy soil-very developable
- possible prime archeological site

Weaknesses
- Lack of municipal sewer
- questionable well water supply
- proximity to terminal/trucking
- property values
- possible archeological sight
- loss of agricultural land
- high tension wires
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Opportunities
- Preserve Open Space
- Enlarge Tax Base
- professional center/offices
- design control
- town control-future town development
- cemetery
- community center
- flea market (town owned)
- Recreational (swimming pool)

Opportunities
- Abutters (homes, cemetery), right-of-ways thru property

Threats
- residential condo tax liabilities impact on town infrastructure
- low income housing
- taxes-taxes-taxes

Threats
- 3 Once it’s gone…
- Loss of archeological site
- White elephant – if it doesn’t move….
  Debated forever
- Incompatible business to abutters, environment
- Entrance to Gill – it is our first impression

Actions
- Light industry- non environmental impact
- office complex
- C.D.C.
- health/medical/professional
- archeological assessment
- cemetery
- put out RFP
- keep as open space
- town owned outdoor flea market/fairground
- re-asses value whole town property (tax base not just riverfront)

Actions
- Sell two acre parcel
- Connect w/Umass, etc, “dig” the site
- Pursue the ‘Lincoln’ model
- H More expertise from other towns and communities, successes and failures
- (Drawings)

Group 4

Strengths
- Easy to develop
- Close to RT 2 & 91
- Flat
- Good soil for septic
- Lots of frontage
- Gill as a community is attractive
- Rural
- Gateway site
- Historically significant
- H Location & nice community

Weaknesses
- No landscaping
- Anticipated bridge construction
- No sewer
- No water
- Possible Indian artifacts
- Truck/bus traffic
- H Mixed use neighborhood = commercial & residential
Opportunities
- Horse farm, lessons/rides
- Community garden site
- Library with playground
- Multi functional use
- Library/conference center, natural history component
- Office park
- Light manufacturing
- Health center
- Town recreation center
- Housing (elderly)
- Mausoleum cemetery
- devaluation of surrounding property
- environmental impacts
- water supply for weeds
- high tension wires
- sewage
- change the look of gill
- bedrock

Opportunities
- Park In front
- Roadway
- housing (tasteful)
- Farming
- industrial (light, office)
- commercial outlets
- recreational Barton Cove
- wildlife habitat
- drive-in theater
- cinema

Threats
- Commercial sprawl
- Fast food
- Overly dense housing
- Increased traffic
- Potential loitering
- H Tax drain
- Pollution
- Potential negative impact

Threats
- No tax value
- inadequate zoning
- too much traffic, noise, light
- limiting ourselves to expand
- environmental degradation
- condos
- too much light (signs)

Actions
- Non-binding request for proposals (RFP)
- Contact Franklin County (CDC)
- Investigate surrounding area
- Appoint an ad hoc committee to report to town
- See assistance from federal legislature for grants for rural planning
- Look at multiple models for development, for rural area population under 2000
- Open house for realtors

Actions
- architectural planning
- look at surrounding area land to possibly expand site
- develop for recreation or commercial
- study for possible site development of 12 acres plus surrounding land including an architectural plan
- purchase additional acreage and model on Stanley Park, Westfield
- Light industrial-commercial use for income for Gill

Group 6

(Liz, Emily, Kathleen, Tupper, Pat, and John)

Strengths
- Flat
- location
- links Riverside and Gill Center
- Cleared
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- Corner/Dual Access
- Access to Bus/Trucking
- Town Owned
- Requires Special Permit/Bargaining Chip

Weaknesses
- Not good for agricultural usage (dry)
- house in between
- requires special permit
- uncertainty over water
- water district issues
- across from bus/truck bad residential area????
- infrastructure issues traffic water and sewer

Opportunities
- Multi-users/multi use
- increase tax base (commercial)
- affordable housing
- community center/ recreation center and fields
- commercial use
- support to current commercial and industrial
  uses in town
- opportunity to rezone, study best use of the
  land, assess best use for town overall
- opportunity for town to re assess zoning town-
  wide
- open space

Threats
- town could get stuck with land
- not everyone is happy
- traffic
- residential pressure on services
- unsavory businesses
- risks to resources (schools, money, and natural
  too little time to think of others

Action
- contact State Representative
- Mark (realtor) who is interested in property
- who is in charge
- determine who has the responsibility
- meet with selectmen and planning board to
  figure out who is doing what
- establish ad-hoc committee/non-officials to
  distill what happened tonight and continue

