Rent and home prices have risen dramatically over the past decade.

Source: Zillow
Nearly 6 in 10 residents say it’s difficult to access affordable housing in the region.

For you personally, how easy or difficult is it for you to access the following in the central Puget Sound region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Difficult</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Difficult/Very (NET)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Transportation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Jobs/Employment</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PSRC Public Opinion Survey
Housing in VISION 2050

- Housing is a regional issue
- Promote more housing, especially near transit, jobs and services
- Create more affordable housing types and choices
- Plan for jobs-housing balance
H-Action-1

Regional Housing Strategy: PSRC, together with its member jurisdictions, state agencies, housing interest groups, housing professionals, advocacy and community groups, and other stakeholders will develop a comprehensive regional housing strategy to support the 2023-24 local comprehensive plan update. The housing strategy will provide the framework for regional housing assistance (see H-Action-2, below) and shall include the following components:

- A **regional housing needs assessment** to identify current and future housing needs to support the regional vision
- **Strategies and best practices** to promote and/or address: housing supply, the preservation and expansion of market rate and subsidized affordable housing, housing in centers and in proximity to transit, jobs-housing balance, and the development of moderate-density housing options
- Coordination with other regional and local housing efforts
Early Work – Scoping Conversations

- Everyone has a role to play
- Moving from concept to action is a challenge
- Data is important but not a critical gap
Early Work – Housing Survey

Purpose

The survey...

- Provides a baseline for local policy implementation
- Identifies opportunities and gaps in housing tools
- Informs future housing work
- Builds on 2009 survey
Key Questions:

- What incentives, tools, types, and policies are allowed?
- How much new housing is being created due to tools?
- What are the successes, challenges, and emerging opportunities for new housing strategies?
73 Responses

- 69 cities, 4 counties
- ARCH and Housing Development Consortium help fill gaps in data
- 2009 survey – 58 responses
Findings
### Top housing types surveyed

#### Ranking of Housing Types Surveyed, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Housing Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td>Attached Accessory Dwelling Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td>Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td>Duplexes/Triplexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td>Low-Rise Multifamily (1-3 stories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero Lot Line/Townhomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td>Mid-Rise Multifamily 4-6 stories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td>Mobile Home Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td>Cluster Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td>Cottage Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td>Planned Unit Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>High-Rise Multifamily (7+ stories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td>Micro Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Top housing incentives surveyed

**Ranking of Housing Incentives Surveyed, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses n=73</th>
<th>Incentive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Density Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Parking Requirement Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Planned Action EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Incentive Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public Land for Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Inclusionary Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Permitting Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local governments are using tools to promote housing development

- Over two-thirds of local jurisdictions (50) have at least one incentive in place.
- Most jurisdictions with no incentives are small cities with no high capacity transit.
- Nearly all jurisdictions surveyed (93%) have zoning that allows housing types other than detached single-family.
Implementation of housing tools is uneven

- The ability to adopt tools to address housing affordability varies significantly among jurisdictions
- There is inconsistency and lack of coordination among local affordable housing strategies
- Critical areas and market factors can limit where and how market-based tools and incentives are adopted
City characteristics influence availability of incentives

Number of incentives by population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Jurisdiction Population</th>
<th>Avg # of Incentives Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10k (25)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-25k (20)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-100k (18)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100k+ (7)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of incentives by median home value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Jurisdiction Median Home Value</th>
<th>Avg # of Incentives Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$250k (14)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250-400k (29)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400-700k (19)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1m+ (7)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mandatory, locally calibrated tools are most effective

- All tools surveyed have had success to some degree

- Effective housing tools need to be properly calibrated for the local market

- Mandatory tools are more effective in creating new affordable housing than voluntary tools

"We have had little in terms of production of affordable units through existing incentives programs. They were put in place at a time when the market was much weaker and were calibrated to be cautious."

-survey respondent
More cities are planning to grow up

- One-third of local jurisdictions surveyed (24) have zoning that allows multi-family high rises.

- Nearly three-quarters of the region’s Metro and Core cities allow high-rise development.

- Just 20% of jurisdictions surveyed in 2009 allowed high-rise development.
Use of the Multifamily Tax Exemption has grown over the past decade

- Over one-third of jurisdictions surveyed (26) have adopted Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE)

- Largest increase in adoption of any incentive surveyed
  - 10 jurisdictions used MFTE in 2009
MFTE accounts for more units than all other incentives combined

Number of units built as a result of incentives in responding jurisdictions, 2009-2019*

- Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE): 17,453
- Parking Requirement Reduction: 2,556
- Density Bonus: 1,775
- Planned Action EIS: 930
- Public Land for Affordable Housing: 422
- Incentive Zoning: 200
- Permitting Priority: 930
- Inclusionary Zoning: 30
- Transfer of Development Rights (TDR): 20

*Unit count is an estimate and may not capture all new units and/or double count units that use multiple incentives
More local jurisdictions are offering resources to mitigate displacement

Displacement monitoring and mitigation tools in place (% of jurisdictions)

- No tool in place: 70%
- Tool in place: 30%

- Renter protections: 11%
- Relocation assistance: 10%
- Mobile home park protections: 10%
- Staying in place assistance: 8%
- Data monitoring: 5%
- Foreclosure assistance: 3%
- Other: 15%
Next Steps

Regional Housing Strategy
Technical Assistance
Assessment, Monitoring, and Reporting
Local Plans
REGIONAL HOUSING STRATEGY
Regional Housing Needs Assessment – What are gaps between current and future projected housing needs and housing supply?

Actions & Tools – How can the region address current and projected gaps in housing need and supply through coordinated action?

Implementation & Monitoring – How will we move forward? How do we measure success?
Key Topics

- Housing supply to support the Regional Growth Strategy
- Preservation of market-rate and subsidized affordable housing
- Expansion of market-rate and subsidized affordable housing
- Housing in centers and near transit
- Jobs-housing balance
- Moderate-density housing options
Relationship to Other Efforts

Build on complete and forthcoming state, county, regional, and local work
  o HB 1923 funded housing work
  o King County Affordable Housing Committee
  o Snohomish County HART

Coordinate with other regional work
  o Regional Equity Strategy
  o Growing Transit Communities implementation
  o Growth targets guidance
  o Centers implementation
Stakeholder Engagement & Responsibilities

GMPB: Lead process

Executive Board: Briefings at key milestones

Regional TOD Committee, Regional Staff Committee, Community Partners: Advise the process, provide subject matter expertise

Other stakeholders: Scoping, workshops, public comment period
Questions for the Committee

• What should be included in the regional housing strategy to best advance VISION 2050?

• How can the regional housing strategy best inform local comprehensive plan updates?
Next Steps

- GMPB adopt work plan in spring 2020
- Update on work plan and discuss regional needs assessment methodology at future meetings
Thank you.
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