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Vision Statement Draft

• Optimize land uses by encouraging high density development in Downtown to take better advantage of existing infrastructure: especially Framingham MBTA commuter rail service from Downtown Framingham to Worcester and Boston and the MWRTA public transit system.

• Support existing Framingham businesses with housing options attractive to their workers and current needs. Support multi-cultural businesses and attract new office and retail enterprises to strengthen a unique urban experience in Downtown that provides for residents and visitors by encouraging a mix of uses while respecting the character of the historic buildings and urban fabric.

• Promote reinvestment and redevelopment of existing housing stock and create opportunities for new investment to increase housing in Downtown and provide more residential types for a diversity of incomes.

• Provide increased tree canopy, passive open space, and active parks, and enhance linkages to natural resource areas including Farm Pond and Cushing Park, for environmental sustainability and community health.
# Tasks, Schedule, and Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOD Working Group Meeting - Intro Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>23rd, BAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RKG Private Sector Engagement Meeting - Kick Off</td>
<td></td>
<td>Week of August</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Working Group Meeting - Market Analysis, Grade Separation Alt. Review, Existing Zoning Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Week of August</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Working Group Meeting - Dev't Feasibility, Value Capture, Multi-Modal Improvements, Zoning Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Week of September</td>
<td>15th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Engagement - Final Meeting - RKG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Week of October</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October 21st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Week of November</td>
<td>17th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Working Group Meeting - Final Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Week of December</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Zoning Committee Meetings - MAPC and Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Town and MAPC will work to determine the best schedule for these meetings to work through concepts with the planning and zoning committees/boards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 21st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARKET ANALYSIS: Preliminary Findings
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CONSULTING TEAM:

ECONOMIC PLANNING & REAL ESTATE CONSULTANTS
Primary Market Area (0-0.25 mi.), Secondary Market Area (0.25-0.50 mi.) and Tertiary Market Area (0.50-3 mi.)
## DOWNTOWN INVESTMENT ACTIVITY

### Residential Building Permit Activity 2012 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014 (through 8/11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Demolition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Permits</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fees</td>
<td>$383,377</td>
<td>$292,874</td>
<td>$211,557*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fees</td>
<td>$8,157</td>
<td>$8,135</td>
<td>$10,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commercial Building Permit Activity 2012 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014 (through 8/11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Demolition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Permits</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fees</td>
<td>$1,824,525</td>
<td>$3,034,230</td>
<td>$3,870,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fees</td>
<td>$29,910</td>
<td>$54,183</td>
<td>$71,730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# REAL ESTATE TAX RATE COMPARISON

## FY14 Tax Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Avg. Single-Family Home Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framingham</td>
<td>$18.29</td>
<td>$40.92</td>
<td>$323,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natick</td>
<td>$14.18</td>
<td>$14.18</td>
<td>$455,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayland</td>
<td>$18.33</td>
<td>$18.33</td>
<td>$598,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>$18.03</td>
<td>$24.94</td>
<td>$640,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>$16.11</td>
<td>$24.94</td>
<td>$288,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southborough</td>
<td>$16.18</td>
<td>$16.18</td>
<td>$536,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>$17.39</td>
<td>$17.39</td>
<td>$365,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherborn</td>
<td>$20.34</td>
<td>$20.34</td>
<td>$704,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Department of Revenue, Division of Local Services, Municipal Data Bank.
UNITs BY TYPE: ½ MILE RADIUS

- Apartments: 51%
- Two Family: 18%
- Condominiums: 8%
- Single Family: 8%
- Three Family: 9%
- Mixed Use: 3%
- Other: 3%

Sources: Framingham Assessor’s Parcel Database (2012), and ESRI.
## GENERAL HOUSING DEMOGRAPHICS

### Housing Units 1990 – 2010 (Actual) and 2019 (Projected)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>24,246</td>
<td>24,960</td>
<td>26,443</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>28,773</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL HOUSING DEMOGRAPHICS