- we own it
- flat
- river ambiance
- close to route 2
- multiple options
- agricultural
- parking
- food snow mobile tracks
- open
- building
- industry

Weaknesses
- zoned residential (agricultural limitation, but
  we can mange that)
- houses around it
- kuz neighbor
- water/sewage financial burden power lines
- divided parcel
- cemetery adjacent
- topography of two acres is not plus

Opportunities
- Berry patch
- community garden
- residential
- re-sale
- potential low income
- swimming pool
- light manufacturing
- office building
- strip mall
- owl property
- flea market
- agriculture

Threats
- if residential; school budget vulnerable
- re-sale, loss of control, excessive noise,
  pollution, and traffic concerns
- no buyers
- loss of open space
- change is scary
- how much is will cost town if Gill does not
  take any action

Actions
- inform residents of all ideas consensus
  choices
- volunteer for community development center
  link a liaison up with University of
  Massachusetts
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- schedule with deadlines and targets for decision making
- investigate light manufacturing
- take more than one action
- road trip to Lincoln
- get volunteers tonight for University of Massachusetts
- clear brush by the sign

Group 8

Strengths
- Location (rte 2/91)
- Near turners (arts)
- Flat land, cleared
- Good sandy soil, aquifer
- Near commercial
- Compatible land uses
- 20 acres available next door
- turners airport
- perkable
- 418 study: #1 study for commercial
- close to water/sewer

Weaknesses
- Wetlands (parcel 16)
- Split lot
- No sewer
- No water
- Residences close
- Cemetery across street
- Increasing traffic

Opportunities
- Raise tax base
- Can save open space by clustering
- Possible for mixed use
- For flexible space
- Job creation

Threats
- No development, town loses $$$
- Added to tax base
- Loss of farmland
- Polluting industry could come

Actions
- Small stores – things town doesn’t have,
  Numerous examples:
  ○ video shop
  ○ convenience store
  ○ shoe stores
  ○ children’s clothing
- locally owned
- provide services to residents
- Farmers market
- Form committee to study other town’s best practices
- “campus style” offices – clustering with open space
- senior housing – mixed use
- arts center, workshop space – theater link with Hallmark Institute, education with arts
  clustered, mixed-use “campus style” with paths, one-story with farmers market
  (example Atkins Farm)
- spaces for locally-owned stores that provide services to locals (convenience stores,
  barber, video store, shoe store) also with arts/education space, housing (for seniors)
  becomes community’s space/center
APPENDIX C

FISCAL IMPACT WORKSHEETS
## Fiscal Impact Assessment for Assisted Living Complex in Gill, Massachusetts

### Data Input Sheet

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Market Value of Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Senior Housing (over 55)</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Single Family Blend</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>1-2 Bedroom units</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>3 bedroom units</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of new homes in development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Senior Housing (over 55)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Single Family Blend</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>1-2 Bedroom units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>3 bedroom units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Residential Assessment Ratio for Tax Purposes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Residential Tax Rate per $1,000 FY2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total Tax Levy FY2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total School Budget 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>School Aid from State FY2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Number of School Children (2002-2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Current Local School Cost per Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Current School Aid per Student (State School Aid divided by # of Schoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>School Aged Children Multiplier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Senior Housing (over 55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Single Family Blend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>1-2 Bedroom units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>3 bedroom units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other Misc. Revenue from Local Receipts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Appropriated Expenditures excluding schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Residential Proportion of real property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Existing Residential Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>New capital improvements required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police and Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Community Projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Assuming none, or covered by outside developer

|   | Median Home Value in Gill | $120,800 |
# FISCAL IMPACT OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

## I REVENUE FROM NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

### A. Revenue from Property Tax on Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1. Market Value of Development multiplied by 1.00%</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2. Assessment Ratio</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3. Actual Assessed Value multiplied by 1.00%</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4. Residential Tax Rate /$1000</td>
<td>$14.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-5. Estimated Property Tax Revenue</td>
<td>$57,240.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Other Miscellaneous Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1. Miscellaneous Revenue multiplied by 1.00%</td>
<td>$202,828.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2. Residential Proportion of all Property</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3. Miscellaneous Revenue from Residential Use divided by 1.00%</td>
<td>$168,955.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4. Number of Residential Units</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5. Miscellaneous Revenue per Housing Unit</td>
<td>$301.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6. Number of new homes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7. Estimated Additional Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>$12,968.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Additional State School Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1. State School Aid (Chapter 70) divided by 1.00%</td>
<td>$5,735,466.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2. Number of School Children</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3. School Aid per Student multiplied by 1.00%</td>
<td>$4,024.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4. Number of Students in New Development</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5. Estimated Additional School Aid</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Total Estimated Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Total Estimated Revenue</td>
<td>$69,308.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II COSTS DUE TO ASSISTED LIVING DEVELOPMENT
A. School Costs Due to Development

