Geissler's Plaza – Mixed-Use Redevelopment

Proposed 60,740 Sq. Ft. Commercial Space and 125-Unit Multi-Family Development

Zoning Change Review and Municipal Fiscal Impact Analysis:
Prepared for REESG Newco South Windsor, LLC and Presentation to the South Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission

GOMAN+YORK
PLANNING AND DESIGN

February 22, 2021

Prepared by:

Donald J. Poland, PhD, AICP
Managing Director, Urban Planning & Strategy
Goman + York Property Advisors, LLC
1137 Main Street
East Hartford, CT 06108
Phone: 860-655-6897
E-mail: dpoland@gomanyork.com
www.gomanyork.com

DONALD J. POLAND, PHD, AICP
MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING & STRATEGY
dpoland@gomanyork.com – 860.655.6897 – www.gomanyork.com

Zone Change Review and Municipal Fiscal Impact Analysis

Table of Contents

DONALD J. POLAND, PHD, AICP
MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING & STRATEGY
dpoland@gomanyork.com – 860.655.6897 – www.gomanyork.com

February 22, 2021

Bart Pacekonis, Chair
Town of South Windsor
Planning & Zoning Commission
Town Hall
1540 Sullivan Avenue
South Windsor, CT 06074

RE: Geissler's Plaza – Mixed-Use Redevelopment

Dear Chairman, Pacekonis:

I submit this report as expert testimony for the proposed application at Geissler's Plaza. The zone change application seeks to place the Sullivan Avenue Mixed-Use Development Overlay Zone (SAMUD-OZ) over the General Commercial zoning district to allow the redevelopment of the retail plaza and the construction of 125 multi-family residential housing units. The SAMUD regulations permits *mixed-use developments containing compatible and complimentary commercial and multi-family residential uses* with the aim of *revitalizing substandard areas*, providing *high quality development*, increasing *housing opportunity*, and to foster *economic opportunities*.

As I am sure you are aware, the retail sector is being disrupted by advances in technology, the increasing popularity of ecommerce, and shifts and changes in consumer shopping and spending behaviors. These changes have impacted most segments of the retail industry, including community scale retail centers. While large regional malls have received most of the attention in the challenges facing retail, smaller and older community shopping centers are struggling and vulnerable. Most important, the collapse of retail has been accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic. The community scale retail centers that survive will be those that innovate, adapt, and become new hybrid spaces that combine retailing with other uses—known as mixed use developments.

This report will explore these changes and challenges to the retail sector and community retail centers—the issue at the core of this application. In addition, the report will provide a professional planning analysis of the proposed zone change application and a municipal fiscal impact analysis of the mixed-use redevelopment of Geissler's Plaza, including the impacts of the 125 proposed residential units.

I look forward to discussing this report further with you and the Commission, as I will be available at the public hearing(s) to present this report and to answer any questions you or the Commission may have. I thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald J. Poland, PhD, AICP

DONALD J. POLAND, PHD, AICP

MANAGING DIRECTOR, URBAN PLANNING & STRATEGY

dpoland@gomanyork.com – 860.655.6897 – www.gomanyork.com

Summary of Findings
Town of South Windsor – Planning & Zoning Commission
Municipal Fiscal Impacts

Revenues: Real Property Taxes & User Fees

Real Property Taxes (125 Multi-Family Residential Units)	=	$500,777
Real Property Taxes (60,740 Sq. Ft. Commercial Buildings)	=	$182,960
Personal Property Taxes (156 Motor Vehicles at $318/vehicle/year)		$49,638
Sewer User Fees Residential ($415.00/unit/year)		$51,875
Sewer User Fees Commercial[1] ($415/unit/year)	=	$2,490
Estimated Projection – Total Revenues	**=**	**$787,743**

Expenditures: School Enrollment Projections & Cost[2]

Enrollment Expenditures (9 Allocated NTD Enrollments @ $9,718/Year)[3]	=	-$87,462

Expenditures: Municipal Government[4]

General Government Services – Residential (21% of taxes paid)	=	-$115,587
General Government Services – Commercial (27% of taxes paid)	=	-$49,399
Estimated Projection – Total Expenditures		**-$252,448**

Fiscal Impact Summary

Total Revenue (Property Taxes & Fees)	=	$787,743
Total Expenditures – (Education & General Government)	=	-$252,295
Estimated Positive Fiscal Impact/Year	**=**	**$535,295**

One-Time Development Fees

Land Use Permitting Fees[5]	=	$7,675
Building Permitting Fees[6]	=	$506,037
Sewer Connection Fees[7]	=	$215,790
Estimated One-Time Development Fees	**=**	**$729,502**

---

[1] Commercial sewer user fees do not include the water usage per cubic feet. The $415 is minimum base fee.

[2] South Windsor's housing stock consists of 9,783 occupied units, 86% of housing units are owner-occupied, 81% are single-family, and 71.3% have 3+ bedrooms. With 4,554 student enrollments in the school district, South Windsor's housing stock generates 0.47 enrollments per occupied housing unit.

[3] Per pupil enrollment costs are adjusted for non-property tax revenue, expenses are allocated to account for fixed cost not impacted by enrollments, and New-To-District enrollments.

[4] General Government expenditures estimate the percent of municipal services used by the commercial and residential (not including education expenditures accounted for above) uses.

[5] Land Use Fees: See Section VII, Page 26 for details.

[6] Building Permit Fees: Includes Fire Marshall permit fees. See Section VII, Page 26 for details.

[7] WPCA website. See Section VII, Page 26 for details.

I. Introduction

The proposal before the Planning and Zoning Commission is for a zoning map amendment to place the Sullivan Avenue Mixed-Use Development Overlay Zone (SAMUD-OZ) over the General Commercial Zoning District at the Geissler's Plaza. The aim of this application is to facilitate the revitalization of the commercial retail plaza through the construction and addition of 125 multi-family residential housing units and creating an integrated mixed-use development. Geissler's Plaza and the associated parcels are located at 959 Sullivan Avenue and consist of 19.05 acres. As proposed, the commercial redevelopment will consist of three retail buildings containing 60,740 square feet of space. The residential development will consist of four multi-family residential structures containing 125 housing units that total 131,492 square feet of residential space.[8] In addition, there will be a 3,407 square foot clubhouse associated with the residential apartments. New construction will total 134,899 square feet and the total site will contain 195,639 square feet of mixed-use commercial and residential development.

The aim of this report is to provide the South Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission with a land use analysis of the proposed zone change application and the municipal fiscal impacts associated with the proposed mixed-use development. This report will show that the proposed mixed-use development, including the 125-units of multi-family residential housing uses, will have a positive fiscal impact of $601,238 in net-positive tax revenue to the Town of South Windsor each year—ensuring the new housing does not create a fiscal burden on municipal services. In addition, the mixed-use development will create and/or sustain temporary construction jobs, permanent jobs, and generate new consumer spending in local businesses.

The report will also demonstrate that the proposed mixed-use development is consistent with the Town of South Windsor Comprehensive Plan of Zoning and the Plan of Conservation and Development. Based on this land use planning assessment (see Section II. below), the application for zone change to the SAMUD overlay zone meets the requirements and standards for approval.

While the positive fiscal impact, economic impacts, and zone change consistency are important, understanding the demographic, social, economic, and generational changes that are underlying the reasons for this application—and the positive fiscal impact—are even more important to understand. Therefore, to best understand the changes driving this application, the report will provide a detailed explanation of changes in demographic and household structure. This will include the need to understand that towns (cities, suburbs, and metropolitan areas) are complex adaptive systems[9]—socio-economic ecosystems—that are constantly shifting, changing, and reorganizing around new social, behavioral, economic, and technological forces. Therefore, after the zone change application

---

[8] Per the Zoning Regulations, a minimum of 10% of the apartment units will be qualified affordable units.

[9] For a detailed account of urban ecology, changes in suburban communities (including commercial centers and retail), and the need to embrace and manage change, see Poland, Donald; (2016) *Urban Resilience - Evolution, Co-Creation, and the Remaking of Space.* Doctoral Thesis, UCL (University College London).

analysis, this report will discuss these social-cultural changes and how such changes are impacting land use planning and municipal fiscal impacts.

II. The Zone Change Application – Land Use Planning Analysis

Comprehensive Plan of Zoning

In Connecticut, the zoning regulations and zoning map, as a collective document, are recognized as the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning. The Comprehensive Plan of Zoning sets forth the community's future development plan and provides property owners with a *reasonable expectation* for the present and future use of land within the specified zoning districts. This is important to understand when considering an application for zone change because such changes to a zoning district should be *reasonable in nature* and should not *drastically change the character of the district or area*, nor should the changes be contrary to the *reasonable expectations of property owners*. That said, it is also recognized that communities evolve and change over time, and the Planning and Zoning Commissions must have the ability to accommodate change through amendments to the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning.

The proposed zone change to place the Sullivan Avenue Mixed-Use Development Overlay Zone (SAMUD-OZ) over the General Commercial Zoning District at the Geissler's Plaza is consistent with South Windsor's Comprehensive Plan of Zoning. The primary reason for this finding—the zone change being consistent with the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning—is that the SAMUD overlay zone was created and designed to allow *mixed-use developments containing compatible and complimentary commercial and multi-family residential uses in the General Commercial Zoning District fronting on Sullivan Avenue.* Therefore, the SAMUD-OZ was designed to be used in locations already zoned General Commercial. It is this symbiotic nature of the SAMUD and the General Commission zoning designations that removes concerns of inconsistency or raises concern that the zone change may result in spot zoning.

As an overlay zone, the underlying General Commercial zone remains in effect. However, the SAMUD overlay zone provides an alternative development approach and application process that the property owner/applicant choose to utilize by requesting the zone change. Therefore, the SAMUD-OZ is not imposed unwillingly upon a property or a property owner. The key changes that occur with the adoption of the SAMUD-OZ is that it offers a more flexible approach to site design and allows for mixed-use commercial and residential developments. This approach is commonly known as a Master Plan development approach. The Master Plan Development allows the Commission to elevate considerations of design elements, while affording itself the *legislative discretion of a zone change application* when considering the Master Plan. For the applicant, the SAMUD-OZ offers the opportunity for mixed-development, provide affordable housing is offered as part of the development.

The purpose of SAMUD-OZ "is to allow…mixed-use developments containing compatible and complimentary commercial and multi-family residential uses in the General Commercial Zoning District

fronting on Sullivan Avenue (Route 194). Such SAMUD developments are intended to revitalize substandard and/or blighted areas, to provide high quality development, to increase housing options for town residents (including affordable housing), and to substantially add to the community's economic base and employment opportunities." In my professional opinion, the proposed application meets the intent and purpose of the SAMUD overlay zone and legal requirements for approving a zone change application.

Section 8.3 (Zone Change Standards and Procedures) and subsection D (Review Criteria) of the South Windsor Zoning Regulations provide the Planning and Zoning Commission with further guidance when considering a proposed change. The following table provides the regulatory Review Criteria on the left and my professional findings for each criterion on the right.

