SHOREHAM TOWN PLAN

Shoreham's Selectmen first adopted a Town Plan in 1971 under the authority of Title 24 V.S.A., Chapter 117 (the "Act"). This plan is implemented through zoning regulations. Zoning and subdivision bylaws legally require the policy and data documentation of a Town Plan. Section 4387 of Chapter 117 requires that municipalities review, revise, and readopt plans every five years to remain in effect and retain authority to revise bylaws. The plan is also legal evidence in reviews for Act 250 permits. The Shoreham Planning Commission has reviewed the town's conditions and facilities, and states its public goals and objectives in the following 1979 Town Plan.

Statement of Goals:

1. Promote and maintain conditions ensuring the health, safety, and welfare of its residents;
2. Pursue a fiscal policy of modest capital investment keyed to low intensity land use;
3. Discourage those uses which compete with agricultural land use and the farm economy;
4. Encourage its local convenience retail, service, and agricultural support businesses;
5. Protect property values while permitting an adequate range of property opportunities.

Population Characteristics and Projections

Between 1960-75, Shoreham's population rose from 786 to 900, for an annual average growth rate of 1.0%, compared to a regional rate of 2.2%. The Vermont Health Department's estimate of Shoreham's 1977 population is 940, a 1975-77 annual growth rate of 2.2%. The State Planning Office's projection of Shoreham's 1985 population is 960. Long term trends suggest a faster growth rate and therefore, the projection of this plan is for a 1984 population of 1000.

Age range shares in Shoreham in 1960, 1970, and 1975 has shown a consistent trend with 0-4 year olds declining 12%, 11%, 10%; 5-17 year olds declining 29%, 27%, 26%; 18-64 year olds increasing 50%, 53%, 55%, and the elderly retaining a constant proportion of 9% of

the total population. The total number of approximately school aged children in 1960, 1970, and 1975, was 228, 217, and 237, respectively. Because the percentage of school age children is declining, a relatively constant level of school enrollment is predicted during the term of this plan.

Average household size in Shoreham in 1960, '70, and '76 was 4.03, 3.59, and 3.01. The State Planning Office projects a 3.00 average household size for the period of this plan. With an average household size of new households of 3.0, then 3 new dwelling units per year would be required to house the 1976-1984 population increase projected above.

Housing Characteristics

A 1976 windshield survey of Shoreham found 68 farm households, 220 single family dwellings, of which 38 were mobile homes and 20 were combined with a business use, 5 multi-family dwellings (2 in farms), 65 seasonal dwellings, of which 8 were mobile homes, and 20 vacant dwellings. In 1970, Shoreham's housing stock was relatively older than the region's, its proportion of multi-family to total housing was below the region's average, but above the proportion of all but two other rural towns in the region. In 1976, 12.5% of all year-round housing was considered rehabitable or dilapidated, compared to 9.8% for the region. In 1976, 3.8% of Shoreham's year-round housing units were vacant and suitable for occupancy, a level adequate for reasonable access to housing. 1976 house sale prices ranged between under $5000 to the $20,000-$35,000 level. Seasonal houses counted in 1968, 1973, and 1976 were 73, 94, and 65.

Local Economic Conditions

Dairy farm and cow numbers in 1953, 1968, and 1977 were 80-2760, 55-3024, and 59-2812 The 1970-75 major increase in large herds had slowed by 1977 while the trend of about 20 bare farms remains fairly constant. There are relatively few farms in Shoreham in the mid-herd size range that has been unstable during the 1970's thus suggesting at least short-term farm stability for Shoreham. Shoreham also has a major and growing apple industry with

numerous orchards, two storage and wholesale facilities, cider manufacturing, and some retail outlets.

During 1965-78 the following shifts in percentage of Grand List by land use have occurred in Shoreham: residential, 19% to 29%; vacation, 4% to 6%; commercial, 2% to 4%; industrial, 12% to 4%; farm, 63% to 49%, and vacant land 0% to 8%. Based on several samples, 1976-77 bulk farm land sales price per acre in Shoreham averaged under $400, slightly lower than the region.

In 1977 Shoreham had the following local businesses covered by unemployment insurance 2 contractors, a trucking-warehouse firm, a water transporter, a general retail store, a gas station, an eating and drinking place, a lodging place, an auto repair shop, and a gallery, which all together had 40 employees. In addition, apple warehouse-wholesale businesses employ up to approximately 60 persons, and there are several self-employed businesses.

