Town of Madison, Connecticut
The Academy School Study

Report of Findings
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Project Overview

- GreatBlue Research was commissioned by the Town of Madison, CT (hereinafter, “Madison”) to conduct comprehensive research among its residents to gain a deeper understanding of their preferred path for the future development of The Academy School (hereinafter, “Academy”).

- The primary goal of this research study was to gauge support and opposition for seven (7) different development proposals for The Academy School (four for private development and three for community use), and the degree to which residents support or oppose these proposals.

- In order to service these research goals, GreatBlue conducted 403 telephone interviews among a representative sample of Madison residents based on age and gender quotas. GreatBlue also received 2,000 digital interviews from current voting and / or taxpaying Madison residents; two online survey links were provided to the Town for distribution on its website, as well as via the Town’s senior center and library.

- The outcome of this research will enable the Town of Madison to a) clearly understand support and opposition towards several proposals for Academy’s future development, b) gauge the degree to which Madison residents support or oppose these proposals, and c) identify which options for Academy are more likely to pass in an upcoming referendum.
The Town of Madison Academy School Study leveraged a quantitative research methodology to address the following areas of investigation:

- Support or opposition of seven (7) different proposals regarding future usage of Academy (four for private development, three for community use)
- Strength of support or opposition toward each proposal
- Residents’ choice of single option for future Academy use
- Support or opposition for a proposal requiring the sale of the land for development
- Demographic profile of respondents
Overview of Proposals - Private Development

- **Dakota Proposal** - This option would turn Academy into 40 rental apartment units offered at both market and affordable rates. The units would be age-restricted to age 60+, and the existing gymnasium would be available for shared community use. The Academy building, and a small amount of land for access, parking and septic, would be sold for $250,000. If fully rented, the project would bring an estimated annual tax revenue of $40,000 to the Town.

- **Women's Institute Proposal** - This option would turn the Academy building, and a small amount of land for access, septic and parking, into 28 rental apartments at both market and affordable rates. It also would make the existing small auditorium available for shared community use. There would be no purchase payment to the Town, but rather a long-term lease with payments that have not yet been determined, but are expected to be nominal. Estimated tax revenues are undetermined.

- **RAL Proposal** - This option would turn Academy into 20 luxury condominiums. The Academy building, and a small amount of land for access, septic and parking, would be sold for $250,000. Additional revenues would be paid to the Town for sales above a certain price point. Fully sold, this project would bring an estimated annual tax revenue of $375,000 to the Town.

- **Horton Group Proposal** - This option would turn Academy into 21 market-rate rental apartments and 11,000 sq. ft. of commercial office space. The Academy building, and land for access, septic and parking, would be sold for $300,000, with an additional $175,000 for open-space enhancements. Fully rented, this project would bring an estimated annual tax revenue of $170,000 to the Town.
Overview of Proposals - Community Use

**Town Park Proposal** - This option would demolish the Academy building and construct a town park in its place for community use. This project would cost an estimated $1.5 to $2.5 million to the Town, or about $24 a year for an average household. *Because the building is on the National Register of Historic Places, demolition could be subject to litigation under Connecticut law.*

**Town Hall Proposal** - This option would move the Town offices currently located at the Town Campus to the Academy building, which would be renovated for municipal purposes, with the existing auditorium and gymnasium available for community events and programming. The Police Department would remain at Town Campus. The cost to the Town of renovating the Academy building is estimated at $14 million. With federal and state historic preservation tax credits, the final cost could be reduced by $2 to $4 million. The Town Campus building would then be converted to a community center at an estimated cost to the Town of $5 million, bringing the total project cost to an estimated $19 million, or about $188 a year for an average household. Operating and maintenance costs are expected to remain consistent with the Town Campus annual budget.

**Community Center Proposal** - This option would turn Academy into a multi-use community center that might include youth and adult classes and programs, meeting rooms, co-working space, art classes, community gymnasium, theater, kitchen, dining area, marketplace, workshop and daycare. The cost to the Town of this renovation is estimated at $14 million, or about $140 a year for an average household. With federal and state historic preservation tax credits, the final cost could be reduced by $2 to $4 million. Operating and maintenance costs, which would be part of the Town annual budget, would depend on the final design, and may be partially offset with revenues from programming and activities.
# Research Methodology Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>No. of Completes</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Online</td>
<td>403 = Phone</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Registered voters and / or taxpaying residents in the Town of Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000 = Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-level**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: +/- 4.8%***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online: +/-2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Dates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 26 - December 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This represents the total possible number of questions; not all respondents will answer all questions based on skip patterns and other instrument bias.