Table 1. Zone Change Review and Findings

Zoning Change Review Criterion	Professional Findings
1. The goals, objectives, and recommendations of the Plan of Conservation and Development.	See discussion on the Plan of Conservation and Development below.
2. The purposes of zoning and of these regulations.	As stated above, the application satisfies the purpose of the SAMUD overlay district.
3. Changes that have taken place in the rate and pattern of development and land use within the Town and adjoining communities.	The proposed zone change and application for a mixed-used redevelopment are consistent with the rate and pattern of development and land use within South Windsor and the region.
4. The supply of land available in the present and proposed zone.	The application is for the redevelopment of existing land. Therefore, it does not increase land consumption or remove available and developable land from the community.
5. The physical suitability of the land for the proposed zone.	As demonstrated by the master plan for the site development, the site is physically suitable for the proposed mixed-use development.
6. The impact on the capacity of the present and proposed utilities, streets, drainage systems, and other improvements.	Preliminary findings by the applicant's engineers reveal that no concerns exist with meeting these capacity requirements and compliance will be demonstrated as part of the site plan and special applications.
7. The general character and zoning of the neighborhood.	The proposed mixed-use development is consistent with the general character of the area, especially the existing and proximate commercial and multi-family development.
8. Impacts on the surrounding area.	There will be no negative impacts on the surrounding area since the proposed mixed-use development is consistent with the surrounding land uses and character of the area.
9. Traffic congestion impacts.	The traffic study provided with this application demonstrates no meaningful impact on traffic congestion.
10. The impact on surrounding property values.	As discussed elsewhere in this report, the large investment in this site will have positive impacts on area property values.

11. The environmental impacts.	As demonstrated by the engineer reports provided with this application, there are no negative environmental impacts.
12. The health and general welfare of the community.	The Zoning Regulations and specific provisions of the SAMUD are designed to protect health and welfare. This application complies with the standards provided in the Zoning Regulations.
13. Neighborhood acceptance weighed against community needs.	The need for a diversity of housing, affordable housing, and investment (the redevelopment of this site) out-weighs any foreseeable neighborhood opposition.
14. The protection of historic factors.	There are no historical factors associated with this site or proximate to the site.

Based on the review and findings, *I find that the proposed zone change application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning and meets or exceeds the Review Criteria for Zone Change applications set forth in the South Windsor Zoning Regulations.*

Plan of Conservation and Development

When considering a zone change application, in addition to reviewing the application for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan of Zoning, the Commission must also consider the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD). The POCD is a policy document that is advisory, and the Planning and Zoning Commission is not *bound to the policies and recommendations of the Plan.* However, the Commission should *review and consider* the recommendations and policies contained within the POCD that relate to the zone change area and how the proposed zone change (and the proposed development, seeing that this is a Master Plan development) relate (or not) to the POCD.

The POCD, first and foremost, is a land use plan. That means the primary objective of the POCD is to plan for spatial organization, density, and intensity of existing and future land use. In doing this, the POCD considers the social, economic, and environmental characteristics of the community to inform the land use policies. The planning for future land use also allows the community to further plan for the secondary objective of the POCD, planning for the public infrastructure and community facilities needed to support future land use.

This understanding of the POCD, as a land use plan and public infrastructure plan, reveals the big picture nature of the POCD and exposes the limits of the POCD to conceptualize the specifics and nuances of any given development application. Unfortunately, the big picture nature of the POCD makes it easy to cherry-pick the POCD for policies and recommendations that are either consistent or inconsistent with a specific application. Therefore, when reviewing a specific land use application against the POCD, I typically seek to frame the review with two general questions. First, did the POCD planning process and/or does the POCD as adopted conceptualize this kind of development in this general area of the community? Second, does the application and development generally forward the goals and objectives of the Plan?

Based on my review of the South Windsor 2013 Plan of Conservation and Development, the General Commercial zoning district in the general area of Geissler's Plaza and the area now proposed for Sullivan Avenue Mixed-Use Development Overlay Zone (SAMUD-OZ) were conceptualized as a location with potential for mixed-use

development[10] and high focus area for development.[11] Therefore, it is my professional opinion that the General Commercial zone, SAMUD-OZ, and the proposed application, provide the answer of yes, to both POCD consideration questions I raised above. While the POCD did not conceptualize this specific development proposed, the general area, including Geissler's Plaza, was conceptualized for mixed-use development and higher density residential development. In addition, the review of the POCD did not reveal any direct conflicts with other thematic areas of consideration or the policy recommendations of the Plan. Therefore, I *find that the proposed zone change and mixed-use redevelopment forwards the goals and objectives of the South Windsor Plan of Conservation and Development.*

III. The Changing Landscape of Retail

The form and function of our settlement patterns are forever changing around technological and transportation innovations, economics, and our social-cultural ways of living in our environment. For example, our first industrial mills and factories were located alongside rivers (their source of power) and towns and cities were constructed around them. Riverside locations were later abandoned once electricity was invented and electric power sources provided. The arrival of rail resulted in the abandonment of many ports, as manufacturing relocated along the rail lines. Later, interstate highways further transformed and reorganized the location and site of industry at interchanges and access ramps (i.e., the industrial park) and large single-story buildings that consolidated production, assembly, and distribution on a single floor.

The same is true of retailing. The location, building forms, and space of retail has also been continually shifting and changing around technological and transportation innovations, economics, and our social-cultural ways of living in our environment (including the ways in which we shop). In the early to mid-1900s the primary location of retail was in city centers (i.e., downtown and main street) and multi-story department stores. Over time department stores (and other retailers) shifted outward to suburban centers and retail strips. Later, the enclosed American mall came into vogue, located miles outside the central city, downtowns, suburban centers, and beyond retail strip centers, at interstate highway interchanges and access ramps, and anchored by large single- and two-story department stores. Next, the big box discount department stores and specialty retailers (i.e., category-killers) emerged on the scene, often favoring locations proximate to retail malls and other large retail clusters. Just as the mill towns and industrial cities struggled with the changing location of manufacturing, the

---

[10] See Residential Densities Plan map on page 77 of the POCD. The area along Sullivan Avenue is identified as "mixed-use potential."

[11] See Locational Guide Map on page 103 of the POCD. The area along Sullivan Avenue is identified as a high focus Development Area.

downtowns, main streets, suburban centers, and retail strips struggled with the changing location of retailing.[12]

Today, with the arrival of ecommerce, the retail sector continues to change. However, the arrival of ecommerce retailing is not simply a spatial shift in the physical location of retail, it is a shift to a virtual space that captures market share, while rendering physical locations and physical spaces of retailing functionally obsolete. For example, when retailing moved from main street to malls, new uses and certain forms of retailing, such as personal service and hospitality (i.e., restaurants) discovered new opportunities on main street, backfilling into abandoned spaces, and creating new vitality on many main streets and in town centers. With the shift to the virtual space of ecommerce, there is no longer enough demand for physical space (bricks and mortar retail) to backfill in downtowns, town centers, main streets, and retail strips, and enclosed regional malls. Many of the past locations and spaces of retail are being rendered functionally obsolete.

This shift from the spatial location and physical space of past retail to the virtual space of ecommerce and the industrial location and space of fulfilment and distribution centers is at the core of the new media accounts of the '*retail apocalypse*' and '*dead and dying malls.*' While such media accounts may over-dramatize the collapse of bricks-and-mortar retail (and retailers), there are many truths to the *apocalypse* and the struggles of the changing landscape of retailing. The fact is the landscape of retail has changed and will continuing to change. Retailing as we once knew it is being disrupted and transformed by technological and transportation innovations, economics, and the ever-changing behaviors of consumers. Simply put, consumers no longer shop and spend in the same ways as we did one or more decades ago.

Bricks-and-mortar retail, including community scale strip centers like Geissler's Plaza, will not cease to exist. Those that can and do innovate will find their place and persist. However, the future of retail remains uncertain, the struggle to innovate and persist are real, and the retail industry will remain subject to continued forces of disruption—technological advance in artificial intelligence and even autonomous auto-mobility will further challenge the retail industry. Many retail locations, sites, and stores will collapse and be defined by vacancy, abandonment, and ultimately blight. Others will innovate, adapt, and shape-shift into new hybrid forms and functions that comingle similar, related, and compatible uses into new kinds of spaces and lifestyle experiences. Adaptation and hybrids are at the core our American entrepreneurial culture and by paying close attention to and giving "special sensitivity to marginal, neighboring, or occluded practices" we "generate the art, not science, of invention."[13]

---

[12] It is important to note that during this century-long change in the spatial location and organization of retailing, the retail sector itself was also transformed from the tailor-made, local, and individualized product to off-the-rack mass-produced products provided by global commodity chains.

[13] See Spinosa, Charles, Flores, Frenando, and Dryfus, Hubert, L., (1997): *Disclosing New Worlds: Entrepreneurship, Democratic Action, and the Cultivation of Solidarity*. The MIT Press. Cambridge, MA. (P. 30).

The owners of the Geissler's Plaza are seeking to innovate—to adapt and find new hybrid forms to (re)position the Geissler's Plaza to remain economically and socially viable and sustainable. However, repositioning a property to retain tenants and to compete for new tenants requires substantial investments in upgrades, renovations, and new amenities that drive demand. At this point, the writing is on the wall, given enough time, regardless of best efforts by the ownership, vacancies will increase, eroding the economic vitality and viability of the Geissler's Plaza—eroding South Windsor's tax base and image as a prosperous community.

During the collapse of the industrial economy and manufacturing sector, we did not have a crystal ball to see the future of industrial dereliction that would come. However, the collapse of our industrial economy and the abandonment and blight of industrial sites provides a window into the future of retail sites. Industrial decline helped us learn, taught us lessons, and provided us with the knowledge and understanding that complacency, resistance to change, and efforts to maintain and sustain the status quo do not work. The forces that drove industrial decline were more powerful than our ability to overcome the decline. The same is true of the forces that are driving the *retail apocalypse*. If we are complacent, resist change, or seek to maintain the status quo of retail, we will repeat our failures of the industrial past.

From the perspective of community planning, the challenge is not to resist change, but to embrace and manage change.[14] Adaptation is the foundation to resilience. Foresight and intentional action are the remedies to complacency and uncertainty. The abandoned sites of our industrial past were in less favorable locations and far less adaptable to new uses than our modern retail sites, structures, and locations.[15] In fact, many retail sites, structures, and locations are adaptable and well-positioned to be transformed—this is especially true of the Geissler's Plaza site. However, to successfully adapt and reposition these sites requires intentional action. Those who act now will stay ahead of the collapsing retail-wave that will further erode community scale retail into functional obsolescence. Those who find new hybrid forms and functions are most likely those who will succeed. "New products and…services are generated…by knowledge, imagination, innovation, risk, trial and effort…"[16] and who are first to "innovate and is lucky will take the market."[17]

This application, to amend the zoning map and place the Sullivan Avenue Mixed-Use Development Overlay Zone (SAMUD-OZ) over the General Commercial Zoning District at the Geissler's Plaza site is an intentional and proactive step by the property ownership to adapt the property to the ever-changing and challenging retail landscape, to create diversity in use and revenue aimed at creating resiliency.