In 1973 and 1976 Shoreham's adjusted annual personal incomes, as noted by State tax returns, were distributed by percentage, into the following income ranges: $0-3999, 29%-18% $4000-5999, 14%-16%; $6000-7999, 14%-13%; $8000-9999, 8%-11%; $10000-14999, 15%-20%; $15000-24999, 8%-13%; $25000+, 4%-3%; unknown, 8%-6%. During 1967-76 Shoreham's percentage growth in average adjusted annual income per tax return has been 85%, compared to an 82% regional growth. This data base does not include welfare recipients and very low earned incomes. 1970 Census data revealed a relatively high percentage of families and individuals with incomes below poverty levels in Shoreham, an average percentage of elderly families, but a high percentage of elderly families below poverty levels. Shoreham's percentage of regional total welfare and Community Action Group clients has been relatively low in the 1970s.

Land Use and Environmental Conditions and Trends

Shoreham's 30,080 acres is distributed into approximately 20% woods, 30% pasture, and 50% tillage lands, according to SCS surveys. Lake Champlain forms its westerly boundary

The northwestern quarter of town, with its clay open lands, Cedar Swamp, and relatively few roads, is sparsely settled. The remaining area of Shoreham is variegated in land cover and topography, widely served by roads, and settled in a dispersed rural pattern. The major drainageway, the Lemon Fair River, is impounded for its southerly third as Richville Pond. Two state roads traverse Shoreham: VT 22A connects southeastern Vermont and New York to Vergennes; VT 74 connects a ferry at Larrabees Point to VT 30 in Cornwall, which ties to the County seat. VT 73 connects Larrabees Point to Brandon, and Whiting road connects VT 22A to U.S. 7 at Leicester.

Shoreham has three settlements: Shoreham Village, which combines residential, public, industrial and commercial uses at the intersection of VT 22A and VT 74; Shoreham Center, a residential hamlet, and Lapham Island and Bay, a seasonal lakeside settlement. Compared to other area towns, Shoreham has a very low number of residences per public road mile. Strip settlement is most concentrated on parts of VT 74, and town highways 6, 1, and 48. Development built between 1969 and 1976 has followed the earlier scatter-cluster pattern with no new concentrations of development. Regional employee residence data suggest that Shoreham is increasing its suburban function.

Approximately 5% of Shoreham's soil area is reasonably well suited to on-site sewage disposal. While much of this light soil land is in tillage or orchard use, a substantial acreage is woodlot or pasture. Except for camps on and near Lapham Point and Bay, very few, if any, houses in Shoreham are in 100 year flood hazard areas. Tri-Town public water service serves about half the road frontages in Shoreham. Early 1970's development does not appear to have favored areas with available public water service. Areas without this service remain the most sparcely settled.

State owned areas in Shoreham are the Richville Pond and shore, and two fishing accesses to Lake Champlain. Two Shoreham sites are listed on the National Register of Historic Sites: East Shoreham Covered Railroad Bridge and the stone, District Number 6 Schoolhouse. Twenty-four individual properties are currently listed on the State Register of Historic Sites.

Capital gains tax listings of lot sales in 1976 showed that 14 of the region's 126 sales were in Shoreham, the third highest municipal quantity. Twelve of the 14 were 10 plus acres in size. More recent observation suggests that this rapid transfer of large rural lots is continuing, not only on random individual lots but by subdivision of larger, farmland acreages. This real estate trend, combined with the recent population growth rate increase, suggests an acceleration of scattered rural development in Shoreham during the term of this Plan. Commercial use and growth follows the combined village and scatter residential pattern and is likely to continue its small business, low impact character.

Land Use Policy and Plan

The overall land use objectives of Shoreham are to encourage a continuation of its agriculture, village and rural settlement pattern and varied local economy, and to provide for a continued access to local settlement, and an economic provision of public services. Shoreham has a relatively extensive road system investment and maintenance cost burden. Many of these roads have a limited design capacity to carry major increases in traffic without a level of capital investment beyond the Town's tax capability. Since large, extensive subdivisions would tend to add further road mileage and concentrate road use on many low capacity roads, it is the policy of the land use plan to limit opportunities for such large developments and to allow further unconcentrated development utilization of existing traveled roads. The development option of Planned Residential Development is utilized in Lake shore and interior lot areas, which generally have limited soil and access resources for economic development, so as to afford these farm and forest areas the protectic of low density designation while giving their owners the most economic and flexible opportunity to exercise their property rights. Shoreham's roadside residential districting is continued but remapped to discourage large subdivisions on poor soils and to increase the usable area of interior lots for continued open land resource production.

