

## **Haywood Market Assessment Section for Growth Strategies**

Past, current, and future market conditions play a critical role in land use in a community. Blue Oval City dramatically alters Haywood County's market and land use. Some of those impacts are already being felt and can be seen in proposed private development projects. Effects seen and yet to be seen will create change, requiring adjustments to preserve the quality of life of the current and future residents and commercial interests.

### **Agriculture**

Agriculture has been the most prominent industry and driving economic engine for Haywood County. It will continue to influence the future of Haywood County for at least twenty years. The following information contributes to understanding the essential industry in Haywood County.

- ✓ There are about 200,000 acres of land for agricultural production.
- ✓ The industry employs more than 900 workers.
- ✓ The County is one of Tennessee's largest cotton producers, along with soybean production.
- ✓ Following national patterns, there has been a consolidation in the number of farmers, but this has not had an extensive impact on farmed acreage.
- ✓ Cattle and calves are the largest production of livestock in the County.
- ✓ Agriculture has changed through the increased application of scientific technology in seed modification, pesticide control, and production. That trend will continue.
- ✓ Even if the amount of land in production diminishes, that does not imply a decrease in yields. Advances in technology application and scientific control of pests, disease, and other factors will increase yield even though farmed acreage may decrease.
- ✓ Agricultural zoning commonly allows for one home per acre of development as a "matter of right."
- ✓ Larger properties owned or leased are less likely to transition away from agriculture in the next ten or more years.
- ✓ Interviews with various stakeholders indicate that per-acre sale prices for land in Haywood County have risen substantially in the past few years, particularly since the formal announcement of Blue Oval City. The market changes are based upon the knowledge that Blue Oval City will be in operation in a couple of years, generating demand for other land uses.
- ✓ Uncontrolled housing growth would have the most significant impact on agricultural lands in the foreseeable future. Blue Oval City will potentially further impact the amount of agricultural land in Haywood County. Its effect depends on factors, including demand for alternative activity, the availability and cost of public services, the price of land, and land use policies and regulations.

## Housing/Household Growth

Housing growth has the most significant potential to reconfigure future land use more than any other based on historical patterns and trends. Haywood County will see a dramatic change in housing demand because of Blue Oval and associated industrial activity. The following are some salient market reasons for the impact.

- ✓ Blue Oval and associated activity, in Haywood County sitting on the border with Tipton County, will generate thousands of jobs.
- ✓ The unemployment rate in Haywood County is very low, maintained at or around national averages. Should currently employed County residents choose to shift to jobs at Blue Oval, the demand for vacated positions cannot be internally met.
- ✓ New employees represent new residents. In this case, population increases will be mainly synonymous with new households.
- ✓ Housing vacancy rates are low, so new households increase the demand for new housing.
- ✓ People will want to live within a reasonable driving distance from their employment. While the housing stock does not support them, demand will generate the supply over time. Therefore, latent demand, needs unmet immediately, will be met locally over a five, ten, and twenty-year period.
- ✓ Various interests in the County and local jurisdictions have reported housing rental rate hikes and property sales indicate rising per-acre prices for land. Some attribute this to the inflation pressures when combined with construction jobs associated with Blue Oval City.

The survey of Haywood County residents conducted as part of this planning process sheds additional light on current employment.

- ✓ Full-time employment levels are high across all primary income earner age clusters.
- ✓ Most households with primary income earners between the ages of 35 and 65 have one or more members working full-time.

**Table 1 - Number of Household Members Employed Full-time by Age Clusters\***

Age Cluster	One full-time	Two Full-time	Three full-time	Four Full-time
Under 25	1%	1%	5%	0%
25-34	11%	14%	0%	0%
35-44	14%	20%	14%	0%
45-54	25%	27%	38%	75%
55-64	31%	28%	38%	25%
65-74	15%	9%	5%	0%
75 or older	3%	1%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023.

- ✓ While most working full-time and others working part-time, some would potentially seek better employment. Less than one-fourth of those that would potentially seek better jobs have completed high school or the equivalent. On the other hand, those seeking better employment working part-time most often have not completed education beyond the high school level.