---

[14] Walker, Brian, and Salt, David, (2006): *Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems and People in a Changing World*. Island Press. Washington, D.C. Walker, Brian, and Salt, David, (2012): *Resilience Practice: Building Capacity to Absorb Disturbance and Maintain Function*. Island Press. Washington, D.C.

[15] Note, industrial sites are further burdened by the challenges of environmental contamination and cost of remediation.

[16] Deming, W. Edwards, (1984): *Out of the Crisis*, The MIT Press. Cambridge, MA. (P. 182.)

[17] Deming, W. Edwards, (1993): *The New Economics: For Industry, Government, Education*. Second Edition, The MIT Press. Cambridge, MA. (P. 10).

The Geissler's Plaza ownership is seeking to innovate, to create a hybrid site of retail and residences—compatible uses that are mutually beneficial. Entrepreneurial spirit and efforts are always constrained by governance structures. However, government can also be entrepreneurial, especially local land use planning, a practice and profession that is seeking to move a community forward and into the future.[18] The South Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission can be entrepreneurial and innovative, embracing and managing change by working with the Geissler's Plaza ownership to adapt to change and (re)position the property as a hybrid space that can and will compete for investment. In fact, there is a symbiotic relationship between retail and housing—retail needs households and households need retail. This is one of the reasons why mixed-use developments have become so common. Allowing residential housing and retail to share the same site provides mutual benefits to both uses.

IV. Demographics, Housing, and School District Enrollments

Connecticut has been a slow-to-no-growth state for three decades. Job growth has been mostly stagnant and population growth has been anemic. This lack of statewide economic and demographic growth has resulted in changes to Connecticut's demographics and demographic structure. Unfortunately, these changes are for the worse. It is often said that demographics are destiny. In the case of Connecticut and its communities (including, South Windsor), the primary outcome of our demographic destiny is that we are aging—growing older. Older populations require more government services, need to be supported by a contracting labor force, and result in fewer young families with fewer children—further reducing the next generation of our labor force.

One of the most notable community concerns related to any proposal for new residential housing development is the impact of housing on municipal budgets resulting from new public-school age children generated by new housing units and enrolled in the local school district. This fiscal concern results from the fact that the largest portion of any municipal budget is the Board of Education budget—typically between 55% and 65% of the total municipal budget. In South Windsor, the Board of Education budget represents 60.6% of the total municipal budget. However, and unfortunately, assumptions related to the number of public school-age children generated by new housing units are often higher than the actual number of school district enrollments that result from new housing. For example, it is not uncommon for persons or commissions to assume that each new housing unit

---

[18] Many Connecticut communities with malls and retail sites are innovating and view residential development as a promising and viable use for struggling retail sites. For example, the Enfield Square Mall "plans to add housing to the site" and Town officials are working with the owners (see *Shopping mall already facing a rough road in an online world, but the coronavirus pandemic made it even rockier*, Hartford Courant, June 22, 2020 by Kenneth R. Gosselin). Another example, a Town official from the Town of Manchester contacted Mike Goman and Don Poland of Goman+York Property Advisors on June 3, 2020 to inform them he reached out to the mall's ownership regarding the potential for multi-family development (already allowed in zoning) on the Buckland Hills Mall site and for Goman+York to spread the word of this opportunity to potential developers.

produces one, two, or even more school district enrollments. These assumptions result from past experiences, memories of prior generations, and failure to understand that the same social-cultural forces that are contributing to the disruption of retail are also disrupting our communities, government services, and school district enrollments.

Changes in demographics and generational changes to lifestyle are resulting in fewer traditional households and fewer school age children (school district enrollments). For example, some simple calculations can dispel the myth of one or more school enrollments per housing unit. Statewide, Connecticut has 527,829 children enrolled in public schools[19] and 1,377,166 households.[20] Divide statewide enrollments (527,829) by households (1,377,166) and number of public-school district enrollments equals 0.38 enrollments per household. The same calculation can be applied to South Windsor. South Windsor has 9,783 households and 4,554[21] school enrollments (4,554 / 9,783) or 0.47 school district enrollments per household. Enrollments of 0.38 per household statewide and 0.47 per household in South Windsor are well below the one or more enrollments per new housing units that is commonly assumed.

Statewide, and in most Connecticut communities, school district enrollments have declining for over a decade. For example, in 2008 statewide enrollments were 574,848 compared to 527,829 in 2020 (a loss of 47,019 statewide school district enrollments).[22] South Windsor's school district enrollments peaked in 2005 5,161 enrollments, compared to 4,554 in 2020 (a loss of 607 school district enrollments or a 11.8% decline).[23] In fact, South Windsor's school district enrollments were as low as 4,114[24] in 2015 and slowly increasing since.

The disconnect between perceived enrollments from new housing and actual enrollments, and the most declining enrollments for a decade and half, should cause us to pause, think, and ask questions. For example, why are actual enrollments per household so low? Or why have school enrollments been declining over the past decade or more? Another question, why has South Windsor's enrollments increased since a low in 2015? The answers to these questions are found in our demographics, specifically the changes in the demographic structure of our population.[25]

---

[19] Connecticut State Department of Education, www.http://edsight.ct.gov (2020).
[20] United States Census, www. https://data.census.gov (2019).
[21] Advance-CT South Windsor Town Profile and EdSight CT (2020).
[22] Connecticut State Department of Education, www.http://edsight.ct.gov (2020).
[23] Connecticut State Department of Education, www.http://edsight.ct.gov (2020).
[24] Connecticut State Department of Education, www.http://edsight.ct.gov (2020).
[25] These changes in demographics and demographic structure are also contributing to the changes in retail and shopping behavior of consumers. For example, fewer family-households and fewer children per household, result in fewer apparel purchases for children—growing children who may need new cloths each year.

Demographics and Demographic Structure

Before discussing the specifics of demographics, it needs to be stated that the total number of housing units in a community (and proposed new housing units) do play a role in public school enrollments. That is to say, the more housing units a community has, the more capacity a community will have for school-age children and school district enrollments. However, the total number of housing units, existing or proposed, are not a primary driver of school district enrollments. School district enrollments are driven more by demographics and the demographic structure (i.e., age, persons per household, married couples/families, etc.) of the population. For example, what this means is that housing units (and the number of bedrooms within housing units) are simply vessels that can and may house school-age children—but there is no guarantee they will house children or generate enrollments. More important, demographics and demographic structure as the driver, for example, means that as a population grows older, the number of births (the total fertility rate) and resultant number of children decrease. Decreasing number of children overall typically results in declining school enrollments. Declining fertility rates are the primary driver of low and declining school district enrollments.[26]

The total fertility rate is the average number of children that would be born by a woman if all women lived to the end of their childbearing years. Since only women have children, and since all women do not live to the end of their childbearing years, the replacement level of the fertility rate is between 2.1 and 2.3 (births per women) to maintain a stable population—higher rates result in population growth and lower rates result in population decline. Another way of understanding this is to understand how the fertility rate relates to the death rate. The equation for population growth (not including immigration and migration) is births plus deaths equals growth. If births are higher than deaths, the population grows. If births are lower than deaths, the population declines. Table 2. below shows how the fertility rate translates deaths to births. Note that the United States fertility rate is 1.73 and Connecticut's fertility rate is 1.57. That means, in Connecticut, 27 fewer persons are born for every 100 persons who die. Excluding immigration and migration, given enough time at a 1.57 fertility rate, Connecticut's population will decline to zero.

Table 2. Median Age

	Fertility Rate	Deaths	Births	Replacement Rate
Above Replacement	2.4	100	120	+5 Births = Growth
Replacement	2.3	100	115	Stable
Replacement	2.2	100	110	Stable
Replacement – USA	2.1	100	105	Stable
Below Replacement	2.0	100	100	Decline
United States	1.73	100	82	-18 Births = Decline
Connecticut[27]	1.57	100	73	-27 Births = Decline

---

[26] PEW Research Center, 2018. The US Total Fertility Rate has declined from 3.6 in 1960 to 1.73 in 2018.

[27] www. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_U.S._states_and_territories_by_fertility_rate

Declining fertility rates, nationally and in Connecticut, are not simply the result of an aging population. Declining fertility rates are also tied to, and the result of, increased economic opportunity (wealth), greater education, and the associated changes social-cultural behaviors that come with wealth and education.[28] Most important, these structural changes in our demographics can be traced across generations. For example, if you are of the Baby-Boom generation (born between 1946 and 1964),[29] it's likely that you have more siblings than you have children. It is also more likely, as a Baby Boomer, you moved out of your parent's home, got married, and had your first child at a younger age than those in Generation X (born between 1965 and 1980) and the Millennial Generation (born between 1981 and 1996). These slow-moving changes in the way-we-live and behave are often hard to notice in real time. However, by studying demographics and social behaviors over time (generation by generation), the changes become noticeable and their collective impacts can be profound. These changes (and other demographic and social changes) are why school district enrollments have been declining statewide for over a decade and why South Windsor's enrollments declined by 20.3% from 5,161 enrollments in 2005 to 4,114 enrollments in 2015.

South Windsor is an aging community. In 2000, South Windsor's median age was 39, increasing to 42 in 2010, and in 2017 the median age increased to 42.3—well above the national and state median age (Table 3).[30] In short, older populations have fewer children, resulting in fewer school enrollments. In addition, older households spend less on goods and services—spend less in retail establishments.

Table 3. Median Age

	USA	CT	South Windsor
2017	37.8	40.8	**42.3**
2010	37.2	40.0	42.0
2000	35.3	37.4	39.0

South Windsor's demographic structure over the past three decades has been transformed by the increasing age of the population. In addition, changes in demographics and socioeconomics have transformed household structure. For example, in 1960 only 13.0% of housing units in the United States were occupied by 1-person households. Today, 28% of our nation's housing stock are occupied by 1-person households.[31] As of 2017, 23.5% of South Windsor's occupied housing stock was occupied by 1-person households.[32] Also notable, 52.4% of South Windsor's renter-occupied housing units were 1-person households—that means that 52.4% of rental housing in South Windsor is not producing any school age children or school district enrollments. This high percentage of 1-person rental households

---

[28] For example, prioritizing career over childrearing.

[29] PEW Research Center, 2018.

[30] All housing, demographic, and socio-economic data provided in this report are sourced from U.S. Census, (2017 or 2019) or the U.S. Census 2000 and 2010 (historical), unless otherwise noted.

[31] United States Census, www.https://data.census.gov (2019).

[32] United States Census, www.https://data.census.gov (2019).

is important to understand and provides meaningful context to this application that is proposing 125 multi-family rental housing units—especially when 14% of the units will be studios and 53% one-bedrooms.