These policies and strategies are further defined by the following land use districts:

Neighborhood Commercial	NC
High Density Residential	HDR - 1/2
Medium Density Residential	MDR - 2
Medium Density Planned Residential	MDPR - 5
Planned Agricultural Residential	PAR - 50

which are further defined below and on an accompanying Land Use Map.

Neighborhood Commercial District

Most of the town's commercial and public uses are located in this district as well as high density village residential use. Also located here is the Town's major industry. The clay soils in this district, however, place a restraint on intensive development which is also appropriate to a neighborhood commercial district. So as to protect environmental quality, yet avoid the necessity for instituting costly public sewerage, the intensity of uses in this district should be limited to their on-site sewerage capacity.

Permitted uses should be limited to single family residence, mixed shop and single family residential use, local convenience retail and service, offices, and galleries. Conditional uses should be limited to multi-family dwellings, small shop industries, service station, clinics. food packing and storage, lodgings, clubs, and community services. Conditional uses should be liable to site plan review,performance standards, and should be limited in size and intensity, where necessary, to preserve existing village residential character and amenity. New uses, or conversions or extensions of existing uses should meet the water and sewer standards of Chapter 5, Subchapter 10, Health Department Subdivision Regulations. The village area, composed of the Neighborhood Commercial and adjoining High Density Residential Districts would be suitable for a design control district designation, given its State historic district status.

Residential use density in the Neighborhood Commercial District should be one dwelling unit per acre for single family dwellings and up to two dwelling units per acre for multi-family dwellings, depending on the site sewage capacity limits of the above State Health Regulations. For non-residential uses, spacial regulations may be imposed to limit the size and scale of development, and ensure adequate site servicing screening, and district residential character.

High Density Residential District HDR - 1/2

This district is mapped in two areas in or adjoining settlements with existing public road access, and a minimum of existing agricultural tillage or orchard use. In the village extension district, a prevailing area of soils with moderate or slight on-site sewage drainage limitation exists. In the Lapham Island district high density seasonal housing exists on light and heavy soils, and on flood and non-flood sites. District size and shape, access, and development suited soils should make the village district suitable for efficient and economic development thereby offering a reasonable, diversified housing opportunity. The Lapham district represents an existing condition.

Permitted uses should be limited to single and multi-family residential use, seasonal residential use, agriculture, non-commercial recreation, and community facilities. Residentia density should be 1/2 acre per dwelling unit for single family and multi-family dwellings where site conditions permit on-site sewerage at this density. A minimum lot frontage of 100 feet is suggested. Multi-family and community facility uses should be liable to site plan review.

Further utilization of Shoreham's limited area of non-arable light soil resources for high density residential use may be recommended by future plans as demonstrated demand for their use and town fiscal capacity for increased public services warrent such use. Their current limitation reflects a policy of phased growth. A logical location for a future HDR area would be the developing settlement on light soils along the Northeastern section of VT 74 since this is a developing area convenient to both Middlebury and Shoreham village.

Medium Density Residential District MDR - 2

This district is mapped in a narrow strip along all town public traveled road frontages not otherwise mapped. Because soils in this district have generally severe limitations to on-site sewage disposal, a two acre minimum lot size and dwelling unit density and a minimum frontage of 300 feet is suggested. The two acre minimum lot size is suggested to permit sufficient site flexibility to install a mound system and sufficient site size for a replacement septic drainage field. Lots of ten or more acres partly or wholly in this district

should have a minimum frontage of 1000 feet.

Permitted uses should be limited to single family residence, agriculture, non-commercia recreation use, and community facilities. Conditional use should be limited to multi-family dwellings, sales of local agricultural products, small shop industries and repair services, and agricultural support businesses. Non-residential conditional uses may be required to have larger lot sizes and setbacks, screenings, and other requirements necessary to preserve scenic quality and residential amenity and character. Larger lot size may be required to satisfy the on-site sewage requirements of the State Health Department Subdivision Regulations. All conditional uses should be liable to performance standards and site plan review. Agriculture residences other than farm owners should be considered farm buildings exempt from lot restrictions, when occupied by agricultural employees.

Medium Density Planned Residential District MDPR-5

This district is mapped along the Lake Champlain shorefront generally 1000 feet inland from the mean shoreline. It is suggested that this district utilize the Planned Residential Development allowance of the Act, which enables the Planning Commission and an applicant to modify the lot size and space requirements of the district so long as the district's overall density requirement is maintained over the applicant's total proposed project site. This provision allows the most efficient use of land, may provide some economy of housing provision, and a retention of open space for productive or recreational use. However, this open space must be guaranteed by covenant, deed, or other means, for continued non-development. Non-PRD lots should have a minimum frontage of 600 feet.