- Majority PMA and SMA units built early 1900s; in TMA, 1950-1990
- 77% of PMA/SMA units are rental; in TMA, 41%
- Most owners and renters in PMA and SMA: ages 25-54, few 65 and over
- Renters more diverse than owners in PMA and SMA as compared to the TMA.
- Owners tend to be white in all areas.
- In all study areas, households have 1-2 people
- Most PMA/SMA residents moved into present homes in the past decade.
- Framingham: Median SFH sales price is $330,000, sales back to pre-recession levels.
- Framingham: Median Condo price is $130,000, sales back to pre-recession levels.
- Owner vacancy: <1% in all study areas
- Renter vacancy: 6.6% in PMA and SMA; 2.3% in TMA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLS - Past 12 Months</th>
<th>1902 - 1917</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0.26 - 0.48</th>
<th>32 days</th>
<th>610</th>
<th>$870</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>$1.43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kendall St. Apts.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$925</td>
<td>Heat + HW</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennison Triangle (w/loft)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronin’s Landing – Waltham</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronin’s Landing (w/den) - Waltham</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>$2,485</td>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>$2.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Apartment Rents

### Two-Bedroom Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year Built/ Renovated</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Distance to Train Station (miles)</th>
<th>Occupancy Rate/Days on Market</th>
<th>Sq. Ft</th>
<th>Avg. Rent</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Avg. Rent/Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLS – Past 12 Months</td>
<td>1902 - 1910</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.28 - 0.48</td>
<td>34 days</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>$1,206</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>$1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham Apartments</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kendall Street Apartments</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>Heat + HW</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennison Triangle</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>$1,788</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennison Triangle (w/den or loft)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>$1,913</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronins Landing - Waltham</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>$2,615</td>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronins Landing (w/den) - Waltham</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>$2,873</td>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>$2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HOMEOWNERSHIP: SINGLE FAMILY HOMES

### MLS Single Family Home Sales February 2014 - August 2014 in ½ Mile Radius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th># Sales</th>
<th>Miles to Train</th>
<th>Days On Market</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Average Sales Price</th>
<th>Average Sales Price/Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892 - 1948</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3 - 0.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>$266,500</td>
<td>$146.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedroom Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>$249,900</td>
<td>$119.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Homeownership: Single-Family Homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLS Family Home Listings February 2014 - August 2014 in ½ Mile Radius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887 - 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897 - 1907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOMEOWNERSHIP: SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES

• No short sales or foreclosures; no distressed properties
• 4/5 Sales had made renovations: increased the *purchase* price
• 4/6 Listings had made renovations: increased the *asking* price
• Conclusions:
  • Very little on the market in the PMA and SMA
  • Selling period very short
  • Owners making investments to modernize older properties.
## HOMEOWNERSHIP: CONDOMINIUMS

### MLS Condo Sales August 2013 - August 2014 in ½ Mile Radius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th># Sales</th>
<th>Miles to Train</th>
<th>Days On Market</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Average Sales Price</th>
<th>Average Sales Price/ Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969 - 2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13 - 0.48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>$137,333</td>
<td>$161.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MLS Condo Listings August 2013 - August 2014 in ½ Mile Radius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th># Listings</th>
<th>Miles to Train</th>
<th>Days On Market</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Average List Price</th>
<th>Average List Price/ Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>$229,900</td>
<td>$230.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOMEOWNERSHIP: CONDOMINIUMS

- No short sales or foreclosures
- No distressed properties
- Condos built in 2008 at 23 Beach Street selling at a premium $225,000 / $233 Sq. ft.

Conclusions:
- Very little on the market in the PMA and SMA
- Selling period very short
## AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN BRIEF

### Homeowners Costs Percentage of Income 2005 - 2012 - Framingham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Owner Households</td>
<td>14,651</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>14,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%+ of Income: Cost Burdened</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>5,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gross Rent as a Percentage of Income 2005 - 2012 - Framingham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Renter Households</td>
<td>10,612</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>13,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%+ of Income: Rent Burdened</td>
<td>5,241</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>5,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%+ of Income: Severely Rent</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>3,181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MAPC/RKG Associates, Inc.
SUBSIDIZED HOUSING INVENTORY

