MONDAY, APRIL 20, 2020
6:00P.M.

Meeting Held Electronically Only via Video Conference
For information on live viewing,
contact the Planning & Development Department.

Members of the Topeka Planning Commission

Brian Armstrong, 2020 Chairperson
Ariane Messina
Corey Dehn
Marc Fried
Wiley Kannarr
Jim Kaup
Corliss Lawson
Katrina Ringler
Matt Werner

Topeka Planning Staff

Bill Fiander, AICP, Planning Director
Carlton O. Scroggins, AICP, Planner III
Dan Warner, AICP, Planner III
Mike Hall, AICP, Planner III
Tim Paris, Planner II
Annie Driver, AICP, Planner II
Taylor Ricketts, Planner I
Bryson Risley, Planner I
Melissa Fahrenbruch, Planner I
Kris Wagers, Administrative Officer

ADA Notice: For special accommodations for this event, please contact the Planning Department at 785-368-3728 at least three working days in advance.
A. Roll call

B. Approval of minutes – March 16, 2020

C. Presentation and discussion on the draft Citywide Housing Market Study and Strategy for the City of Topeka (Andy Pfister, Development Strategies)

D. Communications to the Commission

E. Adjournment
Monday, March 16, 2020

6:00PM – Municipal Building, 214 SE 8th Street, 2nd floor Council Chambers

Members present: Brian Armstrong (Chair), Corey Dehn, Marc Fried, Wiley Kannarr, Jim Kaup, Ariane Messina, Katrina Ringler, Matt Werner (8)

Members Absent: Corliss Lawson (1)

Staff Present: Bill Fiander, Planning & Development Director; Dan Warner, Comprehensive Planning Manager; Mike Hall, Current Planning Manager; Kris Wagers, Administrative Officer; Mary Feighny, Legal

Roll Call – Chairman Brian Armstrong called the meeting to order with eight members present for a quorum.

Approval of Minutes from February 17, 2020

Motion to approve by Ms. Ringler, second by Mr. Kaup. APPROVED (4-0-4 with Armstrong, Fried, Kannarr, and Messina abstaining)

Declaration of conflict of interest/ex parte communications by members of the commission or staff – None

Action Items

P20/06 Greenhill Pointe Subdivision by Drippe Construction, Inc., comprising 57.31 acres, the centerline of the tract being approximately 2,100 ft. north of NW 46th Street and 1,000 ft west of NW Green Hills Road all being within unincorporated Shawnee County.

Mr. Hall presented the staff report and staff’s recommendation for approval. He explained that subdivisions within the 3-mile boundary are regulated by the city even though they are outside the city limits. The property is outside the Urban Growth Area (UGA), so urban densities are not supported. The proposed density is similar to the density of the subdivision(s) on the east side of Greenhills Road.

Mr. Dehn asked if the Shawnee County Planning Commission would consider this project and Mr. Hall said it does not; the city maintains sole authority over subdivisions within the 3-mile area.

Mr. Kaup asked if there had been a traffic impact study, especially in light of poor sight lines for access off 46th Street. It was generally agreed that a traffic study would likely be required if lots 9 and/or 10 were someday developed, though that would be in the far distant future. Regarding the current proposal, the project was reviewed by the Shawnee County Planning Department and Shawnee County Public Works, neither of which asked that a traffic study be done. The agenda packet includes a letter of support from the county, and Mr. Armstrong noted that from a traffic engineering viewpoint, he doesn’t believe the projected 200 trips per day would necessitate a traffic study.

Jeff Laubach of Schmidt, Beck & Boyd announced he was present for questions, as was the property owner. Mr. Dehn asked for and received confirmation that the homes will be single-family dwellings.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the applicant has a timeline for building, and Mr. Laubach stated they’re aiming
Mr. Armstrong opened the floor for public comment. With nobody coming forward to speak, Mr. Armstrong declared the public hearing portion closed.

Ms. Messina expressed concern about the number of vacant properties in Topeka and stated she’s not comfortable supporting growth outside the city limits.

Mr. Dehn explained that he lives in the area and supports the proposal. He appreciates the two large lots remaining undeveloped and believes this addresses neighbor concerns about a loss of trees and wildlife. He mentioned that he wishes there were a turn lane on 46th Street but acknowledged that the traffic generated from this project won’t have a large impact. Mr. Armstrong stated that 46th Street is perhaps part of a countywide sales tax project.