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1.</td>
<td>Current School Cost per Student</td>
<td>$5,950.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2.</td>
<td>Number of Students in New Development</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3.</td>
<td>Total School Cost per Year</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Service Costs Due to Development
(Costs associated with Library, Health, Recreation, Police, Fire and Road Maintenance)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1.</td>
<td>Town expenditures excluding Schools multiplied by 83.30%</td>
<td>$940,410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2.</td>
<td>Residential portion of All Property</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3.</td>
<td>Service Costs due to Residential divided by 560</td>
<td>$783,361.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4.</td>
<td># of Residential Units</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5.</td>
<td>Service Cost per unit</td>
<td>$1,398.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6.</td>
<td>Number of Homes in New Development</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7.</td>
<td>Town Service Costs for Residential units</td>
<td>$55,954.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Costs Due to Capital Improvements
(Assuming none, or covered by outside developer)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-6</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Costs due to Development</td>
<td>($0.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Total Costs due to Development | $55,954.40

III Net Fiscal Impact Resulting from Development

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Total Revenue from Residential Development</td>
<td>$69,308.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Total Costs due to Residential Development</td>
<td>$55,954.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Net Fiscal Impact per Year</td>
<td>$13,353.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Change in Tax Rates due to Assisted Living Development
(negative numbers indicate a decrease in tax payments, thus a gain to homeowner)

A. Change in Town Tax Rate
A-1. Total Tax Levy divided by
     A-2. Tax Rate/Thousand
     A-3. Amount affecting Tax Rate by one dollar
     A-4. Net Fiscal Gain divided by
     A-5. Amount affecting Tax Rate by one dollar

A-6. Change in Tax Rate $0.12

A-7. Impact on Average Home Owner
     A-8. Cost of Home
     A-9. Tax Rate per 1000 at Present
     A-10. Annual Tax Payment without Further Growth
     A-11. Cost of Home
     A-12. Tax Rate per 1000 after New Development
     A-13. Annual Tax Payment after New Development

A-14. Local Tax Impact after New Development ($14.38)
**FISCAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR OFFICE BUILDING DEVELOPMENT IN GILL, MASSACHUSETTS**

Assuming a 12,000 square foot office building at $70/sq ft

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total Market Value of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assessment rate for tax purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Town Tax Rate per $1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total Property Tax Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other Misc. Revenue from Local Receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Service share of Town Tax Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Com./Ind. Proportion of Real Property in Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Equalized Value of Commercial/Industrial Prop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes: Amt. in Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police and Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Community Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Assuming none, or covered by outside developer</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Median Home Value in Gill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FISCAL IMPACT OF OFFICE BUILDING

I REVENUE FROM NEW COMM/IND DEVELOPMENT

A. Revenue from Property Tax on Development

A-1. Market Value of Development multiplied by $900,000.00
A-2. Assessment Ratio 100.00%

A-3. Actual Assessed value multiplied by $900,000.00
    Tax Rate/$1000 for the Town $14.31

A-4. Estimated Property Tax Revenue $12,879.00

B. Other Miscellaneous Revenue

B-1. Miscellaneous Revenue multiplied by $202,828.00
B-2. Commercial Proportion of all Property 16.70%

B-3. Miscellaneous Revenue from Commercial Use divided by $33,872.28
    Equalized Value of all Non-Residential Property $18,771,111.00

B-5. Misc. Revenue per $1 in value multiplied by $0.0018
B-6. Assessed Value of new development $900,000.00

B-7. Estimated Additional Miscellaneous Revenue $1,624.04

C. Total Estimated Revenue $14,503.04
II. COSTS DUE TO NEW COM./IND. DEVELOPMENT

A. Service Costs

A-1. Service Share of Town Tax Levy  
multiplied by  
$940,410.00

A-2. Commercial/Industrial Percentage of all land  
16.70%

A-3. Service Costs due to Commercial/Industrial  
divided by  
$157,048.47

A-4. Equalized value of current com./ind. property  
$18,771,111.00

A-5. Service Cost per $ of equalized value  
multiplied by  
$0.0084

A-6. market value of com./ind. new development  
$900,000.00

A-7. Town Service Costs for Comm/Ind Development  
$7,529.85

B Costs due to Capital Improvements

Assuming none, or covered by outside developer

B-6 Capital Improvement Costs due to Development  
($0.00)