Another important change can be seen in married-couple households with children (under the age 18). In the United States, from 1970 to 2012, the percent of married-couple households with children declined from 40.3% to 19.6%. South Windsor is similar. The total family-households with children (under the age of 18) in South Windsor account for only 33% of total households. These changes in household structure result from both an aging population and social-cultural trends. Today, compared to decades and generations before, we marry later, marry less, and have fewer children. This explains—answers the question as to why South Windsor's enrollments declined from 2005 to 2015. In addition, South Windsor's aging population (discussed above) begins to explain why South Windsor's school district enrollments have been increasing since 2015. With an aging population, deaths increase, and outmigration of retirees increases—this results in a turnover in housing stock, a housing stock that is dominated by single-family residential homes, with 3+ bedrooms, and that is predominantly owner-occupied. The fact is South Windsor's past favoritism and overreliance on large single-family housing with many bedrooms is now driving the increases in school district enrollments as that housing stock turns over.

Housing Characteristics

The hard to notice slow-moving changes in demographics and demographic structure also impact housing and the housing market. South Windsor has 10,346 housing units, of which 9,691 (93.6%) are occupied.[33] South Windsor's housing stock is 86% owner-occupied, 81% single-family (detached units equal 72.8% and attached units equal 8.2%), and 71.3% of the housing stock has 3- or more-bedrooms per units (Table 4).[34]

Table 4. Number of Bedrooms

Bedrooms	South Windsor	
	Estimate	Percent
Total housing units	10,346	100%
No bedroom	82	0.8%
1 bedroom	791	7.6%
2 bedrooms	2,098	20.3%
3 bedrooms	**4,238**	**41.0%**
4 bedrooms	**1,456**	**23.7%**
5 or more bedrooms	**681**	**6.6%**

---

[33] United States Census, www. https://data.census.gov (2019).
[34] United States Census, www. https://data.census.gov (2019).

It is important to understand, larger housing unit size and the housing units with 3+ bedrooms per unit are the housing stock that is most appealing and desirable to families with children. This is the very reason why it should not be a surprise that owner-occupied households have more occupants per unit than renter occupied households. For example, South Windsor's owner-occupied housing averages 2.77 persons per unit compared to 1.94 persons per renter-occupied housing unit.[35] Simply put, with an 86% homeownership rate, 81% of the housing stock as single-family, and 71.3% of housing units having 3- or more-bedrooms, South Windsor's housing stock favors family-households with children. The result, South Windsor's housing stock is attracting the very kind of households it was designed for—family households with children.

However, it is important to repeat what was discussed above, changes in demographic structure are resulting in fewer married couples, fewer family households, and fewer children. That means the primary driver of new housing is to provide housing units that appeal to singles and non-traditional households. This is the very reason why more than 50% of new housing being constructed in Connecticut today is multi-family rental, compared to less than 20% of new housing constructed pre-2008. If South Windsor wants to maintain a robust and competitive housing market, then it must diversify its housing stock. Otherwise, South Windsor runs the risk of its existing housing becoming more functionally obsolete and/or only appealing to family-households, which will continue ebbs and flows in school district enrollments as the housing stock turns over generation by generation.

School District Enrollments

The structural changes to South Windsor's demographics—specifically median age and household size—are further evidenced when comparing South Windsor's recent new housing development and declines in school enrollments since 2005. For example, from 2005 to 2017 South Windsor gained 559 new housing units[36] and school district enrollments declined by 935 (see Table 5.).[37] To put it another way, for every new housing unit added from 2005 to 2017, South Windsor's school district lost 1.67 enrollments.

---

[35] Statewide, Connecticut's owner-occupied households average 2.67 persons and renter occupied households average 2.32 persons. United States Census, www.https://data.census.gov (2017).

[36] Connecticut State Department of Community and Economic Development: www.https://portal.ct.gov/DECD/Content/About_DECD/Research-and-Publications/01_Access-Research/Exports-and-Housing-and-Income-Data.

[37] Connecticut State Department of Education, EdSight (www.edsight.ct.gov), South Windsor School District, Enrollments.

Table 5. South Windsor New Housing Permits by Year Vs Enrollments

Units Added	Permits	Total Units	1-Unit	2-Units	3 & 4 Units	5 Units or More	Demo	Net Gain	S.W. Enrollment	Gain & Loss
	2018	47	---	---	---	---	---	47		
+559	2017	102	---	---	---	---	---	102	4,226	**-935 (-1.67)**
	2016	141	57	6	0	78	10	131	4,150	
	2015	43	43	0	0	0	2	41	4,114	
	2014	25	25	0	0	0	0	25	4,170	
	2013	20	20	0	0	0	2	18	4,243	
	2012	15	15	0	0	0	0	15	4,275	
	2011	**14**	14	0	0	0	1	13	4,363	
	2010	17	17	0	0	0	2	15	4,570	
	2009	20	20	0	0	0	0	20	4,661	
	2008	115	27	0	0	88	4	111	4,793	
	2007	47	45	2	0	0	2	45	4,936	
	2006	38	38	0	0	0	1	37	---	
	2005	68	66	2	0	0	0	68	5,161	
	2004	163	160	0	3	0	20	143	---	
	2003	**171**	69	0	0	102	15	156	---	
	2002	167	95	0	0	72	1	166	---	
	2001	71	71	0	0	0	12	59	5,008	
	2000	64	64	0	0	0	1	63	4,895	

This simple comparison of new housing construction to school district enrollments (Table 5) highlights the power of demographic change—the force of demographic structure over housing production. It also demonstrates that new housing development and new housing units are not a primary driver of school district enrollments. It is also important, now, to return to the earlier statement that *the total number of housing units in a community (including the proposed new housing units as part of this application) do play a role in public school enrollments by adding capacity to the community to house school age children and the potential for new enrollments.* It is reasonable, based on this statement, to assume persons or the Planning and Zoning Commission will raise questions or be concerned that by adding more housing, South Windsor is increasing its capacity for school age children, and opening the door to future increases in school district enrollments.

To put this concern and the data above in context, at South Windsor's current rate of 0.47 enrollments per housing unit, and approximately 400 home-sales per year, South Windsor will experience greater increases in school district enrollments from the natural turnover in the existing housing stock—a housing stock that is dominated by large single-family residential homes, with 3 or more bedrooms, and predominantly owner-occupied—than from the 125 multi-family residential units that are predominantly (67%) studio and one-bedroom units. In addition, even though the South Windsor Public Schools Enrollment Projections Update reports (2020, 2019, 2018) continually project that

enrollments will match or exceed 5,151 by 2030—numbers similar to the District's peak enrollment in 2005—I have to respectfully disagree. The fact is, from my perspective, such increases are highly unlikely in the foreseeable future. The demographic trends (discussed above) are working against a return to past enrollment levels—fertility rates have been in decline for decades and household size will likely continue to decline. While it is likely school district enrollments may continue to increase with the turnover in existing housing stock, there is no indication the increases match or exceed the past peak enrollment. For the near term, the next ten years, the demographic structure of the Millennial Generation is working against younger families producing large numbers of school age children (and enrollments), as once was expected. In fact, more than half the Millennials are already over the age 29, the peak age for births. In addition, Millennial births peaked at 11% of women at age 29 compared to Generation X with 12% of women at age of 29. Furthermore, and at same time, Millennial births at age 22 were 9.2% of women compared to 11.3% of Generation X women.[38] This shows that Millennials are not, and more than likely will not, produce a large cohort of children that will substantially increase school enrollments. Add to this the fact that the youngest Baby-Boomers are now 56 years old, the population structure should continue aging for the next decade. Last, and possibly most important, it appears that the COVID-19 pandemic is going to cause further declines in the fertility rates (births) and likely cause a baby bust in 2020 with approximately 300,000 fewer births[39] in United States—with the potential for longer-term declines in fertility rates.

V. Proposed Housing Enrollment Projections

Understanding, at the macro-scale of South Windsor, how demographics and demographics structure are impacting households and school district enrollments (discussed above) allows us to shift to the micro-scale of the proposed 125-unit multi-family residential development proposed as part of this mixed-use development. To accomplish this, we utilize a comprehensive study performed by Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research to estimate the projected school district enrollments from the proposed 125 housing units based on the estimated mix of studio, one-, and two-bedroom units. In addition, we compare the Rutgers demographic multipliers to actual school district enrollments from newly constructed housing in South Windsor.

---

[38] Millennial and Generation X comparisons based on United States Census analysis by the PEW Research Center, 2018.

[39] Brookings Institute, 'Half a million fewer children? The coming COVID baby bust.' (June 2020) and "The Coming COVID baby bust Update' https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/12/17/the-coming-covid-19-baby-bust-update/ (December 2020).

Residential Demographic Multipliers

The Rutgers *"Residential Demographic Multipliers - Connecticut"*[40] are utilized to project enrollments from the proposed new housing units. The *Multipliers* are derived from the 2000 U.S. Census and the demographic fields, differentiated by housing type, housing size, housing price, and housing tenure, have been found by Rutgers to be associated with *statistically significant* differences in Household Size, School-Age Children, and Public School-Age Children. The multipliers are calculated for new housing, defined as units enumerated in the 2000 Census and built from 1990-2000. It is important to note, while the *"Residential Demographic Multipliers"* are derived from the 2000 U.S. Census and based on new housing built from 1990-2000, the data is still relevant and meaningful today since demographic trends related to age, fertility rates, and household structure continue to slowly trend in the same direction they were in the 1990s. Therefore, if there is a time-related error in the *Multipliers*, they are over, not under, estimating enrollments.

An analysis of the *Residential Demographic Multipliers for Connecticut* reveals that new housing units, regardless of type and tenure, generate fewer total persons, school-age children, and public school-age children (enrollments) per housing unit than is commonly assumed. This is consistent with the calculations and discussion above that showed statewide, Connecticut's housing/households produce 0.38 enrollments per household (occupied housing unit) and South Windsor's housing/households produce 0.47 enrollments household.

The proposed housing development consists of 125 multi-family rental units. The mix of unit types by bedroom, as proposed, is anticipated to include 17 studio units (14%), 66 one-bedroom units (53%), and 42 two-bedroom units (34%). Based on the mix of units by number of bedrooms and the Rutgers Multipliers for each type of unit, the 125-units are projected to generate 14 total enrollments into the South Windsor School District. This equals 0.112 enrollments per unit, which is lower than the enrollments per unit from the newly developed Evergreen Walk apartments (0.18/unit) and the Residences at Oakland Road apartment (0.17/unit). However, the low enrollment projection based on the Rutgers *Demographic Multipliers* are expected and explained by the large number of studio and one-bedroom units.[41]

---

[40] Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, *Residential Demographic Multipliers—Connecticut — Estimates of the Occupants of New Housing: Residents, School-Age Children, Public School-Age Children by State, Housing Type, Housing Size, and Housing Price.* 2006.

[41] South Windsor Public Schools Enrollment Projections Update, Milone & MacBroom, November 24, 2020. Note, in the Milone & MacBroom 2019 South Windsor Public Schools Enrollment Projections report, had the Evergreen Walk apartments with 0.16 enrollments per unit and the Residences at Oakland Road apartments with 0.14 enrollments per unit.