Ms. Ringler asked for clarification on what the Planning Commission is being asked to approve. Ms. Feighnly stated that it would be a motion to approve the plat subject to the conditions in the staff report. She explained that this is not a recommendation to Council; City Council’s authority is to accept dedications of property in the plat. The Planning Commission’s responsibility is to determine whether the proposed project meets our subdivision regulations. Mr. Fiander added that the subdivision regulations contain a standard that it must be consistent with our Comprehensive Plan, which is covered in depth in the staff report.

Mr. Kaup noted that City Council is tasked with deciding whether to accept the dedications of public right of way included in the plat. If approved by Planning Commission, plat conditions will stand if Council approves the dedications.

Mr. Fiander stated that since he became director, this is the first time he’s seen a major plat outside the city on property not being annexed; it’s not a common occurrence. There are very straight-forward rules about connecting to utilities, but this project includes an acceptable exemption from annexation. A main reason this is a rare occurrence is that projects such as this require construction of street(s) at the expense of the applicant, which is quite costly.

Mr. Hall noted that the sewer line was installed well before the current land use plan was adopted. The current land use plan is a departure from past policy. Mr. Fiander explained that if there is concern about more proposals of this type coming in the future, it is within the purview of the Planning Commission to recommend changes to the Land Use and Growth Management Plan (LUGMP).

Mr. Fried inquired about minimum lot size requirements. Mr. Fiander reviewed the LUGMP’s density recommendations. Staff worked with the developer to create a density comparable to/compatible with that density to the east of Greenhills Road.

Ms. Messina stated she does have concerns about future projects.

Motion by Mr. Dehn to approve the Greenhill Pointe Subdivision plat, subject to conditions listed in the staff report, second by Mr. Kannarr. APPROVED (7-1-0 with Ms. Messina dissenting)

Crossroads Wesleyan Church

A20/01 by The Kansas District of the Wesleyan Church requesting annexation of Crosswind Wesleyan Subdivision, an approximately 29-acre subdivision on property located at 2030 SE 41st Street to allow for church to be built on Lot 1 of the subdivision. Lot 2 is to be used for future church related outdoor activities.

Mr. Warner reviewed the memo provided in the agenda packet and recommendation for a finding that annexing the subject property is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The annexation proposal will go before the Governing Body for approval; the Planning Commission is tasked with determining
whether the proposal is consistent with growth management principles of the Land Use and Growth Management Plan (LUGMP).

Mr. Armstrong asked for and received confirmation that the commission will be considering re-zoning of a portion of the property.

Mr. Armstrong opened the floor to public comment and, with nobody coming forward to speak, closed the public comment period.

Motion by Mr. Kaup for a finding that the proposed annexation is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, second by Mr. Dehn. (APPROVAL 8-0-0)

Z20/01 by Topeka Planning Commission requesting to amend the district zoning map from RR-1 Residential Reserve District to R-1 Single Family Dwelling District on a 2.2 acre tract located at the northeast corner of SE 41st Street and SE California Avenue all being contiguous to the corporate city limits.

Mr. Hall presented the staff report and recommendation of approval, explaining that the land under consideration is just a portion of that being considered for annexation. At this time, the applicant does not intend to change the current use of the remainder of the property, and it is consistent with a zoning of RR-1.

Mr. Kaup asked for and received verification that the proper notifications had been sent out and legal ads published. Mr. Hall noted that this information is included on page 5 of the staff report. The required property owner notification distances are 200’ within the City and 1,000’ outside the City.

It was noted that Ed Southhall was present representing the applicant and would stand for questions.

Mr. Kaup recommended a change to a comment on the final plat, which is still in draft phase. The change was in regard to the applicant giving consent to a petition for a benefit district, as opposed to simply not objecting to a petition. Staff thanked him for his recommendation and will review the language.

Motion by Mr. Werner to recommend to the Governing Body approval of the reclassification of the property from RR-1 Residential Reserve District to R-1 single Family Dwelling District, second by Ms. Messina. (APPROVAL 8-0-0)

Communications to the Commission

Mr. Fiander explained that in light of the Corona Virus outbreak, there will likely be changes to how public meetings will be held for the time being. Commissioners and the public will be apprised of changes.