**Table 2 - Education of Those Seeking or Potentially Seeking Better Employment\***

Education Level	Full-time	Part-time
Less than high school	1%	33%
GED	3%	0%
Completed high school	20%	44%
Technical training beyond high school	10%	0%
Some College	14%	11%
Associates Degree	9%	11%
Bachelor's Degree	21%	0%
Graduate-level degree or work	21%	0%
Total	100%	100%

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023.

Haywood County has seen a slow growth in housing units permitted since at least 2002. In defining future opportunities, this growth is defined as “natural” growth without a significant new stimuli source.

Over twenty-one years, Haywood County has permitted over 700 new housing units, representing an annual average of about thirty-four units each year. Of the roughly thirty-four units, twenty-nine are detached, units often referred to as “single-family” units.

**Table 3 – Total Housing Units Permitted and Average Annual Permitted Over Twenty-one Years\***

Housing	2022	Total over 21 Years Through 2022	Avg. Annual
Total Units	19	709	34
Units in Single-Family Structures	19	599	29
Units in All Multi-Family Structures	0	110	5
Units in 2-unit Multi-Family Structures	0	86	4
Units in 3- and 4-unit Multi-Family Structures	0	16	1
Units in 5+ Unit Multi-Family Structures	0	8	0

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023. Based on US-HUD reported data.

There have been two times since the early 2000s when housing production was elevated in this country. The first was from 2004 through 2007, or before the housing bubble bust known as the Great Recession. During the pre-Great Recession years, Haywood County permitted close to 321 housing units or an annual average of about 54 units. Of these units, about eighty-three percent were detached units, often defined as single-family units. The other seventeen percent were attached units.

**Table 4 - Pre-Great Recession Annual Housing Units Permitted\***

Housing	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	Total	Avg. Annual
Total Units	62	56	55	44	42	62	321	54
Units in Single-Family Structures	60	54	53	44	32	28	271	45
Units in All Multi-Family Structures	2	2	2	0	10	34	12	2
Units in 2-unit Multi-Family Structures	2	2	2	0	10	22	0	0
Units in 3- and 4-unit Multi-Family Structures	0	0	0	0	0	4	32	5
Units in 5+ Unit Multi-Family Structures	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023. Based on US-HUD reported data.

The pre-Great Recession annual average units permitted exceeded the post-Great Recession average.

**Table 5 - Average Units Permitted 2002 Through 2022, 2011 through 2022, and 2002 through 2007\***

Time Frame	2002-22	2002-22	2011-22	2011-22	PRE-GR	PRE-GR
Housing	Total	Avg. Annual	Total	Avg. Annual	Total	Avg. Annual
Total Units	709	34	292	24	321	54
Units in Single-Family Structures	599	29	280	23	271	45
Units in All Multi-Family Structures	110	5	12	1	12	2
Units in 2-unit Multi-Family Structures	86	4	0	0	0	0
Units in 3- and 4-unit Multi-Family Structures	16	1	12	1	32	5
Units in 5+ Unit Multi-Family Structures	8	0	0	0	0	0

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023. Based on US-HUD reported data.

In September 2021, Ford Motor Company announced plans for a \$5.6 billion electric vehicle manufacturing facility in neighboring Haywood County at the border with Tipton County. The West Tennessee Mega Site is known as Blue Oval City and has a 4,100-acre, 6-square-mile industrial park. Also built on the site adjacent to Ford is a battery manufacturing plant. Other ancillary and non-ancillary operations are expected to join these two plants, creating thousands of jobs whose average annual wage is expected to be \$50,000 to \$55,000, like those of other vehicle assembly plants in Tennessee.

Haywood County is an excellent place for employee households to live. A substantial dramatic change in demand for housing in the County will occur. The demand for new housing in Haywood County generated by Blue Oval City is based on the following.

- ✓ Haywood County will likely capture between ten and twenty percent of the new households associated with the new jobs (or replacement households to fill current positions from current Haywood County residents accepting new Blue Oval City employment).
- ✓ Conservative estimates of employment at Blue Oval are 4,800, 5,800, and 9,500 jobs in five, ten, and twenty years.
- ✓ Because of factors noted, such as low unemployment in Haywood County, between ninety and ninety-seven percent of the jobs will be associated with people moving into the area.