D. Total Estimated Costs  
$7,529.85

IV. Net Fiscal Impact Resulting from Development

A Total Revenue from Development  
$14,503.04

C Total Costs due to Service and CIP  
$7,529.85

D Net Fiscal Impact per Year  
$6,973.19
V Change in Tax Rates due to Office Building Development  
(negative numbers indicate a decrease in tax payments, thus a gain to homeowner)

A Change in Town Tax Rate

A-1. Total Tax Levy divided by $1,605,261.00
A-2. Tax Rate/Thousand $14.31

A-3. Amount affecting Tax Rate by one dollar $112,177.57

A-4. Net Fiscal Gain divided by $6,973.19
A-5. Amount affecting Tax Rate by one dollar $112,177.57

A-6. Change in Tax Rate $0.062

A-7. Impact on Average Home Owner

A-8. Cost of Home $120,800.00
A-9. Tax Rate per 1000 at Present $14.31

A-10. Annual Tax Payment without Further Growth $1,728.65

A-11. Cost of Home $120,800.00
A-12. Tax Rate per 1000 after New Development $14.25


A-14. Local Tax Impact after New Development $7.51
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA INPUT SHEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Market Value of Home</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Senior Housing (over 55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Single Family Blend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 1-2 Bedroom units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 3 bedroom units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Number of new homes in development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Senior Housing (over 55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Single Family Blend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 1-2 Bedroom units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 3 bedroom units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Residential Assessment Ratio for Tax Purposes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Residential Tax Rate per $1,000 FY2005</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Total Tax Levy FY2005</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Total School Budget 2005</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 School Aid from State FY2005</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 Number of School Children (2002-2003)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 Current Local School Cost per Student</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Current School Aid per Student (State School Aid divided by # of Schoo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 School Aged Children Multiplier</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Senior Housing (over 55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Single Family Blend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 1-2 Bedroom units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 3 bedroom units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Other Misc. Revenue from Local Receipts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13 Appropriated Expenditures excluding schools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14 Residential Proportion of real property</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15 Existing Residential Units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16 New capital improvements required</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Assuming none, or covered by outside developer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22 Median Home Value in Gill</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FISCAL IMPACT OF SENIOR APARTMENTS IN MIXED-USE SCENARIO

I REVENUE FROM NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
A. Revenue from Property Tax on Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1. Market Value of Development</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiplied by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2. Assessment Ratio</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3. Actual Assessed Value</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiplied by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4. Residential Tax Rate /$1000</td>
<td>$14.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A-5. Estimated Property Tax Revenue              | $7,155.00   |

B. Other Miscellaneous Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1. Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>$202,828.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiplied by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2. Residential Proportion of all Property</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3. Miscellaneous Revenue from Residential Use</td>
<td>$168,955.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divided by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4. Number of Residential Units</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5. Miscellaneous Revenue per Housing Unit</td>
<td>$301.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6. Number of new homes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B-7. Estimated Additional Miscellaneous Revenue  | $1,508.53   |

C. Additional State School Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1. State School Aid (Chapter 70)</td>
<td>$5,735,466.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divided by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2. Number of School Children</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3. School Aid per Student</td>
<td>$4,024.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiplied by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4. Number of Students in New Development</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| C-5. Estimated Additional School Aid             | $0.00       |

D. Total Estimated Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Total Estimated Revenue</td>
<td>$8,663.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## II Costs Due to New Residential Development

### A. School Costs Due to Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Current School Cost per Student</td>
<td>$5,950.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>Number of Students in New Development</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>Total School Cost per Year</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Service Costs Due to Development

*(Costs associated with Library, Health, Recreation, Police, Fire and Road Maintenance)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Town expenditures excluding Schools multiplied by</td>
<td>$940,410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Residential portion of All Property</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>Service Costs due to Residential divided by</td>
<td>$783,361.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4</td>
<td># of Residential Units</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5</td>
<td>Service Cost per unit</td>
<td>$1,398.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6</td>
<td>Number of Homes in New Development</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7</td>
<td>Town Service Costs for Residential units</td>
<td>$6,994.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Costs Due to Capital Improvements