** Supervisory personnel in addition to computer-aided interviewing platform ensure the integrity of the data is accurate.

*** Readers should note key study findings are based on phone survey data.
Respondent Snapshot

This slide quantifies select data points to provide context for this research study. The data is not meant to be statistically significant, rather to provide an empirical view into the demographic profile of the participants.

**Gender**
- Male: 58.6%
- Female: 39.8%
- Refused: 3.9%

**Age**
- 18-24: 23.5%
- 25-34: 16.0%
- 35-44: 7.9%
- 45-54: 2.0%
- 55-64: 6.3%
- 65-74: 6.9%
- 75 or older: 6.5%
- Refused: 7.4%
Respondent Snapshot

This slide quantifies select data points to provide context for this research study. The data is not meant to be statistically significant, rather to provide an empirical view into the demographic profile of the participants.

**Employment Status**
- Working full-time: 46.4% (Phone), 56.6% (Online)
- Working part-time: 11.9% (Phone), 13.9% (Online)
- Student: 1.0% (Phone), 4.3% (Online)
- Retired: 34.2% (Phone), 19.0% (Online)
- Unemployed: 3.0% (Phone), 2.3% (Online)
- Don’t know / refused: 4.0% (Phone), 3.0% (Online)

**Number of children under 18**
- 0/ None: 76.7% (Phone), 56.2% (Online)
- 1: 9.4% (Phone), 13.1% (Online)
- 2: 16.4% (Phone), 8.9% (Online)
- 3: 3.0% (Phone), 7.2% (Online)
- 4: 0.7% (Phone), 1.8% (Online)
- 5 or more: 0.0% (Phone), 0.4% (Online)
- Refused: 1.2% (Phone), 3.0% (Online)

**Voting and Taxpaying**
- Both registered to vote and pay taxes: 93.8% (Phone), 72.6% (Online)
- Registered to vote: 21.8% (Phone), 3.7% (Online)
- Pay taxes: 72.6% (Phone), 5.7% (Online)
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Key Study Findings

- Slightly less than three-quarters of Madison residents (71.5%) opposed the Dakota Proposal compared to 28.5% in support. 72.0% of those in opposition said they “strongly oppose” the proposal, while 28.0% said they “moderately oppose” it. 38.3% of those in support said they “strongly support” the proposal, while 61.7% “moderately support” it.

- The majority of residents (80.4%) said they oppose the Women’s Institute Proposal, while only 19.6% said they support it. Of those in opposition, nearly three-quarters (71.9%) said they “strongly oppose” it, while 28.1% said they “moderately oppose” it. The majority of those in support of the proposal (74.7%) said they “moderately support” it, while roughly one-quarter said they “strongly support” the proposal (25.3%).

- The RAL Proposal was opposed by two-thirds (66.7%) and received support from one-third of residents (33.3%). The majority of those in opposition (80.7%) said they “strongly oppose” the proposal, while 19.3% “moderately oppose” it. 44.0% of those in support of this proposal “strongly support” it, while 56.0% “moderately support” it.

- More than two-thirds of residents (68.0%) opposed the Horton Group Proposal, while 32.0% expressed support for the proposal. Over three-quarters of those in opposition (77.7%) said they “strongly oppose” this proposal, while 22.3% “moderately oppose” it. Meanwhile, 40.3% of those in support of the proposal “strongly support” it, while 59.7% “moderately support” it.
The **Town Park Proposal** was opposed by 69.5% of residents and received support from 30.5%. Over three-quarters of those in opposition (76.4%) said they “strongly oppose” this proposal, while 23.6% said they “moderately oppose” it. Roughly one-half of those in support (50.4%) “strongly support” this proposal, while 49.6% “moderately support” it.

Slightly more than two-thirds of residents (67.0%) oppose the **Town Hall Proposal**, while 33.0% support it. Of those in opposition, the majority (80.7%) said they “strongly oppose” the proposal, while 19.3% “moderately oppose” it. Over one-third of residents in support of the proposal (36.1%) “strongly support” it, while the other 63.9% “moderately support” it.

The **Community Center Proposal** was the only proposal that received more support than opposition from residents, as 59.1% supported and 40.9% opposed the proposal. The majority of those in support (70.6%) said they “strongly support” it, while 29.4% “moderately support” it. Meanwhile, the majority of those in opposition (72.7%) “strongly oppose” the proposal, while 27.1% “moderately oppose” it.