Without Blue Oval’s impact and based on historical patterns, 270 new rooftops would be added to Haywood County over the next five years. A total of five hundred forty new households are expected to be added through ten years, and 1,800 new housing units in twenty years.

Even at minimum assumptions for new households and related housing units that result from the addition of Blue Oval in the economy, the new housing units needed in Haywood County will increase by over fifty percent compared to the natural growth pattern. The combined units from Blue Oval and natural growth can be found in the following table.

**Table 6 - Natural Growth and Blue Oval Housing Unit Estimates for a Five, Ten, and Twenty Year Timeframe\***

	5 Years	5 Years		
	Total Natural Units	Blue Oval	Subtotal	Blue Oval Exceeds Natural
Alternative B Rising Housing Values	270	384	654	yes
	10 Years	10 Years		
	Total Natural Units	Blue Oval	Subtotal	Blue Oval Exceeds Natural
Alternative B Rising Housing Values	540	870	1410	yes
	20 Years	20 Years		
	Total Natural Units	Blue Oval	Subtotal	Blue Oval Exceeds Natural
Alternative B Rising Housing Values	1080	1,615	2,695	yes

\*The Chesapeake Group, Inc, 2023.

The Blue Oval vehicle and associated battery plant will stimulate ancillary-related industrial activity and other non-associated industrial activity. Capturing a small proportion of the employment also enables housing development in Haywood County. The ancillary activity is described as “but for” development. If not for Blue Oval, the activity would not locate on either the Blue Oval City mega site property or other lands nearby. The “but for” or tertiary housing opportunities are found in the following table.

**Table 7 - Natural Growth, Blue Oval, and But For Housing Unit Estimates for a Five, Ten, and Twenty Year Timeframe\***

	5 Years	5 Years		
	Total Natural Units	Blue Oval	Blue Oval Exceeds Natural	With Multiplier
<b>Alternative B Rising Housing Values</b>	270	384	yes	789
	10 Years			
	Total Natural Units	Blue Oval	Blue Oval Exceeds Natural	With Multiplier
<b>Alternative B Rising Housing Values</b>	540	870	yes	2498
	20 Years			
	Total Natural Units	Blue Oval	Blue Oval Exceeds Natural	With Multiplier
<b>Alternative B Rising Housing Values</b>	1080	1,615	yes	6,713

\*The Chesapeake Group, Inc, 2023.

There are additional dynamics within the Haywood County housing market.

- ✓ About forty percent of the responding households may or are likely to move in the next five years.

**Table 8 - Potential to Relocate in the Next Five Years\***

	Percent
Maybe	21%
Yes	19%
No	60%
Total	100%

\*The Chesapeake Group, Inc, 2023.

- ✓ For those that may or are likely to move, three-fourths are long-term residents, having lived in Haywood County for at least twenty-one years.

**Table 9 - Likely or May Move and Tenure\***

Living in Haywood Co	Percent
Less than 1 year	2%
1-5 years	9%
6-10 years	3%
11-15 years	4%
16-20 years	6%
21+ years	76%
Total	100%

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023.

- ✓ Of those that may or are likely to move, only twelve percent believe the move would be outside of Tennessee. The low percentage indicates a higher probability residents can be held in Haywood County.

**Table 10 - Location of Those That May or Are Likely to Move\***

New Location	Percent
Stay in Haywood County	29%
Outside of Haywood County, but stay in Tennessee	30%
Leave Tennessee	12%
Uncertain where I might move	29%
Total	100%

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023.

- ✓ Two and three-bedroom units are likely to be sought by those that would either stay in Haywood County or are uncertain as to the new location.

**Table 11 - Relocation Area and Number of Bedrooms\***

# of Bedrooms	Outside of Haywood County, but stay in Tennessee	Stay in Haywood County	Uncertain
1	5%	4%	4%
2	22%	28%	30%
3	53%	50%	50%
4 or more	19%	18%	16%
Total	100%	100%	100%

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023. Number of bedrooms is an indicator of the size of the home sought.