• Chapter 40B Subsidized Housing Inventory: 10.48% with 2,870 Units

• 197 Units in PMA, 110 Units in SMA; total 307 units, 11% of SHI

• Framingham Housing Authority: 1,056 units with a wait list of 4,522 households
  • Waitlist by income: 3,029 Extremely Low (30% AMI), 224 Very Low (50% AMI, 40 Low (80% AMI)
  • Waitlist by unit type: 24 one bedroom, 204 two bedroom, 145 three bedroom, 13 four bedroom
  • Waitlist by race: 845 White, 780 Black, 1,394 Hispanic, 31 Asian
HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS

- Lack of developable land
- Aged building stock
- Regulatory (MAPC will discuss)
  - General length of permitting process
  - Excessive parking regulations
  - Lack of flexibility
- Divided downtown due to rail core
- Traffic congestion
- Not “pedestrian friendly”
- Shortage of green space
- Perception
## INCOME & HOUSING PURCHASING POWER

### Median Household Income 1990 - 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2012*</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>$25,867</td>
<td>$29,015</td>
<td>$45,735</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>$46,496</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>$26,766</td>
<td>$30,540</td>
<td>$44,841</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>$45,886</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>$43,020</td>
<td>$56,888</td>
<td>$71,382</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>$83,473</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Income of $65,000 needed to buy a $250,000 single-family home
- Income of $41,112 needed to buy a $137,000 condominium
- Income of $45,000 need to rent a two-bedroom unit at 1 Kendall
- Income of $71,500 needed to rent a two-bedroom unit at Dennison Bishop

*All assume paying 30% of household income towards real estate costs or rent.*
DOWNTOWN BUSINESS INVENTORY
(0.25 Miles)

• **On-Site Business Inventory Findings***
  - 130 Businesses
  - 37 vacant commercial spaces in 12 locations (30 on upper floors, 7 street level)
  - All but one renter occupied
  - Upper floors: one and two person offices
  - Street-level retail spaces mostly 2-3 person businesses
  - Many empty parking spaces in church and bank parking lots

• **Offsite Research on ESRI/Internet**
  - 81 additional businesses

*Does not include upper floor residential
DOWNTOWN BUSINESS INVENTORY

• **Total 211 businesses within 0.25 miles of the train station**
  
  • **Most Prevalent:** Restaurants, personal services, professional and business offices, banks, convenience stores, travel agencies, furniture and clothing stores, religious organizations, dentists, social services).
  
  • **Mostly small businesses:** Average 5 employees. Together, the 211 business employ about 768 people per day.
  
  • Owners and employees from diverse backgrounds and educational levels
  
  • Range of downtown businesses will attract and support future housing growth
  
  • **Based on 112 of 211 businesses, estimated yearly revenue is $80,018,551 and average revenue $714,451.**
DOWNTOWN BUSINESS INVENTORY

• Advantages:

  • New additions:
    • New Amazing Things Art Center
    • Deluxe Diner
    • Pho Dakoa
    • Extending business hours to evenings!
  • Low Rents
  • Informed and connected immigrant population
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DOWNTOWN BUSINESS INVENTORY

• Suggested Needs:
  • Full service and/or expanded supermarket (desire to expand: Tesaro)
  • Remove obstacles at train station to open access to the aqueduct walking and biking trail.
  • Additional indoor and outdoor recreational space (or good advertising campaign highlighting how close it is)
  • Shared parking
  • Lower commercial tax rate
HOUSING SUPPLY AND DEMAND

CONCLUSIONS

• **Rental supply:**
  
  • Occupancy is high at all income levels
  • Turnover is low (95% occupancy means demand for more product).

• **Homeownership supply:**
  
  • Old, scarce,
  • Needs updating and modernizing, and
  • Consumers are willing to pay more.
HOUSING SUPPLY & DEMAND

CONCLUSIONS

• **What is needed?**
  - More of everything at all price points.
  - Given the success of 1 Kendal and VTT and the potential demand of area colleges, additional new quality rental housing stock (48 in construction, demand for at least 30).
  - Given the success of Dennison Bishop in a healthy economy and the high-end condominium at 23 Beech Street, households from outside of the downtown with higher incomes have a desire to live close to the downtown.