With no further agenda items, meeting was adjourned at 6:54PM.
MARKET ANALYSIS

CITYWIDE HOUSING MARKET STUDY AND STRATEGY

PREPARED FOR
City of Topeka

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION
APRIL 20, 2020

Session Goals

- Purpose of study
- Describe our market analysis
- Focus on key conclusions
- Brief strategies that impact the Planning Commission

Keep in Mind

There are no silver bullet solutions

The city cannot solve Topeka's housing challenges—its resources are finite and role is limited

There is a need to:
- Expand community capacity
- Develop new partnerships
- Increase overall commitment to housing
- Expand financial resources
## Purpose and Goals of Housing Study

1. **Understand Housing Needs & Goals**
2. **Quantify Development Costs & Funding Gaps**
3. **Evaluate Capacity of Existing Organizations and Programs**
4. **Identify Organizational & Programmatic Gaps**
5. **Strategy for Utilizing Available Resources**
6. **Strategy for Creating New Resources & Tools**
7. **Define Roles & Responsibilities for Implementation**

## Process & Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Kickoff</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td>October – February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strategize</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Finalize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSING TYPES AND AFFORDABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of AMI (Area Median Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNHTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsidized | Affordable | Workforce | Upscale | Luxury

midscale

upscale

KEY FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY FINDINGS</th>
<th>NEED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% of Topeka Households are Cost Burdened.</td>
<td>Quality affordable rental housing (&lt;$700/mo.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential homebuyers can’t find suitable homes.</td>
<td>Moderately-priced for-sale housing ($120k-$225K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of reinvestment in core neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Reinvestment in the existing housing stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka has a high rate of homelessness and evictions for a city of its size.</td>
<td>Transitional housing for homeless and other vulnerable households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are limited maintenance-free housing for growing senior population.</td>
<td>A variety of Senior housing options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka’s wages for entry level jobs do not support housing stability.</td>
<td>Affordable housing with better access to jobs (and higher-paying jobs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-wage earners frequently choose to live outside the city.</td>
<td>Upscale rental and for-sale housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family homes are the dominant new construction housing type.</td>
<td>New missing middle and multifamily development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSING STUDY
STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

Topeka Comprehensive Housing Market Study

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Faith Leaders
Social Service Providers
Banking & Finance Professionals
Neighborhood Groups
Developers
Landlords & Property Managers
Universities and Major Employers
Philanthropic Organizations
Brokers and Real Estate Professionals

KICKOFF
STAKEHOLDER GROUPS
**HOUSING GOALS**

**WHAT WE HEARD**

1. Leverage housing (re)-investment to **stabilize Topeka’s core neighborhoods**.

2. Improve housing stability for Topeka’s vulnerable residents — **housing as opportunity**

3. Support **new housing development**, particularly **affordable** and **moderate-income** options.

4. Address **problem landlords, absentee owners, and vacant properties**.

5. Expand the **housing ecosystem** by building new partnerships to fund the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and create a CDC network.

---

**HOUSING STUDY**

**UNDERSTANDING**

- Understanding Needs
- Urban Core Reinvestment
- Housing Diversification

Topeka Comprehensive Housing Market Study
The Topeka Metropolitan Statistical Area is growing...

-0.4% Topeka

+0.5% Topeka MSA

+1.5% MSA outside of Topeka

...but all growth is outside the city.

REGIONAL ECONOMY

Projected Employment Change

Based on projected job growth...

53% of new jobs will pay < $35k

45% of new jobs requiring a high school diploma will pay $35k - $75k

...affordable and workforce housing will be critical.
$785* per month to rent a 2-bedroom unit of safe and decent quality

$16/HR housing wage bare minimum to afford a 2-bedroom unit of safe and decent quality

Based on FY19 HUD Fair Market Rent for Topeka, KS MSA. Gross rent, including $200/month for utilities. Utilities assumption based on max. utility allowance limits by HUD.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY
WHAT'S THE PICTURE OF AFFORDABILITY IN TOPEKA?

Many households cannot afford that $785 rent...

33% City of Topeka

White 31%
Hispanic 36%
African-American 52%

Source: ACS 2013-2017

13 14
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY
WHAT'S THE PICTURE OF AFFORDABILITY IN TOPEKA?

...and many households are **cost-burdened**, paying more than they can afford.

[Diagram showing cost burden in Topeka:>
- >50% of income toward housing
- >30-50% of income toward housing
- >10% of income toward housing
]

Data not available for Douglas County, KS and Linn County, IA.