*Assuming none, or covered by outside developer*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-6</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Costs due to Development</td>
<td>($0.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Total Costs due to Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-1</td>
<td>$6,994.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## III Net Fiscal Impact Resulting from Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Total Revenue from Residential Development</td>
<td>$8,663.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Total Costs due to Residential Development</td>
<td>$6,994.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Net Fiscal Impact per Year</td>
<td>$1,669.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Non-Residential Portion for Total Impact</td>
<td>$5,155.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Change in Tax Rates due to Residential Portion of Mixed-Use

(negative numbers indicate a decrease in
tax payments, thus a gain to homeowner)

A Change in Town Tax Rate
A-1. Total Tax Levy $1,605,261.00
    divided by
A-2. Tax Rate/Thousand $14.31
A-3. Amount affecting Tax Rate $112,177.57
    by one dollar
A-4. Net Fiscal Gain $1,669.23
    divided by
A-5. Amount affecting Tax Rate $112,177.57
    by one dollar

A-6. Change in Tax Rate $0.01

A-7. Impact on Average Home Owner
A-8. Cost of Home $120,800.00
A-9. Tax Rate per 1000 at Present $14.31
A-10. Annual Tax Payment without Further Growth $1,728.65
A-11. Cost of Home $120,800.00
A-12. Tax Rate per 1000 after New Development $14.30
A-13. Annual Tax Payment after New Development $1,726.85

A-14. Local Tax Impact after New Development $1.80
# FISCAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL PORTION OF MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT IN GILL, MASSACHUSETTS

Assuming 6,000 square feet of commercial space at $70/sq ft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total Market Value of Development</td>
<td>450,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assessment rate for tax purposes</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Town Tax Rate per $1000</td>
<td>$14.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total Property Tax Levy</td>
<td>$1,605,261.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other Misc. Revenue from Local Receipts</td>
<td>$202,828.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Service share of Town Tax Levy</td>
<td>$940,410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Com./Ind. Proportion of Real Property in Town</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Equalized Value of Commercial/Industrial Prop.</td>
<td>$18,771,111.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>New capital improvements required</td>
<td>If Yes: Amt. in Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police and Fire</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Community Projects</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Assuming none, or covered by outside developer</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Median Home Value in Gill                                   $120,800.00
FISCAL IMPACT OF RETAIL IN MIXED-USE SCENARIO

I REVENUE FROM NEW COMM/IND DEVELOPMENT

A. Revenue from Property Tax on Development

A-1. Market Value of Development multiplied by $450,000.00
A-2. Assessment Ratio 100.00%

A-3. Actual Assessed value multiplied by
       Tax Rate/$1000 for the Town $450,000.00 $14.31

A-4. Estimated Property Tax Revenue $6,439.50

B. Other Miscellaneous Revenue

B-1. Miscellaneous Revenue multiplied by $202,828.00
B-2. Commercial Proportion of all Property 16.70%

B-3. Miscellaneous Revenue from Commercial Use divided by $33,872.28
       Equalized Value of all Non-Residential Property $18,771,111.00

B-4. Equalized Value of new development $450,000.00

B-5. Misc. Revenue per $1 in value $0.00
B-6. Assessed Value of new development

B-7. Estimated Additional Miscellaneous Revenue $812.02

C. Total Estimated Revenue $7,251.52
II. COSTS DUE TO NEW COM./IND. DEVELOPMENT

A. Service Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1. Service Share of Town Tax Levy</td>
<td>$940,410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiplied by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2. Commercial/Industrial Percentage of all land</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3. Service Costs due to Commercial/Industrial</td>
<td>$157,048.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divided by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4. Equalized value of current com./ind. property</td>
<td>$18,771,111.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-5. Service Cost per $ of equalized value</td>
<td>$0.0084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiplied by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-6. market value of com./ind. new development</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-7. Town Service Costs for Comm/Ind Development</td>
<td>$3,764.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B Costs due to Capital Improvements