Table 6. 125 Housing Units – School Enrollment Projections

Housing Units	Units	Multiplier (1)	PSAC (2)	N-T-D (3)	NTD-E	NTD -Enrollment
Studio (14%)	17	0.04	0.68	50%	0.34	1
One-Bedroom (53%)	66	0.04	2.64	50%	1.32	2
Two-Bedroom (34%)	42	0.25	10.50	50%	5.25	6
Totals	125	[0.26]	13.82	50%	6.97	9

Notes:
1) **Multipliers:** Derived from the Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research *"Residential Demographic Multipliers – Connecticut."*
2) **PSAC stands for Public School Age Children.** It is another way of saying enrollments.
3) **N-T-D stands for New-To-District:** represents the percent of student enrollments who are projected to be new to the South Windsor School District—most enrollments from new residential development are associated with students already enrolled in the District. This consideration is derived from the *South Windsor Public Schools Enrollment Projections* reports by Milone & MacBroom (2018, 2019, and 2020) that have shown New-to-District enrollments fluctuate between 13% to 30% of enrollments. Therefore, our utilization of 50% new-to-district enrollments is conservative. This is an important consideration for calculating the actual fiscal impact of new residential development.

The New-To-District enrollment is estimated at 9 pupils or approximately 64% of total enrollments. The New-To-District enrollments are calculated and presented to highlight the point that every enrollment associated with new housing developments/units do not equal a new enrollment into the school district. Households with school-age children typically move less than those without children. In addition, parents often seek not to disrupt their child's education by moving districts. Therefore, most enrollments from new housing units are existing enrollments that result from rental shifts within the community.

The new-to-district calculation often raises concerns about the potential or likelihood of backfill enrollments in the existing units vacated by the occupants/enrollments associated with the new housing units. While there is the potential for backfill and it is likely that some backfill enrollments occur into the existing units, it is unlikely that such backfill would occur at the same or even similar rate as the shift in enrollments into the new housing units. The most notable reason for this not occurring is, as discussed earlier, the change in demographics, demographic structure, and small household sizes in rental housing. In addition, assuming 50% new-to-district enrollments is intentionally high, projecting greater impact than anticipated.

VI. Municipal Fiscal Impact Analysis

Understanding that the proposed 125 multi-family housing units will generate 14 total school district enrollments, of which 9 or 64% will likely be new-to-the-district, provides the starting point for thinking through and calculating the municipal fiscal impacts that will result from the 125 housing units. To accomplish this, this section calculates (and presents) the municipal revenues and expenditures relevant to the Geissler's Plaza site and the proposed development. For revenues, the analysis

considers existing property taxes for the Geissler's Plaza properties, estimated projections for new real property taxes and new personal property taxes (motor vehicles), and sewer connection fees associated with the proposed 125 housing units. For expenditures, the analysis will consider the education costs associated with the 14 total enrollments from the 125 housing units and the cost of general government services associated with the 125 housing units.

Revenues

The first step in assessing the municipal fiscal impact is to establish the baseline of current taxes paid by the subject property. Table 7 below provides the existing conditions and tax revenues paid by the existing Geissler's Plaza redevelopment site. The data presented is sourced from the Town of South Windsor assessment records. The Geissler's Plaza site consists three properties totaling 20.25 acres, with 4 buildings, and a total of 59,940 square feet of gross building space. The appraised value (market value) is $3,528,300. The assessed value (70% of appraised value) is $2,469,760. Multiplied by the Mill Rate (37.88), current year tax value (taxes paid) is $93,554.

Table 7. Existing Property Tax Value

Sullivan Avenue	Acres	Building(s) Sq. Sf.	Appraised Value	Assessed Value	Tax Value	Taxes /Acre	Taxes /Sq. Ft.
955	0.58	2,552	$574,500	$402,100	$15,231	$26,260	$5.97
959	18.42	52,356	$2,441,200	$1,708,840	$64,730	$3,514	$1.26
1017	1.25	5,040	$512,600	$358,820	$13,592	$10,873	$2.16
Total	20.25	59,948	$3,528,300	$2,469,760	$93,554	$4,620	$1.56
Notes: - Mill Rate = 37.88 (or 0.03788) - Appraised Value is market value - Assessed Value is 70% of appraised value per CT property tax law. - Tax Value is the assessed value multiplied by the mill rate—taxes paid per year.							

To estimate the initial property value for the 125 multi-family housing units, we utilized the construction cost approach to value, adjusted down for soft costs.[42] Our assumptions, calculations, and estimates for the appraised, assessed, and tax value of the 125 multi-family housing units and renovated commercial space are provided in Table 8 below.

---

[42] In utilizing the construction cost approach to value, we recognize that once the property is developed, occupied, and stabilized, it is likely that the Town of South Windsor's Assessor will utilize the income approach to value. At this preliminary point in the approval process, we do not have detail of development costs and operating income needed to estimate the income approach. Soft costs are those costs that do not contribute to the value of the property.

Table 8. Proposed New Units – Tax Value

Use	Building(s) Sq. Sf.	Const. Cost/Sq. Ft.	Market Value/Sq. Ft.	Appraised Value	Assessed Value	Tax Value
Residential Development	134,899	$200	$140	$18,885,860	$13,220,102	**$500,777**
Commercial (rehab)	60,740	$125	$87.50	$6,900,000	$4,830,000	**$182,960**
Total	**195,639**	---	---	**$25,785,860**	**$18,050,102**	**$683,737**

Notes:
- Mill Rate = 37.88 (or 0.03788)
- The construction costs of the residential apartments are estimated at $200 per square foot. We believe this is a conservative estimate since a recent "Hartford Area Multifamily Housing Study" (2020) conducted by Goman+York for the Capital Region Development Authority found construction costs up to $250 per square foot.
- The renovations to the existing commercial buildings are estimated at $125 per square foot.
- To calculate the estimated Market Value for the commercial space we considered the per square foot value of investment, the market rents after renovations, and net operating income. Based on these consideration and assumptions, we estimate value of the commercial to nearly double to $6,900,000.
- To calculate the estimated Market Value per square foot for the new residential construction, we reduce construction cost per square feet 30% to account for soft costs that do not contribute to property value.

As proposed, the commercial redevelopment of the site will consist of three retail buildings containing a total of 60,740 square feet of retail space. The new residential development will consist of four multi-family residential structures containing 125 housing units that total 131,492 square feet of residential space. In addition, there will be a 3,407 square feet residential club house. The new construction will total 134,899 square feet and the total site will contain 195,639 square feet of mixed-use commercial retail and residential development.

The new value added to the Geissler's Plaza property from the renovated commercial space and the new residential housing units is substantial. The appraised value of the property will likely increase from $3,528,300 to approximately $25,785,860 and assessed value from $2,469,760 to $18,050,102. This will likely result in the real property taxes increasing from $93,554 to approximately $683,737 per year.

In addition to the real property taxes to be paid by the 125 multi-family housing units, the Town of South Windsor will also receive personal property tax revenue from the motor vehicles owned by the occupants of the housing units. For taxable property purposes, we estimate a total of 156 motor vehicles to be associated with the 125 residential units (or 1.25 vehicles per unit). Table 8 provides the assumptions, calculations, and estimates for the appraised, assessed, and tax value of the 156 motor vehicles. This result is a conservative estimate of $49,638 per year in personal property taxes to be paid to the Town of South Windsor.

Table 9. Proposed Development – Personal Property Tax (Motor Vehicles)

Housing Units	Motor Vehicles Per Unit	Total Motor Vehicles	Assessed Value	Mill Rate	Total Estimated Taxes	Taxes Per Vehicle
125	1.25	156	$1,310,400	37.88	**$49,638**	$318

Notes:
- To calculate the total number of motor vehicles (for tax purposes) associated with the 125 residential units, we utilize a ratio of 1.25 motor vehicles per unit (125 units x 1.25 = 156 motor vehicles).
- Specific data related to the average appraised value of motor vehicles in South Windsor was not found in the Town of South Windsor financial statements. Therefore, based on our experience, research, and similar assignments in dozens of CT communities, we estimate the appraised value of motor vehicles at $12,000 and the assessed value at $8,400 per motor vehicle.

The proposed 125 multi-family housing units are projected to generate approximately $500,777 in new real property tax revenues and approximately $49,638 in new personal property tax revenue. Combined, the new real and personal property taxes will contribute an estimated $550,415 in revenues to the Town of South Windsor. This will increase the tax revenue generated from the Geissler's Plaza property from $93,554 to $683,737, a substantial and positive increase of $590,183[43] in tax revenue.

Expenditures - Education

The South Windsor Board of Education Operating budget totaled $75,399,351 for the 2020 – 2021 budget year.[44] To estimate the cost of enrollments resulting from the proposed 125 multi-family units, we make four calculations aimed at estimating the actual cost of new per-pupil enrollments, rather than the common and misleading calculation of total per-pupil spending.[45] Table 9 provides a summary of these calculations and detailed notes to explain the specifics of the calculations.

Table 10. Projected Enrollments & Education Expenditures

BOE Expenditures	Per Pupil	Total PSE	Total Cost	N-T-D	N-T-D Cost
Total Expenditures	$16,557	14	$231,794	9	**$149,011**
Local-Share Expenditures	$14,950	14	$209,300	9	**$134,550**
Allocated Expenditures	$9,718	14	$136,052	9	**$87,462**
Calculation Notes:					

---

[43] This assumes and includes the increased value and taxes generated by the renovated commercial space.

[44] Town of South Windsor *Adopted Budget*, 2020-2021.

[45] The reason the total expenditures per-pupil spending is misleading, is that it assumes each new enrollment will include an increase in all costs associated with the school district. This is not the case; many educational costs are fixed and do not change because of changes in school district enrollments.

- **Total Expenditures** is the BOE budget divided by the total enrollment. BOE Operating budget 2020-21 = $75,399,351 / October 1, 2020 enrollment of 4,554 = $16,557 per pupil.
- **Local-Share Expenditure** is the per pupil expenditures less non-local tax revenues (federal, state, and other revenue sources). South Windsor's total 2020-21 budget is $124,347,922. However, $12,083,630 or 9.71% of the budget comes from intergovernmental sources, not property tax revenue. Therefore, to calculate the fiscal cost of education related to property taxes, the Local-Share Expenditures for education cost per pupil are reduced to 90.29% of the Total Expenditures ($16,557) or $14,950 per pupil. Please note, an additional 1.5% of revenues come from local fees and 0.70% of revenues come from investment income. To be conservative, this additional 2.3% of non-property tax revenue is not included in this calculation. If it were included the, the Local-Share Expenditure would equal $14,569 per pupil.
- **Allocated Expenditures** is based on a general analysis of the BOE budget that isolated approximately 35% of the budget that is unlikely to be impacted by changes in enrollment. For example, district office expenditures, school administrative offices, utilities, building operations and maintenance, prorated staffing, etc. Therefore, the Local-Share Expenditure is reduced by 35% to provide for the Allocated Expenditure.
- **N-T-D (New-To-District)** represents the portion or percent of student enrollments who are anticipated to be new to the South Windsor School District. As discussed above, we estimate 50% new-to-district enrollments. However, due to rounding up, the 9 new-to-district enrollments equal 64% or more than double the findings of the recent studies by the South Windsor School District for new-to-district enrollments from newly constructed multi-family residential developments.