• **Developers and lenders now have a track record to bank on.**
SELECTED DOWNTOWN METRICS

• Nearly 4.7 million SF of built improvements on 247 acres of land
  • Little undeveloped land (14 acres)
  • Accounts for nearly $340 million of Town’s assessed value
• 865,000 SF of retail, 580,000 SF office/commercial uses
  • Recent commercial permits represent 16.1 percent investment in building assessed values
SELECTED COMMERCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

• Estimated Average Sales Activity
  • General retail at $125,000
  • Business services at $225,000
  • Dine and drink at $360,000

• Spending Demand and Sales Leakage (3 miles)
  • Unmet demand of $15 million for electronics and appliances
  • Unmet demand of $21.8 million for specialty and niche retail
  • Unmet demand of $6.3 million for dine and drink

• Inventoried 200+ businesses in downtown PMA
  • Represents 10 percent of business establishments in Framingham
  • Represents 2 percent of private sector employment in Framingham
  • Several new restaurants in the last couple of years offering multiple cuisines and ethnicities
DOWNTOWN POTENTIAL FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

• Estimated supportable demand (current) for an additional 11,400 SF to 26,600 SF through re-capture of sales leakage
  • Electronics and appliances 1,600 SF to 3,800 SF
  • Specialty and niche retail 3,800 SF to 9,000 SF
  • Specialty food, drink and dine at 1,600 SF to 3,800 SF
• Estimated annual demand (based on employment growth) for an additional 5,400 SF to 12,700 SF of other commercial
  • Professional and technical services 1,000 SF to 2,100 SF
  • Health related at 2,400 SF to 5,500 SF
NEXT STEPS

• Coordinate with other team members and document findings.
• Continued outreach and discussions with development community and end users.
• Reconcile demand with physical and financial capacity of identified sites.
• Provide examples of successful Transit-Oriented Developments.
Purpose - Multi-Modal Improvements

- Identify Steps to Advance Downtown Vision
  - “Re-energized, Walkable, Mixed-Use Core”
  - Specific Multi-Modal Improvements to Support Identified Development Parcels
Context

• Bisected by Rail
• Existing Infrastructure
• Transit Options
• Future Plans
Grade Separation

• August 2009
• Investigated Four Transportation Alternative Concepts for Downtown
• The Boston Mainline tracks which run parallel to Route 135 create a significant physical divide between the north and south areas of the Downtown.
...depressing Route 126 under Route 135 would adversely impact the Downtown environment...
Alternative 2 - Depress Route 135

...depressing Route 135 under Route 126 would enhancing pedestrian connections within Downtown...
Alternatives 3 & 4 - By-Pass

...Reduces Vehicle Traffic in the Downtown Area...
Downtown

- February 2010
- Existing bicycling & walking conditions
- Recommendations for Improvements
...128 bicyclists and 934 pedestrians counted from 2 to 6 PM on Concord Street in Summer 2008....
Transit
• Commuter Rail
• Bus Options
• MWRTA – 8 Downtown Routes
• Framingham State
5 Minute Walking Distance
Terminus #1 (Pearl Street Garage)
Terminus #2 (Blandin Avenue)
Regional Bike Network

• Bruce Freeman Rail Trail
• Cochituate Rail Trail
• Weston Aqueduct Trail
• Sudbury Aqueduct Trail
• Upper Charles River Trail
Next Steps...