Permitted uses should be limited to single family residence, agriculture, forestry, land resource extraction, and non-commercial recreation. Camps, as distinct from seasonal housing suitable for year-round use, which should be allowed by right as single family residences generally, may be permitted as a conditional use in the Lake district where they do not alter the character of an established residential area. Recreational commercial use may so be permitted as a conditional use in the Lake area and where such use does not alter the character of an established residential area or detract from scenic amenity. Conditional uses should be subject to site plan review, performance standards, and special setback and screening requirements.

Agriculture residences other than farm owners should be considered farm buildings exempt from lot restrictions, when occupied by agricultural employees.

Planned Agricultural Resiential District PAR - 50

This district is mapped for the bulk of Shoreham's land on interior lot areas typically devoted to agriculture and forest use. Only residences with long driveways are found in this district and they constitute a small fraction of Shoreham's housing. Because the land in this district does not have public road access, typically has soils with severe limitations to development, and is the basis of Shoreham's agricultural economy and scenic beauty, it is recommended that its land use be controlled under the Act, Section 4407, Subsections (1)(A) and (3). Subsection (1)(A) suggests a minimum 25 acre density per dwelling unit; Subsection (3) allows development flexibility, as described in the MDPR district above and in the Act, while maintaining the general density of this district. Residential sublots in Planned Residential Developments may be as small as State Health Department subdivision regulations allow for the land site proposed, and as required to meet the spacial use and site plan review requirements of the zoning ordinance.

For the past five years the previous 25 acre density of this district has proved inadequate to achieve the purposes of S4407(1)(A) and s4302(1)(2)(3)(4)(5) and (11) of the Act, as evidenced by numerous residential and speculative land transfers within the district during this period, despite the continuing extensively unused residential capacity of the higher density districts. Therefore the residential density in this district suggested by this plan is 50 acres per dwelling unit.

Permitted uses should be identical to those of the MDPR-5 District, except for the omission of recreational commercial use. Conditional uses should be subject to site plan review and special setback and screening requirements. While there is no limit to new subdivided lot sizes for agricultural and forest uses in this district, no lots of under 50 acre size created after the adoption date of this plan should be permitted, under a grandfather consideration, for non-farm or forestry use.

Housing Plan

Shoreham's housing plan is based on recent income tax return and population data noted earlier. This plan provides extensive land areas developable as small lot parcels with existing water, power, and road frontage, allows multiple dwellings at a density and in locations where light soil and public water is available so that reasonable rent levels may be developed, and permits, as required by the Act, prefabricated housing, and mobile home parks. The latter should be developed to the density and other use and spacial requirements of the land use plan since, notwithstanding Chapter 153, Title 10, under Section 4406 (4)(A) of the Act, prefabricated housing shall be regulated "upon the same terms and conditions as conventional housing."

While the Plan's land use plan is and has been more restrictive than universal one acre residence plans and bylaws elsewhere in the region, there is no evidence, from shifts in numbers of incomes per income range, that such permissive densities and their widespread availability in remote areas necessarily lead to an increase or maintenance of earlier levels of low income households.

Based on Regional Planning Commission data, it appears that other factors, such as federal subsidy program preferences for urban and publicly sewered sites, availability of vacant land, landowner sales choices and competitive real estate pricing are the significant determinants of sites being available for a range of housing needs. There is some evidence that unzoned municipalities appear to have and to be maintaining a relatively higher proportion of lower income households, but not through the addition of new housing (largely mobile homes) that are not also being developed in towns with zoning or a preserving approach to agriculture.

The half acre density suggested by this plan is close to the maximum permitted for septic system disposal under State law. The potential of over 1000 new 1/2 or two acre residential building lots are made available under this plan. The pattern of the MDR-2 district creates a maximum likely chance of available parcels, all with access, and many with power and water.

An analysis of the 1976 personal income tax return data shows 125 returns below $8000 per year income, and 125 returns with higher incomes. $8000 is a current approximate threshold for ability to buy housing in the region, without special, existing, or family capital. Lower

incomes will tend to need either existing personal resources outside of income for ownership, rental housing. The upper quarter of the below $8000 incomes ($6000-8000) have an average number of 2.7 tax exemptions. This group may need family type apartment housing. The average exemptions of the $0-6000 income group is 2.0, suggesting elderly or efficiency apartment housing need. Generally speaking, new, unsubsidized housing is not economically feasible for these below $8000 income ranges. This housing plan, and the related land use plan permit the feasible provision of housing for lower income households.