HOUSING STABILITY
THE EXPERIENCE

**EVICTION**

58th highest eviction rate in the nation

Topeka ranks 220th in population among U.S. cities

**HOMELESSNESS**

35% higher than national average

Data not available for Douglas County, KS and Linn County, IA.
HOUSEHOLD HOUSING AFFORDABILITY
STUDY AREA - RENTAL

- Affordable
- Workforce
- Upscale
- Luxury

Households

- <$500: 4,660
- $650: 4,710
- $875: 3,010
- $1,200: 3,770
- $1,500: 3,420
- $1,825: 1,680
- $2,000: 760
- $2,500: 270

22,300 renter HHs

42% of likely renter households

Average Rent

HOUSEHOLD HOUSING AFFORDABILITY
STUDY AREA – FOR-SALE

- Affordable
- Workforce
- Upscale
- Luxury

Households

- <$70K: 1,420
- $120K: 2,650
- $150K: 2,290
- $185K: 4,300
- $225K: 6,990
- $325K: 5,400
- $375K: 6,370
- $400K: 2,010

31,400 owner HHs

43% of likely owner households

Average Price

2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
Housing Study
Strategic Framework

Understanding Topeka's Neighborhoods
History and Redlining
UNDERSTANDING TOPEKA’S NEIGHBORHOODS
HISTORY AND REDLINING

Historic policies, such as redlining, continue to impact our communities...

...including Topeka’s core neighborhoods.

NEIGHBORHOODS ANALYSIS
BUILDING CONDITION

Map of City of Topeka dated February 1937, City Engineer’s Office, City of Topeka for Home Owners’ Loan Corporation (HOLC) – compiled by the University of Richmond for “Mapping Inequality” project. GIS Shapefile Source: City of Topeka

Source: Parcel Data, City of Topeka
Growing Tax base supports other communities

Investments in Public Realm
Catalyst Projects
Private Investment

Opportunity
Public money flows into targeted sites

Transitional
Public and Institutional investment occurs. Fledgling economy emerges.

Stable
Projects occur without subsidy.

Growing
Tax base supports other communities.

Investments in People

Understanding Topeka’s Neighborhoods
Investments Needed

Neighborhood Cycles
NEIGHBORHOODS AND EQUITY
HOUSING COST BURDEN - A GREATER HARDSHIP FOR MINORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>% Minority Households</th>
<th>% Cost Burdened Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westboro</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-Crest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Topeka</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Topeka</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Topeka</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Build</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunga Park</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ACS 2013-2017

HOUSING STUDY
STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

Topeka Comprehensive Housing Market Study

Understanding Needs
Urban Core Reinvestment
Housing Diversification
NEIGHBORHOODS ANALYSIS
MEDIAN YEAR BUILT

- North Topeka: 1900
- East Topeka: 1965
- Shunga Park: 1960
- Hi-Crest: 1960
- Central Topeka: 1890
- Westboro: 1940
- SW Topeka: 2000
- New Build: 2000

Source: Parcel Data, City of Topeka

HOUSING TRENDS
SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING & HOUSEHOLD TRENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of Single-Family Homes</th>
<th>National 1980</th>
<th>National 2017</th>
<th>The share of single-family homes remained the same from 1980 to 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of married HHs with children</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Yet, the share of married households with children, a primary market for single-family homes, declined substantially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. HH size</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>Household sizes also decreased, impacting consumer preferences about the size of housing units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, ACS 5-yr est.
**HOUSING TRENDS**

**SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING & HOUSEHOLD TRENDS: USA VS TOPEKA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Topeka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of Single-Family Homes</strong></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of married HHs with children</strong></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg. HH size</strong></td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, ACS 5-yr est.

**HOUSING TRENDS**

**PERMITS ISSUED**

71% of all permits issued over the past 10 years were for single-family homes, yet trends in Topeka indicate a need for other housing types...

Source: City of Topeka, HUD SOCD Building Permits Database
ECONOMIC
MEDIAN ANNUAL WAGES OF OCCUPATIONS WITH HIGH PROJECTED NEAR-TERM GROWTH

A mix of affordable, workforce, moderately-priced, and upscale housing is needed to support economic growth

- **$19k** Janitorial Staff
  - **$475 / mo**
- **$21k** Software Developers
  - **$525 / mo**
- **$30k** Personal Care Aides
  - **$750 / mo**
- **$60k** Registered Nurses
  - **$1,500 / mo**
- **$23k** Food Preparation
  - **$575 / mo**
- **$96k** Jobs at Advisors Excel
  - **$2,400 / mo**
- **$23k** Laborers
  - **$575 / mo**
- **$52k** Home Health Aids
  - **$1,250 / mo**