- Evaluate Specific Improvements to Support Identified TOD Opportunities
- Identify Opportunities to Enhance Experience of All Users within Downtown
- Focus on Specific Infrastructure Needs
Framingham Downtown Transportation Planning Study

Prepared for the Metropolitan Area Planning Council and the Town of Framingham

The Cecil Group with GPI
Framingham Downtown Transportation Study

Topics

- Circulation Alternatives
- Downtown Streetscape Project
- TOD Pedestrian Strategy
- Relationship between Transportation and TOD
- Potential for TOD and Downtown Framingham
- Alternatives: Implications for Development
- Next Step: Development Testing
Framingham Downtown Transportation Study

Circulation Alternatives: Phase 2 Studies

Figure 3
Part 2 Roadway Alternatives
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 1: Route 135 Under Route 126
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 1: Route 135 Under Route 126

AFFECTED BUILDINGS AND BLOCKS
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 1: Route 135 Under Route 126

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 2: East Bypass
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 2: East Bypass

AFFECTED BUILDINGS AND BLOCKS
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 2: East Bypass

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 3: West Side Bypass

[Image of railroad yard with trains and a train yard]
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 3: West Side Bypass

AFFECTED BUILDINGS AND BLOCKS
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 3: West Side Bypass

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 4: Route 126 Under Route 135

Image from the 1997 Route 126/Route 135 Study
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 4: Route 126 Under Route 135

AFFECTED BUILDINGS AND BLOCKS
Circulation Alternatives

Alternative 4: Route 126 Under Route 135

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS
Downtown Streetscape Project

Components

- Street realignment
- Sidewalk and streetscape improvements
- Signalization improvements
Downtown Streetscape Project

Components

- Street realignment
- Sidewalk and streetscape improvements
- Signalization improvements
Downtown Streetscape Project

Components

- Street realignment
- Sidewalk and streetscape improvements
- Signalization improvements
TOD Pedestrian Strategy

Study Area

- Goal: Establish a menu of improvements in the pedestrian environment in the area adjacent to the commuter rail station
- Consider alternatives in the event that the circulation system is altered in the future
TOD Pedestrian Strategy

Menu of Improvements
TOD Pedestrian Strategy
Example of Potential Enhancements
The fabric of the downtown is divided by the rail corridor.

Links to the rail station must be reasonably convenient, direct and pleasant to best support TOD and the downtown.
### Building Utilization, Site Availability and Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,091</td>
<td>Total existing parking spaces in downtown area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Total existing parking spaces dedicated for commuter rail services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,482</td>
<td>Total existing parking spaces in downtown area to support existing building stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>Utilization rate of existing parking in downtown, not including commuter parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,495</td>
<td>Estimated parking spaces used for non-commuter purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>Estimated parking used for residential uses, assuming 95% occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>Estimated parking used for non-commuter, non-residential uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>Estimated available parking spaces for non-commuter purposes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculation of Building Utilization based on parking inventory and parking utilization relative to typical parking ratios. Summary prepared by The Cecil Group. August 2014 from previous studies.
Relationship between Transportation and TOD

Building Utilization, Site Availability and Parking

5,395  Total required parking spaces in downtown area in existing buildings, 95% space utilization
20%  Shared use demand reduction
5,111  Net required spaces at 100% space utilization
1,177  Total parking required for residential uses at 95% occupancy
3,934  Net parking required for non-residential use at 95% space utilization
1,318  Estimated parking used for non-commuter, non-residential uses

33%  Effective ratio of utilization of building stock for non-residential uses, as a proportion of parking used/parking that would be needed at a 95% occupancy rate
Building Utilization, Site Availability and Parking

- 2,677,648 Total area, building stock
- 946,600 Total area, residential uses in the downtown
- 1,731,048 Total area, non-residential uses
  - 33% Estimated utilization rate, as calculated above
- 579,754 Total area, effectively utilized non-residential space
- 1,151,294 Total area, underutilized non-residential space

- 1,987 Available parking to support rehabilitation and revitalization of existing building stock
- 13.69 Acres of underutilized parking 300 square feet/space

Data Sources:
Parking evaluations, Town Assessor’s data, calculations from previous studies by The Cecil Group, BETA Group, Rizzo/Tetratech
Building Utilization, Site Availability and Parking

- Existing buildings can absorb substantial amount of development, if they are adaptable to uses that the market will support.
- There is a surplus of land devoted to parking lots that can be used to either support parking or as sites for new development.
Potential for TOD and Downtown Framingham

Initial Candidate Sites
Potential for TOD and Downtown Framingham

Focus Areas: Central and East Crossing Options
Relationship between Transportation and TOD