Household income is another indicator of potential price points for new housing units for either current residents that may move or generate new households or those relocating from other than Haywood County.

- ✓ The respondents' annual mean (average) household income is roughly \$79,900.
- ✓ About one-fourth of the households have incomes above \$100,00.
- ✓ Almost half of those households with incomes of at least \$100,000 have annual incomes between \$100,00 and \$125,000.
- ✓ One-third of all households have annual incomes between \$50,000 and \$100,000.
- ✓ One-fourth of all households have incomes below \$30,000.

The following table contains a breakdown of the responding households by the ages of the primary income earner and the household incomes.

**Table 12 - Responding households by the Ages of the Primary Income Earner and the Household Incomes\***

Income	Under 25	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 or more
Less than \$10,000	33%	13%	4%	3%	5%	8%	5%
\$10,000-\$14,999	17%	3%	10%	1%	5%	7%	7%
\$15,000-\$19,999	0%	3%	0%	2%	5%	7%	7%
\$20,000-\$29,999	17%	5%	4%	7%	9%	10%	9%
\$30,000-\$49,999	0%	41%	10%	15%	15%	14%	16%
\$50,000-\$74,999	17%	18%	16%	16%	22%	23%	35%
\$75,000-\$99,999	17%	3%	22%	11%	12%	12%	9%
\$100,000-\$124,999	0%	10%	10%	15%	12%	10%	9%
\$125,000-\$149,999	0%	3%	8%	10%	3%	1%	0%
\$150,000-\$199,999	0%	3%	10%	8%	5%	4%	0%
\$200,000-\$249,999	0%	0%	4%	2%	3%	2%	2%
\$250,000-\$299,999	0%	0%	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%
\$300,000-\$399,999	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	1%	0%
\$400,000 or more	0%	0%	0%	3%	2%	1%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023.

In the past, new housing units in Haywood County have been created within local and outside those municipalities. Capturing “market share” of future housing units from natural and Blue Oval would maintain past trends and guide future housing development, maintaining stable household growth relationships between municipalities.

On the other hand, market share is based on historical patterns and changes should relationships change. The availability of utilities to support development, zoning, and land development regulations can shift relationships at any time. Furthermore, an economic influence as considerable as Blue Oval City can cause development shifts even before the opening of operations.

Haywood County's population increased in only a couple of years since 2010. Its largest annual population increase since 2010 was 3.2%. Between 2010 and 2022, the County shrank by an average of less than one percent per year. (Source: USA Facts) Declines in population in rural counties are not uncommon, resulting from the out-migration of youth, the aging of the population base, and the mechanization of agriculture.

According to the Census Bureau, Haywood County had a population of about 17,900 in 2020. There are two municipalities. The City of Brownsville with a population of about 9,800 and the smaller is the Town of Stanton, with an estimated population of 420 in 2020.

The following table shows the breakdown by the number of units for the two municipalities in Haywood County and the other non-municipal or unincorporated areas. These estimates reflect only market share based on historical patterns as previously noted. The market share reflected in terms of population is about fifty-five of the growth for Brownsville and just over two percent for Stanton.



**Table 13 - Constant Market Share Estimates for New Housing for the Two Municipalities and Unincorporated Areas of Haywood County\***

5 Years Market Share					
	Total New Units	City of Brownstown	Town of Stanton	Elsewhere	Total New Units
Alternative B Rising Housing Values	789	432	19	338	789
10 Years Market Share					
	Total New Units				
Alternative B Rising Housing Values	2498	1369	59	1071	2498
20 Years Market Share					
	Total New Units				
Alternative B Rising Housing Values	6713	3678	158	2877	6713

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023.

To reiterate, Haywood County is already and will continue to be impacted by Blue Oval City. Numerous factors impact the type of housing unit and whether units are rented or owner-occupied. It is also noted that different ownership models include but are not limited to condominiums, coops, and those with strong homeowner associations that have responsibilities generally for the exterior of buildings and property issues. Some factors impacting the composition of housing units include those that follow. Many of these change with some regularity, and others are more stable.