Assuming none, or covered by outside developer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-6 Capital Improvement Costs due to Development</td>
<td>($0.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Total Estimated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D- Total Estimated Costs</td>
<td>$3,764.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Net Fiscal Impact Resulting from Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Total Revenue from Development</td>
<td>$7,251.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Total Costs due to Service and CIP</td>
<td>$3,764.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Net Fiscal Impact per Year</td>
<td>$3,486.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Residential Portion for Total Impact:</td>
<td>$5,155.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V Change in Tax Rates due to Commercial Portion of Mixed-Use
(negative numbers indicate a decrease in tax payments, thus a gain to homeowner)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A-1. Total Tax Levy</th>
<th>$1,605,261.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>divided by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2. Tax Rate/Thousand</td>
<td>$14.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3. Amount affecting Tax Rate</td>
<td>$112,177.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by one dollar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4. Net Fiscal Gain</td>
<td>$3,486.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divided by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-5. Amount affecting Tax Rate</td>
<td>$112,177.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by one dollar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-6. Change in Tax Rate</td>
<td>$0.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-7. Impact on Average Home Owner

| A-8. Cost of Home                 | $125,000.00   |
| A-9. Tax Rate per 1000 at Present | $14.31        |
| A-10. Annual Tax Payment without Further Growth | $1,788.75 |
| A-11. Cost of Home                | $125,000.00   |
| A-12. Tax Rate per 1000 after New Development | 14.27891895 |
| A-13. Annual Tax Payment after New Development | $1,784.86 |

A-14. Local Tax Impact after New Development $3.89
Traffic Projection Data

(Current Traffic Volumes from counts recorded by FRCOG)
(Trip Generation Rates taken from ITE Trip Generation, 6th Edition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING CONDITIONS</th>
<th>Average Weekday Traffic Volumes</th>
<th>Source Year</th>
<th>Existing RATIO to be used for distributing new trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN ROAD - 500 ft south of West Gill Rd.</td>
<td>4635</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN ROAD - 500 ft south of South Cross Rd</td>
<td>2076</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST GILL ROAD - between Main and South Cross Rds</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USES FROM ITE TRIP GENERATION</th>
<th>Controlling Variable</th>
<th>Proposed Value for Variable</th>
<th>Trips Generated by unit of variable</th>
<th>TRIPS GENERATED PER DAY (AVERAGE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Housing - Attached</td>
<td>occupied dwelling units</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregate Care Facility</td>
<td>occupied dwelling units</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
<td>1000 sq ft gross floor area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79.26</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office Building</td>
<td>1000 sq ft gross floor area</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office Building</td>
<td>1000 sq ft gross floor area</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Retail Centers</td>
<td>1000 sq ft gross leasable area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Post Office</td>
<td>1000 sq ft gross floor area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108.19</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED USES AND IMPACT</th>
<th>TRIPS GENERATED PER DAY (AVERAGE)</th>
<th>NEW TRIPS ON MAIN ROAD NORTH OF SITE</th>
<th>NEW TRIPS ON MAIN ROAD SOUTH OF SITE</th>
<th>NEW TRIPS ON WEST GILL ROAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRIBUTION RATIO --&gt;</td>
<td>calculated above</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 units senior apartments</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 unit assisted living housing</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000 sq. ft. general office space</td>
<td>132.12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000 sq. ft. medical office space</td>
<td>433.55</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000 sq. ft. of small commercial/retail uses</td>
<td>244.02</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 sq. ft. of small commercial/retail uses plus 1000 sq. ft. US post office</td>
<td>311.54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 sq. ft. of small commercial/retail uses plus 2000 sq. ft. daycare center</td>
<td>321.2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Traffic Projection Data

(Current Traffic Volumes from counts recorded by FRCOG)
(Trip Generation Rates taken from ITE Trip Generation, 6th Edition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Uses and Impact</th>
<th>Increase on Main Road North of Site</th>
<th>Increase on Main Road South of Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td>New Weekday Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 units senior apartments</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>2080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 unit assisted living housing</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>2096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000 sq. ft. general office space</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>2106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000 sq. ft. medical office space</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>2176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000 sq. ft. of small commercial/retail uses</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 sq. ft. of small commercial/retail uses plus 1000 sq. ft. US post office</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>2148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 sq. ft. of small commercial/retail uses plus 2000 sq. ft. daycare center</td>
<td>3.56%</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Uses and Impact</th>
<th>Increase on West Gill Road</th>
<th>New Weekday Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td>New Weekday Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 units senior apartments</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>2260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 unit assisted living housing</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>2278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000 sq. ft. general office space</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>2289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000 sq. ft. medical office space</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>2364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000 sq. ft. of small commercial/retail uses</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 sq. ft. of small commercial/retail uses plus 1000 sq. ft. US post office</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>2334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 sq. ft. of small commercial/retail uses plus 2000 sq. ft. daycare center</td>
<td>3.56%</td>
<td>2336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>