More Madison residents expressed support for the **Community Center Proposal** (59.1%) than any other proposal presented. The **Women’s Institute Proposal** received the least amount of support from residents (19.6%).
There is a significant difference in the percentage of women versus men in support of several community use proposals for Academy. While 72.2% of those in support of the Town Hall proposal were female, only 27.8% were male; further, nearly two-thirds of those in support of the Community Center proposal were female (63.9%), while only 36.1% were male.

When presented with the seven (7) development options and asked to select one proposal they would be most likely to support in a referendum, two-fifths of Madison residents selected the Community Center Proposal (41.9%). Roughly one-out-of-seven residents selected the Town Park Proposal (14.4%) or the RAL Proposal (14.1%) as the option they would be most likely to support at referendum. The Women’s Institute Proposal was the least likely to be supported among Madison residents at a referendum (3.5%).

An additional proposal involving the sale of land surrounding Academy received opposition from the majority of residents (84.9%), with only 15.1% supporting this proposal. Of those in opposition, 86.8% “strongly oppose” this proposal, while 13.2% “moderately oppose” it. Over one-half of those in support (54.1%) “strongly support” the proposal, while 45.9% “moderately support” it.

When asked to provide any additional paths for the redevelopment of Academy, the most frequent suggestions included “commercial development,” “arts and entertainment center,” and “schools / academic.”
The **Community Center Proposal** was the only proposal that received more support than opposition from Madison residents (59.1% support, 40.9% opposition). Meanwhile, residents expressed the greatest opposition toward the **Women’s Institute Proposal** (80.4%) and the **Dakota Proposal** (71.5%), which were based on private development of Academy.
Nearly three-quarters of residents (71.5%) expressed opposition towards the Dakota Proposal, which would turn Academy into 40 rental apartments, while only 28.5% of residents showed support for this proposal. Of those in opposition, nearly three-quarters (72.0%) said they “strongly oppose” the proposal, while 28.0% “moderately oppose” it. Of those in support, over three-fifths (61.7%) “moderately support” it and 38.3% “strongly support” it. Notably, a smaller percentage of residents said they “strongly support” this proposal (27.5%) in the online survey than in the phone survey.
The **Women’s Institute Proposal**, which would turn Academy into 28 rental apartments with additional space for community use, received opposition from four-fifths of residents (80.4%) and support from less than one-fifth (19.6%). Of those in opposition, 71.9% said they “strongly oppose” the proposal and 28.1% said they “moderately oppose” it. Of those in support, nearly three-quarters (74.7%) said they “moderately support” it and 25.3% said they “strongly support” the proposal.
RAL Proposal

Two-thirds of residents (66.7%) said they oppose the RAL Proposal, which would turn Academy into 20 luxury condominiums, while 33.3% expressed support for the proposal. Of those in opposition, the majority (80.7%) “strongly oppose” it, with less than one-fifth (19.3%) moderately opposing the proposal. Meanwhile, over one-half of those in support of the proposal “moderately support” it (56.0%), while 44.0% “strongly support” it.
The **Horton Group Proposal**, which would turn Academy into 21 market-rate rental apartments and commercial office space, received opposition from over two-thirds of residents (68.0%) and support from 32.0% of residents. Of those in opposition, over three-quarters (77.7%) said they “strongly oppose” this proposal, while 22.3% said they “moderately oppose” it. Of those in support, the majority (59.7%) said they “moderately support” the proposal and 40.3% said they “strongly support” it.

**Q** If this proposal were put to a referendum vote, would you support or oppose this proposal? **(Horton Group Proposal)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How strongly do you support or oppose this proposal?**

(Horton Group Proposal)