- ✓ Interest rates for borrowing, including construction.
- ✓ Mortgage rates.
- ✓ Cost of production of housing units.
- ✓ Method of construction employed.
- ✓ Land costs.
- ✓ Relationship between unit demand and supply.
- ✓ Income levels.
- ✓ Age of those seeking housing.
- ✓ The number of local and neighboring options.
- ✓ Public processes and policies.
- ✓ Perceptions of the households seeking housing.
- ✓ Inflation or deflation.
- ✓ Area infrastructure.

Factors that impact the likelihood of ownership and rental of new units follow.

- ✓ The propensity of those that have been in the County longest to move.
- ✓ Current mean household income levels of about \$80,000 in Haywood County.
- ✓ Employment turnover in industrial plants.
- ✓ Income levels for households with only one person employed at Blue Oval or related industrial activity.

For the latter, wage rates of people employed at Blue Oval, based on rates at other vehicle assembly plants in Tennessee, are expected to be high, between \$50,000 and \$55,000 annually. For a household with only one person employed and assuming that household spends between 30% and 35% of the annual income of \$55,000 on housing, the total yearly income for housing would be between \$16,500 and \$19,250. The monthly rent or mortgage payments would be between \$1,375 and \$1,600. In current market conditions, which could change, a typical household would need an annual income of about \$80,000 per year to afford a mortgage and related costs on a \$300,000 home.

The following estimates are based on current economic and housing market conditions.

- ✓ About one-half of all new units will have the equivalency of three bedrooms, one of which might be used as an office or den area.
- ✓ About twenty percent will be studio or one-bedroom units likely oriented toward one or two-person households.
- ✓ Sixty percent of the owner-occupied units will be three bedrooms or larger.

Four development scenarios beyond simply building-out under current zoning are considered and vetted. Those four have been defined elsewhere but are identified as follows.

- ✓ Typical “Business-as-Usual” Development Pattern.
- ✓ Minimally Guided Dispersed Development
- ✓ Focused Development in Communities and Clustered in Countryside
- ✓ Concentrated Investment in Existing Communities and Conservation Countryside

Each of these has an allocation of growth within the existing boundaries of the two municipalities as defined as follows.

Development Scenario	Percent of Development
✓ Typical “Business-as-Usual” Development Pattern	30
✓ Balanced Growth Pattern	35
✓ Community Focused and Clustered in Countryside	45
✓ Community Concentration and Countryside Conservation	60

The following table contains the percentage of housing units captured, the density of units, the calculated acreage needed, and the units for five, ten, and twenty years for the four scenarios.

**Table 14 – The Percentage of Housing Units Captured, the Density of Units, and the Calculated Acreage Needed, and the Units for Five, Ten, and Twenty Years for the Four Scenarios\***

5 years	789	Community	Community	Country-side	Country-side	Country-side	
Business As Usual	% of Housing Units Captured	30%	20%	0%	0%	50%	
	Density	2 u/acre	1 u/4 acres	0	0	1 u/10 acres	
	Calculated Acreage	118	632	0	0	3950	
	Unit Mix	237	158	0	0	395	789
Minimally Guides Dispersed Development							
	% of Housing Units Captured	35%	20%	5%	10%	30%	
	Density	8 u/acre	6 u/acre	4 u/acre	3 u/acre	1 u/2 acres	
	Calculated Acreage	35	26	10	26	474	
	Unit Mix	276	158	39	79	237	789
Focused Development in							