Source: Kansas Department of Labor, KSNT

*: average wages

220 jobs retained
Planned expansion; within 5 years

---

Housing Affordability

Market Analysis

DEMAND

What are current needs?
DEMAND
CITYWIDE AFFORDABILITY GAPS - OWNER

Households / Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Price Range</th>
<th>&lt;$70k</th>
<th>$70k-110k</th>
<th>$110k-120k</th>
<th>$120k-140k</th>
<th>$140k-190k</th>
<th>$190k-250k</th>
<th>$250k-370k</th>
<th>$370k-490k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% AMI</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>3,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Share of Stock ‘Below Average’

Households / Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Price Range</th>
<th>&lt;$70k</th>
<th>$70k-110k</th>
<th>$110k-120k</th>
<th>$120k-140k</th>
<th>$140k-190k</th>
<th>$190k-250k</th>
<th>$250k-370k</th>
<th>$370k-490k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% AMI</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMAND
CITYWIDE AFFORDABILITY GAPS - RENTER

Rent Range <$414 $414-552 $552-690 $690-828 $828-1104 $1104-1380 $1380-2070 $2070-2760

Unmet Demand

Household Affordability
Current Supply

Households / Units
5,540
2,280
2,600
2,680
2,000
4,050
Oversupply
1,660
5,760
Oversupply
2,770
5,300
Oversupply
2,480
2,020

Unmet Demand
3,440
1,040

Source: production based on past 10 years of LIHTC allocations; demand based on estimate of households with incomes below 60% AMI; growth based on Heartland 2050

AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUPPLY
IN COMPARISON TO NEED

17,700 HHS qualify
5,840 owner households
6,270 private market
5,590 Subsidized units and households

12,110 unit gap dedicated affordable housing

4,850 of these units have conditions that could put vulnerable tenants at risk and need to be replaced

Source: production based on past 10 years of LIHTC allocations; demand based on estimate of households with incomes below 60% AMI; growth based on Heartland 2050
AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUPPLY
IN COMPARISON TO NEED

5,590 subsidized households
2020

17,700 HHs qualify

7K units
Demand met by private market

gap of 5K units
quality affordable housing

17,500 HHs qualify

-0.05% annual decline

Goal: 125 units per year

+2,500 new units
2040

gap of 4K units
quality affordable housing

What are future needs?

Market Analysis
DEMAND
Housing Affordability

Source: production based on past 10 years of LIHTC allocations; demand based on estimate of households with incomes below 60% AMI; growth based on Heartland 2050
DEMAND SUMMARY: CURRENT
AVERAGE ANNUAL DEMAND

**AFFORDABLE**
- 2,100 units
- 300 units

**WORKFORCE**
- 2,250

**MODERATE**
- 500
- 450

**UPSCALE**
- 400
- 450

**TOTAL DEMAND**
- 7,300 Housing Units
- 5,600 For-Rent Units
- 1,700 For-Sale Units

**RENT/PRICE RANGE**
- For-Rent Units
  - <$665 per month
  - <$715 sales price
- For-Sale Units
  - $720-$1,250
  - $1,000-$1,600
  - $1,000-$1,600

**DEMAND SUMMARY: CURRENT**
- AVERAGE ANNUAL DEMAND
  - 2,100 units
  - 2,250
  - 840

**DEMAND IMPLICATIONS: 10-15 YEARS**

**HOUSING TYPES**

**PRICE/RENT**
- <$400-$750/mo
- $160 - $250k
- $120k - $160k
- $100 - $120k

**DEMAND POOL**
- 4,300 HHs
- 1,500 HHs
- 200 HHs
- 750 HHs

**GAP**
- $100k/unit
- $60k
- $30k
- $5k

**IMPLIED SUBSIDY 100% OF POOL**
- $430m
- $90m
- $6m
- $4m

**$53 million** needed each year

**$6.9 million** current City budget for housing
HOUSING STRATEGIES
TO ADVANCE THE GOALS

SIX STRATEGIES

TWENTY-SIX TACTICS

1. Improve the quality of the existing housing stock
2. Address abandoned & vacant properties
3. Expand resources to encourage housing stability and support homeownership
4. Support development of a diverse mix of housing types
5. Expand production of affordable housing to enhance economic mobility
6. Support Infill Development
7. Recruit Developers to Fill Undeveloped Lots
8. Diversify Housing Stock
9. Expand financial and organizational capacity

Relevant Recommendations

Support Infill Development
Support Downtown Development
Diversify Housing Stock
Recruit Developers to Fill Undeveloped Lots