- **Strongly support**
  - Phone: 40.3%
  - Online: 46.5%

- **Moderately support**
  - Phone: 59.7%
  - Online: 53.5%

- **Strongly oppose**
  - Phone: 22.3%
  - Online: 23.9%

- **Moderately oppose**
  - Phone: 77.7%
  - Online: 76.1%
Over two-thirds of residents (69.5%) said they oppose the Town Park Proposal, which entails demolishing Academy and constructing a town park in its place for community use, while 30.5% were in support of this proposal. Of those in opposition, over three-quarters (76.4%) said they “strongly oppose” the proposal, while 23.6% “moderately oppose” it. Meanwhile, roughly one-half of those in support “strongly support” the proposal (50.4%), while 49.6% “moderately support” it. Notably, a smaller percentage of residents said they “strongly support” (34.0%) or “strongly oppose” (67.6%) the proposal in the online survey than in the phone survey.
Roughly two-thirds of residents (67.0%) said they oppose the Town Hall Proposal, which would move the Town offices to Academy and turn the current Town Campus into a community center. Four-fifths of those in opposition to the proposal (80.7%) said they “strongly oppose” it, while 19.3% “moderately oppose” it. Over one-third of residents in support of the proposal (36.1%) said they “strongly support” it, while 63.9% “moderately support” it. Notably, more residents who took the survey online were in support of this proposal (40.3%) than those who took it by phone, and fewer residents reported being “strongly opposed” to the proposal in the online survey (70.5%) than in the phone survey.
The Community Center Proposal, which would turn Academy into a multi-use community center, was the only proposal to receive more support than opposition from residents, as 59.1% of residents said they support this proposal, while 40.9% said they oppose it. Further, the majority of those in support (70.6%), said they “strongly support” this proposal, while 29.4% said they “moderately support” it. Similarly, the majority of those in opposition said they “strongly oppose” the proposal (72.7%), while 27.3% “moderately oppose” it. It is worth noting that a greater percentage of residents who took the survey online (+9.3 percentage points) were in support of this proposal (68.4%) than those who took it over the phone (59.1%).
Community Center Proposal most preferred

Strong support for the **Community Center Proposal** resulted in a greater percentage of residents selecting it as the single option they would be most likely to support at referendum (41.9%). This was followed by the **Town Park Proposal** (14.4%) and the **RAL Proposal** (14.1%) as the top-3 most appealing proposals. Conversely, the **Women’s Institute Proposal** was the least likely to be supported at referendum (3.5%). It is worth noting that a greater percentage of residents who took the survey online selected the **Community Center Proposal** as the single option they would support (51.3%) than those who took the survey over the phone.
Oppose Sale of Surrounding Area

The majority of residents (84.9%) opposed a proposal where the Town would sell the ballfields, playground and open space behind the Academy for development. Of those in opposition, 86.8% said they “strongly oppose” this proposal, while 13.2% said they “moderately oppose” it. Residents in support were more split, as 54.1% said they “strongly support” this proposal and 45.9% said they “moderately support” it.
Additional development options

When asked to provide any additional suggestions for redevelopment of Academy, the top suggestion was “arts and entertainment center” (5.7% phone, 3.3% online). Other frequently mentioned suggestions included “commercial developments” including hotels, retail and restaurants (5.2% phone, 6.4% online) and “schools / academic” (3.7% phone, 3.3% online).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New proposal idea…</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None / nothing</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and entertainment center (art school, playhouse, theater, concert hall, cultural arts center, performing arts, etc.)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial developments (hotel, marketplace, retail, restaurants / cafes, office space, small business, etc.)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools / academic (private, public, technical, elementary, high school, education center, daycare, preschool, academy)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community center / community use</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything that produces tax revenue / saves tax payers money</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green space (town green, park, dog park, etc.)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable residential development (apartments, condos, senior housing, fixed income, facility for disabled, etc.)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town services (fire / police station, library, town hall / information center, post office, etc.)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More females support community use options

When looking into support of each proposal by gender, there is a significant difference between the percentage of women in support of certain community use options for Academy and the percentage of men in support. Of those in support of the **Town Hall** proposal, nearly three-quarters (72.2%) are female and 27.8% are male. Additionally, of those in support of the **Community Center** proposal, over three-fifths (63.9%) are female and 36.1% are male.
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Considerations

Community Center Proposal Most Likely to Be Supported at Referendum. Based on phone survey data, Madison residents would be most likely to support the following re-development proposals for Academy (in order of support):

1. Community Center Proposal (59.1%)
2. RAL Proposal (33.3%)
3. Town Hall Proposal (33.0%)
4. Horton Group Proposal (32.0%)
5. Town Park Proposal (30.5%)
6. Dakota Proposal (28.5%)
7. Women’s Institute Proposal (19.6%)

Consider Future Research Post Referendum. If the Community Center proposal is brought to a referendum and is then approved by Madison residents, future quantitative survey research and qualitative focus group research could be considered. The aims of this follow-up research would be to assess the specific programs, services and amenities desired by Madison residents for the new Community Center, as well as perceptions of how planning and construction might effect residents (with respect to traffic flows, the look/feel of the building, matching the current character of the town, etc.).