Expenditures – General Government

To estimate general government expenditures associated with the proposed 125 multi-family housing units, we isolate those portions of the budget that can be attributed to residential uses by a process of elimination. For example, we have already accounted for (isolated) education expenditures, or $75,399,351 of the $124,347,922 of total Town budget by allocating the education expenditures to fiscal impact of school district enrollments discussed above. That accounts for 60.6% of the total Town of South Windsor budget.

To further isolate portions of the budget, we note that in 2020-21 commercial and industrial properties accounted for approximately 18.4% of the total Grand List.[46] It is commonly understood that commercial and industrial land uses are fiscal positives regarding municipal tax revenue and expenditures. For example, a 2012 study published by the American Farmland Trust and Connecticut Conference of Municipalities[47] showed that commercial and industrial land uses require, on average, only $0.27 in community services for every $1.00 generated in tax revenue. Therefore, commercial and industrial properties pay-their-own-way. In addition, commercial and industrial properties further subsidize the residential tax burden. As a result of this, we can account for and deduct 18.4% of the

---

[46] AdvanceCT Town Profile, 2019.
[47] American Farmland Trust and the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities, (2012): *Planning for Agriculture: A Guide for Connecticut Municipalities*. Connecticut.

South Windsor general government budget that is funded by commercial and industrial property tax revenues. Combined with education expenditures (60.6%), commercial and industrial properties (18.4%), a total of 79% of the municipal budget expenditures can be accounted for, leaving 21% of South Windsor's budget to be allocated exclusively to the residential share of general government services/expenditures. Therefore, we allocate $115,587 of the $550,415 in real and personal property tax revenues generated by the proposed 125 multi-family housing units to the cost of general government services (expenditures).

Municipal Fiscal Impact

The fiscal impact findings and conclusions, based on the analysis and assessment presented above, are straight forward. The existing Geissler's Plaza property is a fiscal positive for the Town of South Windsor. The property pays approximately $93,554 in property taxes per and uses approximately $25,260 in local government services—a positive fiscal impact of $68,294 in taxes per year.

The property owners are seeking to renovate, transform, (re)position, and diversify the property and income producing asset classes on the property. The proposed 125 multi-family housing units are a substantial investment in this property that will add value to the existing property, while creating economic vitality and sustainability. The proposed housing units will generate an additional $550,415 in real and personal property tax revenue. The renovated commercial buildings with result in approximately $182,960 in additional yearly tax revenue. Combined, the proposed mixed-use development will result in approximately $683,737 total real and personal property tax revenues per year for the Town of South Windsor.[48]

Below, Table 11 (Municipal Fiscal Impact – Revenues & Expenditures), provides the calculation for the fiscal impact of the proposed 125 multi-family housing units and renovated commercial buildings. The calculations for revenues include residential real property taxes, commercial real property taxes, personal property taxes (motor vehicles), and commercial and residential sewer user fees. The expenditures include both education and general government services for both the commercial and residential uses. General government service expenditures are estimated at 21% of residential real and personal property tax revenue and 27% for commercial real property tax revenue.

The education expenditures presented in the table are for the Allocated (14 enrollments) and New-To-District (9 enrollments) as calculated in Table 9 above. The aim of this presentation of revenues and expenditures is to not use the misleading Total Expenditures (or Local Share) which falsely assume all existing education costs can be applied to new enrollments. Therefore, the Allocated and New-To-District education expenditures are utilized to better represent the actual costs of new student enrollments created by new residential development.

---

[48] This calculation does not include personal property taxes for commercial equipment since that value is unknown.

Table 11. Municipal Fiscal Impact – Revenues & Expenditures

Revenues & Expenditures	Total	
Revenues		
Residential Real Property Taxes (125 Units)	$500,777	
Commercial Real Property Taxes (60,740 Sq. Ft.)	$182,737	
Personal Property Taxes (Motor Vehicles)	$49,638	
Sewer User Fee – Residential ($415/unit/year)	$51,875	
Sewer User Fee – Commercial ($415/unit/year)	$2,490	
Total Revenue	**$787,517**	**$787,517**
Expenditures	**Allocated**	**N-T-D/Allocated**
Education Expenditures	$136,052	$87,462
General Government Services – Residential (21% taxes paid)	$115,587	$115,587
General Government Services – Commercial (27% taxes paid)	$49,399	$49,399
Total Expenditures	**$301,038**	**$252,448**
Municipal Fiscal Impact	**$486,479**	**$535,069**

The municipal fiscal impacts, based on the above table and calculations, are estimated to be a fiscal positive. We find that the proposed mixed-use development will generate approximately $486,479 to $535,069 in net positive revenues per year.[49]

VII. One Time Municipal Development Fees

In addition to the yearly-recurring revenues from property taxes and user fees, land use applications and developments generate (pay) several one-time permitting fees. These fees are designed to off-set the cost of government costs services (i.e., permitting, inspections, and other related municipal expenses) directly related to the development. These fees (revenues) come primarily from four sources: land use permit fees, building permit fees, fire marshal review fees, and the sewer connection charges. The calculations for these fees are different for each category and extensive, therefore, Table 12 (and the associated Table 12a) provides a summary of each of these permits/fees and the basis for calculations to estimated fees. The 'Total' column provides the estimated fees to be paid for each category, sub-totals, and the total one-time development related fees to be paid by the proposed mixed-use development. The proposed mixed-use development will pay approximately $513,612 in permitting fees and $215,790 in WPCA connection fees, for a total of approximately $729,402 in one-time development fees.

---

[49] Worst case scenario, if we were to use the Total Expenditures (Table 9, $231,794) for 14 enrollments, the development would result in $343,883 net positive tax revenues.

Table 12. One-Time Development Related Revenues - Permit and Other Fees

Building and Land Use Permits	Fees/Rate	Base[50]	Total
Building Permit (Rehab)	$60 first $2,000; $18 each additional $1,000	$3,796,250	$68,392
Building Permit (New Construction)	$60 first $2,000; $18 each additional $1,000	$16,375,760	$291,441
Building CO	$40/residential unit	125 units	$5,000
Fire Marshal Review	$7/$1,000 building permit fee	$20,172,010	$141,204
MF Special Exception/Site Plan	$50 + $5/unit	125 units	$675
Zoning Permit	$25/unit	125 units	$3,125
Zoning CO	$25/unit	125 units	$3,125
Earth Removal	$750 > 10,000 cubic yards	Greater	$750
		Sub-Total	$513,612
Other Revenue Sources	Rate	Base	Total
WPCA Connection Charge/Fee	See WPCA Table 7a. below	-----	$215,790
		Total, Fees & Other Revenue	$729,402

Table 12a. WPCA Connection Charge Formula

Variable	Quantity	Multiplier	Total
Base Charge (commercial & residential)	5	$2,708	$13,540
Lateral Assessment (commercial & residential)	5	$1,225	$6,125
Unit Charge – Residential	125	$1,225	$153,125
Frontage (new residential)	1000 feet	$43	$43,000
		Total	$215,790

Notes:
These calculations assume existing commercial space will not pay connection fees.

VIII. Economic Impact

Economic Impact – Multipliers & Calculations

The aim of our economic impact assessment is to provide the Town of South Windsor with a reasonable and conservative estimate of the economic impact of the Geissler's Plaza development. To accomplish this, we utilized economic development research studies and industry sources to develop multipliers that allow us to estimate job creation, consumer spending, and impacts on surrounding property values.

---

[50] The base fee utilized for these calculations is 50% of total construction cost. The 50% reduction is to account for soft costs and constructions costs that don't require permits.

Construction Jobs

To calculate the construction jobs created by the construction of the 125 proposed residential apartment units, we start by using the findings of a study by the National Association of Home Builders (2012) that found the construction of 100 multi-family units creates 165 construction jobs (or 1.65 jobs per unit). Multiplied by 1.65 jobs per unit, the 125 proposed residential units, the findings of the NAHB study would estimate 206 construction jobs created. However, the NAHB study utilizes an approach that includes all the jobs in the commodity chain of the building materials and transportation of materials to the site, in addition to the on-site construction jobs. Therefore, and next, we compare the construction jobs estimated by the NAHB findings to the labor hour and construction cost multipliers and provide an estimate based on our experience.

Per our estimates, the hard costs for the residential construction are $32,375,760. The calculation, total hard construction costs of $32,375,760 x 6.2 (labor hour multiplier) = $200,729,712 / $1,000 (per $1,000 of construction cost) = 200,729 hours / 2,000 (1-year full-time employment hours) = 101 full-time equivalent (FTE) construction jobs to be created and/or sustained during the construction period of the residential apartments. Compared to the NAHB estimate of 486 FTE construction jobs—which we believe to be unreasonably high—the 101 FTE construction jobs, based on labor hours and construction costs is a more reasonable estimate of the construction jobs to be created (and/or sustained) as a result of the 125 residential units. Being conservative in our work, we project that 101 FTE construction jobs will be created (and/or sustained).

Permanent Jobs

To calculate the permanent jobs created for the 125 residential apartments, we would not expect more than three direct full-time on-site jobs. However, the NAHB (2015) study found that 100 newly constructed apartments create and sustain approximately 50 jobs in year two (and beyond). These jobs would include facilities management and maintenance (e.g., landscaping, HAVC service, etc.) and the spillover of consumer spending into surrounding businesses from the new residents—that consumer spending creating (and/or sustaining) jobs in the community.

Once again, we believe the NAHB findings to be very high. For example, the 50 jobs per 100 units equals 63 jobs created by the 125 units. Therefore, based on our experience and the calculations on disposable income and consumer spending in the community (see below), we conservatively estimate in year two and beyond, approximately 20 jobs will be created (and/or sustained) from the 125 residential units on-site and in the surrounding area. Most notable in our conservative estimate is the high percentage of studio and one-bedroom units that effectively result in small household size, lower household income, less disposable income, and less local spending power.

Total Jobs

Based on the estimates above, we conclude that the Geissler's Plaza development will likely result in *approximately 101 construction jobs and 20 permanent jobs will be created and/or sustained on-site and in the surrounding area.*

Disposable Income & Consumer Spending by Residents

To estimate the consumer spending impact of new housing, we utilize the assumptions on household income, disposable income (spending power), and disposable income (local share spending) present on our described methodology (see Appendix I.). Based on these assumptions, we estimate that each renter household will earn approximately $43,021 per year and have approximately $34,352 in discretionary income. That totals to $4,294,000 in discretionary spending for the 125 households in a single year.

Recognizing that our lives and consumer spending habits stretch across municipal borders, we conservatively assume and estimate that only 40% of household discretionary spending will be spent in the local community (within South Windsor). Therefore, we estimate and anticipate that local discretionary spending will be approximately $4,122 per household, totaling approximately $515,250 in consumer spending per year at local businesses.[51]

Property Value Impact, Estimating Property Value Impact to Proximate Properties

Qualitatively, market experts recognize that investment (maintenance and improvement) in one property benefits other proximate properties. Market experts also recognize the inverse, disinvestment (deferred maintenance and deteriorating property conditions) in one property negatively impacts other proximate properties. This dynamic effect of investment—especially, the negative effect of disinvestment—is well documented in distressed neighborhoods and communities suffering from socio-economic decline.