Transportation Plan

Shoreham has one of the region's most extensive town highway systems which include a number of class 4 roads, for which no state aid is given but which are open to development, and often costly resultant road upgrading responsibility; and relatively few discontinued or "thrown up roads."

The latest State map of Shoreham highways lists the following as discontinued roads (named here as continuations of existing numbered roads): Town Highway (TH) 24 north to VT 74, and TH 9 south to TH 5, for a total of 3.4 miles. The following THs are listed as untraveled, and they did not, in 1974, have development on their frontages: TH 11, TH 16, TH 18, TH 22, TH 23, TH 25, TH 34, TH 33, TH 43, TH 32, and fragmentary extensions of other, currently maintained roads. These roads have approximately five miles of right of way. This transportati plan recommends a periodic review of the class 4 status of these roads, and urges they be reclassified as discontinued roads. None of these roads appear to have a potential regional traffic function nor do they, for the most part, serve lands well suited to development.

As of 1974, only THs 1, 2, part of 3, part of 5, and part of 30 were paved--a relatively low percentage of total mileage. Unless maintenance problems or heavy increases in traffic volume demand further bituminous paving, further paving is not recommended, given the recent and expected future high rise in materials costs.

The town land use bylaws should stipulate the use of the A-76 State Development Highway road standards for new roads. In order to preserve scenic quality without jeopardizing road service, the Planning Commission should recommend suitable "scenic roads" in Shoreham, utilizin

the guidelines of "The Vermont Backroad." Scenic road designation by the selectmen would lead to some modification of construction requirements.

Community Facilities: Assets, Needs, and Plan

Shoreham's K-6 steel and brick veneer school was built in 1955. Its classrooms range in pupil capacity from 27 to 30. 1977 class sizes ranged between 15 and 25 pupils. Out of the 1984 projected population of 1000, about 24-25% are likely to be of school age, given recent age distribution trends. Therefore, unless class sizes become more skewed, or unprojected large residential growth occurs, the present school facility should remain generally adequate. A recent State survey of the building recommended a 400-500 square foot addition of space to better house administrative and storage functions. A 34% increase in State certified equalized grand list between 1978 and 1979 is leading to lower per pupil State Aid. With Shoreham's practical limit to increasing non-residential or feasible agricultural tax base, this Plan's educational policy is to restrain further school capital investments during the period of this Plan. Until or unless school bus routes, traveled roads, and school location are changed, no education plan map is required. The present school location is on the village green at the center of town public activity.

The Town library, clerk's office, and former school are part of the 12 acre village green lot. The former school is being leased to a local health clinic. There is a five acre Town forest, and a public access to a small public lot on Lake Champlain. Town equipment includes a backhoe-loader, 2 dump trucks, a grader, a fire truck, a water tanker, a jeep, and a tractor with mower.

Tri-town water service is a public utility controlled by users in the towns of Shoreham, Bridport, and Addison. It is presently undergoing a capacity and piping expansion program. The system will carry a reserve capacity in available road frontage tap-ons on water capacity during the term of this plan.

Solid waste disposal access is contracted on a yearly fee basis with a private contractor utilizing a publicly owned sanitary landfill in Salisbury. This landfill, reportedly filling at a rate of one acre per year in 1977 should have sufficient capacity

to serve Shoreham during the term of this plan! However, a State 1980-85 landfill recertification program may either require Shoreham to locate another solid waste repository and/or face sharply higher landfill fees. Therefore this Plan recommends that the Town seek longer contracts and participate in any regional search for regional landfill sites suitable for certification.

Overall Growth Phasing Policy

So as to implement this Plan's goals, it is the policy of this plan that residential growth potential applied for in Act 250 permit applications be limited in number of added housing units or lots proposed to 10 per year. This limit should be effective on a cumulative basis per calendar year.

Capital Budget

The following Capital Budget has been prepared in consultation with the Board of Selectmen and is endorsed by this Plan. This five year budget may be revised annually by the electorate as per State law. This Capital Budget is designed to offer an overview of needed future expenditures, exercise purchase economies, and serve as a guide to scheduled facility changes with respect to proposed Act 250 developments.

Investment	Year				
	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
New dump truck	$8000	$8000	$8000	$8000	
New road bridge					$10000
Fire truck note	$1800				
Total	$9800	$8000	$8000	$8000	$10000

All of the above investments are planned to be paid for by notes supported by local property taxes.