<b>20 years</b>	6713	Community	Community	Countrysi de	Country side	Countrysi de	
Business As Usual	% of Housing Units Captured	30%	20%	0%	0%	50%	
	Density	2 u/acre	1 u/4 acres	0	0	1 u/10 acres	
	Calculated Acreage	1007	5372	0	0	33570	
	Unit Mix	2014	1343	0	0	3357	6713
Minimally Guides Dispersed Development							
	% of Housing Units Captured	35%	20%	5%	10%	30%	
	Density	8 u/acre	6 u/acre	4 u/acre	3 u/acre	1 u/2 acres	
	Calculated Acreage	294	224	84	224	4028	
	Unit Mix	2350	1343	336	671	2014	6713
Focused Development in Commun. & Clustered in Countryside							
	% of Housing Units Captured	45%	15%	10%	15%	15%	
	Density	12 u/acre	8 u/acre	4 u/acre	3 u/acre	1 u/acre	
	Calculated Acreage	252	126	143	336	1007	
	Unit Mix	3021	1007	671	1007	1007	6713
Concentrated Inves. in Existing Commun. & Conservation Countryside							
	% of Housing Units Captured	60%	15%	15%	5%	5%	
	Density	12 u/acre	8 u/acre	4 u/acre	3 u/acre	1 u/acre	
	Calculated Acreage	336	126	252	112	336	
	Unit Mix	4028	1007	1007	336	336	6713

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023.

**Commercial/Non-Residential Growth**

The expansion of supportable space for retail goods, related offices, and other services results from market expansion and the capture of dollars. With few unique sets of circumstances, those dollars are derived from residential growth in the market.

Supportable space, measured by square footage, reflects the number of dollars necessary to support business activity, and it includes the ability to pay all costs of operation and a reasonable return on investment. Each type of business or service has different sales or revenues per square foot required to pay expenses and provide a return.

As defined, the number of households and rooftops will expand significantly in the next five, ten, and twenty years. The resulting growth in supportable square feet should not drain any existing business, assuming competitiveness. Therefore, growth-based supportable square feet is new space for which demand will exist.

Most households spend most of their income on three commodities irrespective of income. These are housing, transportation, and food. Food spending is generally made at an operation selling groceries or at a food service establishment, such as restaurants and fast food operations.

The Haywood County residents’ survey indicates the following concerning key spending indicators.

- ✓ The average household spends \$127 per week on groceries and related merchandise. This spending is about \$6,6.00 each year. This figure represents about 8.3 percent of household income.
- ✓ About two in ten households generally spend \$175 or more weekly.
- ✓ About one in four households spend less than \$75 weekly on groceries and related merchandise.

**Table 15 - Average Weekly Spending on Groceries and Related Merchandise\***

Weekly Grocery Spending	Percent
Less than \$30	3%
\$30-49	6%
\$50-74	15%
\$75-99	13%
\$100-124	21%
\$125-174	19%
\$175-199	9%
\$200-249	9%
\$250-299	1%
\$300 or more	3%
Total	100%

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023.

- ✓ About one-half of all households generally eat dinner and lunch outside the home at least weekly.

**Table 16 - Frequency Households Eat Lunch and Dinner Out\***

Frequency Outside of the Home	Lunch	Dinner
A few times/week	24%	33%
Once/week	24%	23%
About twice/month	19%	18%
Once/month	8%	5%
4 to 9 times/year	7%	5%
Once or twice/year	5%	4%
Rarely/almost never	13%	12%
Total	100%	100%

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023.

- ✓ Preferred establishments include national and regional chain restaurants for dinner and lunch and fast food operations for lunch.

As defined, substantial household growth will occur in Haywood County in the five, ten, and twenty-year periods. The change will result in significant new supportable commercial space opportunities.

- ✓ About 240,000 square feet of new space will be marketable in five years.
- ✓ About 550,000 square feet of new space will be marketable in the next ten years.
- ✓ About 1.3 million square feet of new space will be marketable in the next twenty years.

**Table 17 - Haywood County Commercial Sales and Supportable Square Feet from Market Components and for Five, Ten, and Twenty Years\***

	Blue Sales	Natural Sales	Combined Retail Growth Sales	"But for" Sales	Total New Supportable Square Feet
5 Year	11,309,760	5,006,925	16,316,685	149,619	240,000
10 Year	29,467,226	11,515,928	40,983,154	441,680	552,000
20 Year	63,914,029	63,914,029	127,828,058	1,696,353	1,290,000

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023.

The following table contains the five, ten, and twenty-year percentage estimates for commercial space and calculated acreage based on a forty percent coverage for the four scenarios.