South Windsor and the Sullivan Avenue area overall do not suffer from meaningful blight and abandonment, the subject property does suffer from disinvestment, deferred maintenance as the result of a weak retail market, and substandard conditions. The Geissler's Plaza mixed-use redevelopment is a substantial investment in this area of the community and will revitalized a property that has suffered from decline. In addition, the scale of the development and the high-quality modern

---

[51] Our estimates for local consumer spending multi-family residential apartments are more conservative than those of the National Association of Home Builders. A 2015 study by NAHB found that the consumer spending impact on local business was $623,200 per 100 multi-family units. That translates to $779,000 in consumer spending at local businesses for the proposed 125 residential apartments. Our estimates of $515,250 is approximately 33% less than the NAHB findings.

design will project a positive image to the market and send a strong signal of investor confidence. This large investment, and market signal of confidence will have strong and positive impact on proximate properties and the neighborhood.

Quantitatively, it would be a stretch to put a dollar value on the probable positive impact that the Geissler's Plaza development will have on neighboring and proximate properties. In addition, since commercial real estate is commonly valued through the income approach—an analysis of the properties net operating income as a means of measuring the potential of the property to produce income—quantifying increases in real property value from the Geissler's Plaza redevelopment becomes an even greater challenge.

However, qualitatively (as discussed above), the positive impact of the Geissler's Plaza redevelopment is real and meaningful. This is a highly visible property on a busy arterial street. The high-quality design and the attention to detail will project and reaffirm the South Windsor image for quality development and investment. In addition, the 125 households will add vibrancy and spending power to the area and local businesses, creating new value that will in time further contribute to grand list and taxable value of area properties.

Appendix I.
Methods and Sources

The following provide narrative and sources related to the information and data analysis contained in this report. The following approaches, methods, and sources were utilized in creating this report.

Market Assessment: While not presented in this report, a general review of existing market conditions was conducted. This market assessment included a review of existing rental property listings/rates and municipal tax assessment data for other rental properties. In addition, we reviewed demographic and socio-economic data. Sources included, US Census, AdvanceCT Town profiles, ESRI Tapestry, STDB (The Site to Do Business), and ULI real estate publications. The primary focus of this market assessment was to understand the general characteristics of the local and regional housing and retail market. Sources:

> AdvanceCT, Town Profile – *South Windsor 2019*, https://www.advancect.org/advancing-business/data-information/town-profiles/.

> U.S. Census (2018), https://factfinder.census.gov

> The Site to do Business for Commercial Real Estate Professionals, https://www.stdb.com/

Proposed Multi-Family Housing: This review included the conceptual master plan and data tables for the unit/bedroom mix. In addition, market data was reviewed to estimate construction costs and anticipated market values/rents. In addition, our professional experience, knowledge, and understanding of Greater Hartford real estate market was relied on and utilized. Construction cost estimates, market value, and tax assessments are converted to per square foot and/or per unit values to allow us to equalized comparison. To test assumptions and approach we compare our work with best practices and ULI publications. In addition, we rely on the work and publications of Professor Robert Burchell, of Rutgers University, as background sources and methods for our fiscal impact analysis. Sources:

> Brett, Deborah L., and Schmitz, Adrienne, (2009): *Real Estate Market Analysis: Methods and Case Studies*. Second Edition. Urban Land Institute. Washington, D.C.

> Burchell and Listokin, *The Fiscal Impact Handbook*, New Brunswick, New Jersey, Center For Urban Policy Research, 1978.

> Burchell, Listokin, and Dolphin, *The New Practitioners Guide to Fiscal Impact Analysis,* New Brunswick, New Jersey, Center For Urban Policy Research, 1985.

> Burchell, Listokin, and Dolphin, *Development Impact Assessment Handbook,* Washington, DC, Urban Land Institute, 1994.

> Miles, Mike E., Berens, Gayle L., Eppli, Mark J., and Weiss, Marc A., (2007): *Real Estate Development: Principles and Process*. Fourth Edition. Urban Land Institute. Washington, D.C.

Fiscal Impact of Public-School Age Children (Enrollments): To conduct the analysis of fiscal impacts related to public school age children, the Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research

"Residential Demographic Multipliers for Connecticut" are utilized. These multipliers are a trusted source of data/multipliers for public school age children generated by new housing development. To ensure the generalized multipliers work for the local municipality, a few calculations are made to cross-check the data. For example, dividing the actual school district enrollment by the number of housing units to establish a baseline for enrollments per unit. In addition, we make further calculations using U.S. Census data on housing occupancy, single-person households, family-households, family-households with children, and age cohort data to calculate the approximate number of enrollments per unit for both owner- and renter-occupied housing. In addition, we continually compare our calculations to previous studies we have conducted to ensure there is no excessive variation. We also conduct post-development reviews on our calculations and findings—once a project is occupied and stabilized, we test our projected enrollments with the actual enrollments. Other sources used in this process include the State Department of Education District Profiles, the EdSite data sets, local enrollment studies, BOE, and municipal budgets. Sources:

> Connecticut, State of, Department of Education, *EdSight*, http://edsight.ct.gov, South Windsor 2008-2020.

> Connecticut, State of, Department of Economic and Community Development, *Annual Construction Report (Housing Permit Data) 1997-2019*, www.ct.gov/ecd/cwp/view.asp?a=1106&q=250640.

> South Windsor, Board of Education, *Adopted Budget 2019-2020, 2020-2021.*

> South Windsor, *Assessment Records, 2019-2021.*

> South Windsor, *Adopted Budget 2020-2021.*

> Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, *Residential Demographic Multipliers for Connecticut*, 2006.

Economic Impact: To estimate construction jobs created (and/or sustained) by residential development (construction) we use two methods. First, we use estimates (a multiplier) derived from the National Association of Homebuilders (2015) study on the local economic impact of multi-family housing development. Second, we use a multiplier of 6.2 labor hours per $1,000 of total construction cost (total project cost less the soft costs).

- Calculation: construction cost multiplied by labor hours of 6.2 hours per $1,000 construction cost and divided by 2,000 hours (average full-time hours worked per year) equals the total number of construction jobs created and/or sustained. For example, if the construction costs are estimated at $10,000,000 x 6.2 (labor hour multiplier) = $62,000,000 / 1,000 (per $1,000 construction cost) = 62,000 hours / 2,000 (full-time employment hours) = 31 jobs.

We then evaluate the results of both methods and estimate what we believe to be a reasonable estimate of construction jobs based on the two methods and our experience.

To estimate permanent jobs created (and/or sustained) by residential development we also derived multipliers from the National Association of Homebuilders (2015) study on the local economic impact

of multi-family housing development. We compare these findings to our calculations of local consumer spending in the community by the residents and estimate the permanent jobs. Source:

> National Association of Home Builders, (2015): *The Economic Impact of Home Building in a Typical Local Area: Income, Jobs, and Taxes Generated.*

Methodology Assumptions - Consumer Spending and Local Area Impact:

- *Renter Median Household Income:* Renter Median Household Income for South Windsor (Source: US Census) adjusted by Goman+York for the housing product and price point. Our adjusted gross household income (AGHI) is between $31,707 and $54,335 ($43,021 estimate). We use this conservative estimate rather than the median gross household income (MGHI) of $107,374 from the 2015-2019 American Community Survey 5-year dataset for South Windsor because renter households tend to be less affluent than homeowners and the proposed development is mostly studio and one-bedroom units. Also, we do not utilize the median gross family income (MGFI) of $97,800 for the Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT HUD Metro FMR Area because that figure is based on the outdated 2013-2017 5-year American Community Survey dataset. Additionally, our assumptions do not explicitly account for 10% of the units (13) being restricted as affordable and only available to households with incomes at or below 80% of median area incomes. The eligible affordable households are implicitly accounted for in our AGHI since it is less than the 80% AMI ($78,240) income required to qualify for the affordable units.

- *Disposable Income (Spending Power):* We calculate disposable income based on an income tax rate of between 16.65% to 25.55% (20.15% estimate) in effective income tax rate (8.08% federal income, 4.42% CT income, 7.65% FICA). Therefore, a renter household making between $31,707 and $54,335 ($43,021 estimate) a year would have between $25,318 and $40,452 ($34,352 estimate) in discretionary spending (minus effective income tax rates). We assume 30% disposable income for a total of between $7,595 and $12,135 ($10,305 estimate) per household.

- *Disposable Income – Local Share Spending:* Using the 40% of household disposable income, we allocate 40% ($4,122) of disposable household income for local (in South Windsor) spending.

This approach and method recognize fiscal impacts, especially municipal fiscal impacts, as more of an art than a science. Many factors and variable influence development, demographics, socioeconomics, public policy, and local fiscal impacts of new development. Therefore, this approach is intended to provide reasonable estimates of the fiscal impacts resulting from the specific development. To say it another way, these are reasonable projections and estimates, not forecasts or predictions of actual numbers or dollars.

Appendix II.
South Windsor Housing Data

Housing Characteristics

According to the U.S. Census (2017 estimates), South Windsor has a total of 10,346 housing units, 93.6% (9,691) of which are occupied and 6.3% of which are vacant (Table 1.). Vacancy rates of less than 10% typically indicate demand and the need for new supply.

South Windsor's housing stock is dominated by single-unit detached housing—commonly known as single-family housing. Including single-unit attached housing (typically condominiums), 81.0% of South Windsor's housing stock in considered single-family housing—a housing stock that is favorable to homeownership (Table 2). The remaining 19.0% of housing stock is in various forms of multi-family housing (2-unit or more).

Table 1. Housing Occupancy

Housing Occupancy	South Windsor	
	Estimate	Percent
Total housing units	10,346	100
Occupied housing units	**9,691**	**93.6%**
Vacant housing units	655	6.3%
Homeowner vacancy rate	---	0.9%
Rental vacancy rate	---	3.0%

Table 2. Units in Structure

Housing Units in Structure	South Windsor	
	Estimate	Percent
Total housing units	10,346	100%
1-unit detached	**7,529**	**72.8%**
1-unit attached	**847**	**8.2%**
2 units	164	1.6%
3 or 4 units	230	2.2%
5 to 9 units	527	5.1%
10 to 19 units	491	4.7%
20 or more units	**409**	**4.0%**
Mobile home	149	1.4%
Boat, RV, van, etc.	0	0.0%

The high percent (81.0%) of South Windsor's single-unit (single-family) housing stock lends itself to homeownership and explains the 86.0% homeownership rate in South Windsor—exceeding the single-unit detached and attached housing (Table 3.) and most likely the result of common-interest communities. The average household size of owner-occupied units is 2.77 persons per unit compared to 1.97 persons per rental unit. The difference in persons per unit (0.80) between owner and rental housing is most likely driven by the number bedrooms available in the units—single-unit detached housing that is owner-occupied typically has three or more bedrooms per unit, while rental housing typically has three or fewer (often one and two bedrooms) per unit. As a result, single-unit housing and owner-occupied housing typical attract more families and more children than multi-family and rental housing.