Observations and Discussion
Downtown Framingham and Transit-Oriented Development

Roundtable Number 5
August 20, 2014
Downtown Framingham TOD Study
Preliminary Zoning Analysis
5 Study Area Zoning Districts

- Central Business District (CB)*
- Business (B)
- General Residence (G)
- Manufacturing (M)
- Office/Professional (P)

*Majority of analysis to date has focused on the CB district.
Downtown Framingham Existing Zoning Districts
Allowed Uses

• Wide range of commercial uses.
  – Most retail
  – Professional or administrative offices
  – Health clubs
  – Artisans, artist studios
  – Lodge, club or private non-profit social or fraternal organization
  – Trade, professional or other school

• Some residential

• Many typical uses not allowed, as of right or by Special Permit.
Multi-Family Residential

- New construction multifamily-only residential NOT allowed anywhere even by Special Permit.
- Multi-family ALLOWED by Special Permit only in:
  - CB District as part of Mixed-Use
  - Historic Reuse – but limited to condominiums
  - Conversion of single-family to multi-family
  - As part of a Planned Unit Development (PUD)
Special Permits

- Structures over 8,000 SF require a Special Permit.
- Restaurants require a Special Permit.
  - 8,000 SF or under: ZBA
  - 8,000 SF and over: PB
- Mixed-Use development requires a Special Permit
- Administrative, professional offices and bank branches under 8,000 in the Office/Professional District.
Site Plan Review

• Required of any new structure/structures
  – Only exception: Residential with <5 new parking spaces (e.g. Single Family)

• Requirements:
  – Review of detailed site plan and other documents
  – Development Impact Statement
  – Timing: Up to 155 days.
### Dimensional Requirements

- Little difference between districts, particularly in residential requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Max FAR</th>
<th>Min Lot Area (sf)</th>
<th>Max lot coverage</th>
<th>Setbacks</th>
<th>Min lot frontage</th>
<th>Min open space surface ratio</th>
<th>Height (max stories)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **General Residence (G)** | None    | 8,000             | 35%              | 30’ or more | 10’             | 65’                           | 3 stories (40’)
| **Central Business District (CB) – Any residential use** | None    | 8,000             | 35%              | 30’ or more | 10’             | 65’                           | 3 stories (40’)
| **Central Business District (CB) – Any other principal or Mixed-use** | 2.0     | None              | 60%              | 10’       | None            | None                          | 6 stories (80’)
| **Business (B) – any residential use** | None    | 8,000             | None             | 30’ or more | 10’             | 65’                           | 3 stories (40’) |
Zoning Overview Summary

• Zoning By-Law is quite restrictive in the downtown
  – Multi-family not allowed by right
  – Onerous Special Permit process
    • Restaurants (any)
    • Any structure over 8,000 SF
  – All new construction requires a Site Plan Review
    • Includes Development Impact Assessment
Issue: Onerous Special Permit Process

Recommendation:

• Allow Mixed-Use by-right with Site Plan Review

• Require Special Permit for larger mixed-use projects (threshold TBD)

• Allow for 3-BR units (currently not allowed)
**Issue:** Site Plan Review required for nearly all new development

**Recommendation:**

- Reduce requirement for Site Plan Review
  - Set a threshold for development size (e.g. larger projects above X GSF); or
  - Eliminate Development Impact Statement for smaller projects.
- Consider separate Site Plan Review process for CB District.
**Issue:** New construction multi-family residential not allowed.

**Recommendation:**
- Allow multi-family-only development by Special Permit downtown
- Allow 3-BR units
- Reduce residential front setback requirements in CB
Issue: Residential and non-residential parking requirements.

Preliminary Recommendations:

• Make parking more predictable, but also flexible, downtown.
• Tie residential parking to number of bedrooms, not by unit.
• Encourage shared parking strategies
• Reduce requirements by increasing radius for qualifying off-street parking facilities.
Next Steps

• Analysis of M District
• Work with RKG to align zoning recommendations with development feasibility outcomes
• Analyze existing parking capacity and utilization to inform parking recommendations in zoning