**Table 18 - The Five, Ten, and Twenty Year Percentage Estimates for Commercial Space and Calculated Acreage for the Four Scenarios\***

<b>5 years</b>		Com- munity	Com- munity	Country side	Country side	Country side
Business As Usual	240000 sq ft					
	% Commercial Captured	30%	20%	0%	0%	50%
	40% Coverage Calculated Acreage	72000	48000	0	0	120000
Minimally Guides Dispersed Development	% Commercial Captured	35%	20%	5%	10%	30%
	40% Coverage Calculated Acreage	84000	48000	12000	24000	72000
	% Commercial Captured	5	3	1	1	4
Focused Development in Commun. & Clustered in Countryside	% Commercial Captured	45%	15%	10%	15%	15%
	40% Coverage Calculated Acreage	108000	36000	24000	36000	36000
	% Commercial Captured	6	2	1	2	2
Concentrated Inves. in Existing Commun. & Conservation Countryside	% Commercial Captured	60%	15%	15%	5%	5%
	40% Coverage Calculated Acreage	144000	36000	36000	12000	12000
	% Commercial Captured	8	2	2	1	1
<b>10 years</b>	552000 sq ft	Com- munity	Com- munity	Country side	Country side	Country side
Business As Usual	% Commercial Captured	30%	20%	0%	0%	50%
	40% Coverage Calculated Acreage	165600	110400	0	0	276000
	% Commercial Captured	11	6	0	0	16
Minimally Guides Dispersed Development	% Commercial Captured	35%	20%	5%	10%	30%
	40% Coverage Calculated Acreage	193200	110400	27600	55200	165600
	% Commercial Captured	11	6	2	3	10
Focused Development in Commun. & Clustered in Countryside	% Commercial Captured	45%	15%	10%	15%	15%
	40% Coverage Calculated Acreage	248400	82800	55200	82800	82800
	% Commercial Captured	15	5	3	5	5
Concentrated Inves. in Existing Commun. & Conservation Countryside	% Commercial Captured	60%	15%	15%	5%	5%
	40% Coverage	331200	82800	82800	27600	27600

	Calculated Acreage	19	5	5	2	2
<b>20 years</b>	1290000 sq ft	Com-munity	Com-munity	Country side	Country side	Country side
Business As Usual	% Commercial Captured	30%	20%	0%	0%	50%
	40% Coverage	387000	258000	0	0	645000
	Calculated Acreage	23	15	0	0	38
Minimally Guides Dispersed Development						
	% Commercial Captured	35%	20%	5%	10%	30%
	40% Coverage	451500	258000	64500	129000	387000
	Calculated Acreage	27	15	4	8	23
Focused Development in Commun. & Clustered in Countryside	% Commercial Captured	45%	15%	10%	15%	15%
	40% Coverage	580500	193500	129000	193500	193500
	Calculated Acreage	34	11	8	11	11
Concentrated Inves. in Existing Commun. & Conservation Countryside	% Commercial Captured	60%	15%	15%	5%	5%
	40% Coverage	774000	193500	193500	64500	64500
	Calculated Acreage	46	11	11	4	4

\*Developed by The Chesapeake Group, Inc., 2023.

While the defined residential growth is likely to have the most significant transformational impact on land use in Haywood County, industrial development will likely have the most significant economic impact. With Blue Oval City situated in Haywood County, industrial activity space opportunities will likely impact land use around Blue Oval City in the future.

It is estimated that there will be potential for more than three million additional square of industrial space, excluding the activity on site and land owned by Tipton County’s economic development arm adjacent to Haywood County. The **three million square feet of space** assumes transportation, communications, and other infrastructure networks can accommodate the growth.

Some space will be linked to the vehicle assembly and battery plants, but other opportunities exist.

Skilled resident employees trained in the systems or relocating to Haywood County will portend potential opportunities. Options will change with ever-changing technology if space is available.

- ✓ Drone production and assembly for military and civilian purposes.
- ✓ Other advanced battery production for non-Ford vehicles.
- ✓ Warehousing and logistics operations.
- ✓ Opportunistic housing construction.