Table 3. Housing Tenure

Housing Tenure	South Windsor	
	Estimate	Percent
Occupied housing units	9,691	1000
Owner-occupied	**8,332**	**86.0%**
Renter-occupied	1,359	14.0%
Average household size of owner-occupied unit	2.77	(X)
Average household size of renter-occupied unit	1.94	(X)

The median number rooms per housing unit is 6.6 with 52.8% of South Windsor's housing stock having seven rooms or more (Table 4). More rooms typically indicate larger homes and more bedrooms per housing unit. 71.3% of South Windsor's housing stock has three or more bedrooms and nearly 30.3% of the housing stock has four or more bedrooms (Table 5).

Table 4. Rooms

Rooms Per Housing Unit	South Windsor	
	Estimate	Percent
Total housing units	6,847	100%
1 room	60	0.6%
2 rooms	306	3.0%
3 rooms	415	4.0%
4 rooms	1,327	12.8%
5 rooms	1,209	11.7%
6 rooms	1,564	15.1%
7 rooms	**1,958**	**18.9%**
8 rooms	**1,499**	**14.5%**
9 rooms or more	**2,008**	**19.4%**
Median rooms	6.6	---

Table 5. Bedrooms

Bedrooms	South Windsor	
	Estimate	Percent
Total housing units	10,346	100%
No bedroom	82	0.8%
1 bedroom	791	7.6%
2 bedrooms	2,098	20.3%
3 bedrooms	**4,238**	**41.0%**
4 bedrooms	**1,456**	**23.7%**
5 or more bedrooms	**681**	**6.6%**

South Windsor's housing stock is relatively young, with 49.4% of the housing stock being built since 1980 and 10.8% of housing being built since 2000 (Table 6.). A younger housing stock indicates that the housing stock has modern amenities that mostly likely make the housing product more desirable and competitive in the overall market. This may, in part, help to explain the low vacancy rate. It may also, in part, help to explain recent increases in school enrollments—that is to say, South Windsor's housing stock (and South Windsor as a community) are desirable and competing in the overall regional market.

South Windsor's householders are mostly new to the community. Nearly 90% (88.2%) of the householders moved into their housing unit since 1980, 77.9% moved in since 1990, and 58.1% have moved in since 2000. This is generally consistent with the age of the housing stock and overall movement patterns of householders. The fact that 58.1% of households moved into their housing since 2000 and only 10.8% of the housing stock has been built since 2000, indicates that South Windsor is experiencing substantial turnover in housing and households. This further indicates the

competitiveness of the housing stock and community and may further substantiate the cause of recent increases in school enrollments.

Table 6. Year Structure Built

Year Structure Built	South Windsor	
	Estimate	Percent
Total housing units	10,346	100%
Built 2014 or later	43	0.4%
Built 2010 to 2013	169	1.6%
Built 2000 to 2009	910	8.8%
Built 1990 to 1999	**1,351**	**13.1%**
Built 1980 to 1989	**2,639**	**25.5%**
Built 1970 to 1979	1,385	13.4%
Built 1960 to 1969	1,679	16.2%
Built 1950 to 1959	1,339	12.9%
Built 1940 to 1949	236	2.3%
Built 1939 or earlier	595	5.8%

Table 7. Year Householder Moved into Unit

Year Householder Moved into Unit	South Windsor	
	Estimate	Percent
Occupied housing units	9,691	100%
Moved in 2015 or later	**552**	**5.7%**
Moved in 2010 to 2014	**1,854**	**19.1%**
Moved in 2000 to 2009	**3,222**	**33.2%**
Moved in 1990 to 1999	**1,920**	**19.8%**
Moved in 1980 to 1989	999	10.3%
Moved in 1979 and earlier	1,144	11.8%

South Windsor's median value of housing is $281,100 with over 79.2% of owner-occupied housing valued above $200,000. In addition, 42.6% of the owner-occupied housing is valued above $300,000. To afford the median owner-occupied home at $281,100 in South Windsor, a household needs to have a household income of approximately $84,330 ($281,100 x 0.30). Of the 4,408 owner-occupied housing units, 72.4% (3,191 units) have a mortgage (Table. 9).

Table 8. Value – Owner-Occupied Housing

Value	South Windsor	
	Estimate	Percent
Owner-occupied units	8,332	100%
Less than $50,000	185	2.2%
$50,000 to $99,999	206	2.5%
$100,000 to $149,999	567	6.8%
$150,000 to $199,999	781	9.4%
$200,000 to $299,999	**3,047**	**36.6%**
$300,000 to $499,999	**2,931**	**35.2%**
$500,000 to $999,999	576	6.9%
$1,000,000 or more	39	0.5%
Median	$281,100	---

Table 9. Mortgage Status

Mortgage Status	South Windsor	
	Estimate	Percent
Owner-occupied units	8,332	100%
Housing units with a mortgage	**5,760**	**69.1%**
Housing units without a mortgage	2,572	30.9%

Of the 9,691 occupied housing units in South Windsor, 2,281 (or 23.5%) are one-person households— such households would generate zero school enrollments. A total of 712 (or 52.4%) of the rental housing units in South Windsor are one-person households (Table 10). Of the 9,691 occupied housing units, 7,171 (or 74%) are Family Households, of which 33% (or 3,198 units) have related children under 18 years of age. Of those households with related children under 18 years old, 2,909 are owner-

occupied (34.9% of the total owner-occupied units) and 289 are renter-occupied (21.3% of the total renter-occupied units).

Table 10. Households, Families, and Young Children

Household Type	Occupied Units	Occupied %	Owner Units	Owner %	Rental Units	Rental %
Occupied Housing Units	**9,691**	100%	8,332	100%	1,359	100%
1 – Person Household	2,281	**23.5%**	1,569	**18.8%**	712	**52.4%**
2 – Person Household	3,112	32.1%	2,827	33.9%	285	21.0%
3 – Person Household	1,825	18.8%	1,644	29.7%	181	13.3%
4-or-more– Person Household	2,473	25.5%	2,292	27.5%	181	13.3%
Family Households	7,171	**74%**	6,571	**78.9%**	600	44.2%
Married-Couple Family	6,059	**62.5%**	5,700	**68.4%**	359	26.4%
Household 65+	1,271	**13.1**	1,135	**13.6%**	136	**10.0%**
Other Family	1,112	11.5%	871	10.5%	241	17.7%
Non-Family Households	2,520	26.0%	1,761	21.1%	759	55.8%
Household Living Alone	2,281	**23.5%**	1,569	**18.8%**	712	**52.4%**
Householder 65+	1,244	**12.8%**	704	**8.4%**	540	**39.7%**
Householder Not Living Alone	239	2.5%	192	2.3%	47	3.5%
Householder 65+	59	**0.6%**	42	**0.5%**	17	**1.3%**
Family Type & Own Children						
W/Related Children Under 18 years	**3,198**	**33.0%**	2,909	**34.9%**	289	**21.3%**
No Related Children Under 18 years	6,493	67.0%	5,426	65.1%	1,070	78.7%

South Windsor's housing stock (10,346 units) is dominated by one-unit detached (single-family) housing (93.6% or 9,697units) that is predominantly owner-occupied (86% or 8,332 units). In addition, the housing stock is predominately occupied by family-households (74% or 7,171 units) of which, 34.9% (2,909 units) have related children under 18 years of age. Rental housing units only account for 14% (1,359) of the total occupied housing units, of which, only 21.3% have related children under 18 years of age. Based on this analysis, it is overwhelmingly evident that one-unit detached housing and owner-occupied family households are the drivers of school enrollments, not the rental housing.

Statement of Qualifications – Expert Witness

Donald J. Poland, PhD, AICP: I am an urban geographer and professional planner with over twenty-five years' experience in land use planning, community and economic development, and market and development feasibility. I have worked in public, private, non-profit, and academic sectors as a municipal planning director, zoning enforcement official, planning consultant, executive director/CEO, and as a university lecturer and visiting professor in human geography, urban planning, urban studies, and tourism.

I earned my PhD in the Department of Geography, *Cities and Urbanization* program at UCL, London, England. My doctoral dissertation explored the remaking of urban space through the utilization of urban-ecological theory and metaphors to better understand how places change. I also earned a Master of Science in Geography, concentrating in planning, from Central Connecticut State University (CCSU) and a Bachelor of Arts degree, majoring in both Psychology and Geography, from CCSU.

As a planning professional, I am a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) and a Certified Zoning Enforcement Official (CZEO). I have been accepted as an *expert witness* in the areas of *land use planning, neighborhood redevelopment, and community development* in the United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana. I have also been accepted as an expert witness in the Circuit Court of St. Louis County, State of Missouri. Over the course of my career, I have held the positions of Zoning Enforcement Official for the Town of East Hartford (1996-1998), Director of Planning and Development for the Town of East Windsor (2000-2004), and Executive Director/CEO for the Neighborhoods of Hartford, Inc.

Since 2008, I operate a boutique planning consulting practice and have worked on assignments in 18 states and over 100 local and regional jurisdictions. This work includes post-Katrina planning, zoning, and redevelopment strategies in St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana; an HUD NSP-2 application and reinvestment strategy for Venango County, Pennsylvania; zoning regulation modernization and updates as part of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan for Canton, Ohio, Canton, Ohio; a downtown economic investment strategy for Oswego, New York, and countless municipal planning and zoning assignments in Connecticut. In addition, I have also represented dozens of real estate developers before public agencies for commercial, residential, industrial, and mixed-use development projects—including market research, financial feasibility, project viability, and municipal fiscal impact analysis.

I am a Past-President of the Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association (CCAPA) and Past Chairman of the CCAPA Government Relations Committee. I have also served on APA's Chapter Presidents Council, the Executive Committee for the CT Association of Zoning Enforcement Officials, the Board of Trustees for the CT Trust for Historic Preservation, the Board of Trustees for the Bushnell Park Foundation, and was a public member of the State Board of Examiners for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors. In addition, I have assisted the CT General Assembly's Planning and Development Committee with bill screening and drafting legislation. I also participated in the creation of the American Planning Association's development of a *smart growth policy guide* and was a member of the National Delegates Assembly (for the *Smart Growth Policy Guide*).

As an academic, I have taught over a dozen courses in human geography, urban planning, and tourism at Saint Joseph University, Manchester Community College, Central Connecticut State University, the University of Connecticut, and Trinity College. I held the position of *Visiting Lecturer in Public Policy,* Graduate Studies Program at Trinity College, Hartford, CT and *Associate Professor, Tourism and Hospitality*, at CCSU. I hold the position of *Visiting Associate Professor in Urban Studies,* Graduate Studies Program at Trinity College, Hartford, CT. I was awarded the CT Homebuilders 2003 Outstanding Land Use Official Award and am a 2004 alumnus of the Hartford Business Journal's Forty Under Forty leaders.