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Introduction

The City of Platteville is located in Grant County in the southwestern portion of Wisconsin. Platteville began in 1827 when the first miners in the area established settlements around lead mines near the creek. The City was first surveyed in 1835 by an English immigrant – Thomas Hugill Sr., who came from a mining city in northern England. Platteville’s distinctive small blocks, narrow streets, and modest public square are said to be based on Hugill’s hometown back in England, and the irregularity of Platteville’s streets was due to the need to avoid mine shafts below ground.

Unlike many mining communities across the country, Platteville has enjoyed continued growth since the nineteenth century due to a balanced economy. The Platteville Normal School was founded in 1866 as the first teacher preparation school in Wisconsin, and the Wisconsin Mining Trade School was founded in 1907 to train technicians and workers to support the numerous mining operations around the area. These institutions grew over the years and eventually merged in 1959 to form what is currently known as the University of Wisconsin – Platteville. As of fall 2018, the university has a total enrollment of 7,979 students and remains a focal institution in the Platteville community.

The area around Platteville also became successful for its agriculture, which allowed the City to support a large number of businesses. The arrival of railroads in the 1870s and 1880s gave industries around Platteville access to faraway markets, especially the newly burgeoning zinc mining industry.

Today, the Main Street District in the City serves as a proud beacon of Platteville’s heritage, preserving many of the community’s historic structures and providing a lively atmosphere for local businesses operating today. The District is protected by a Historic Preservation Ordinance and Historic Preservation Commission. The Main Street District also accommodates the City’s government buildings and serves as the home of two museums, an art gallery, and the municipal auditorium.

Demographics

According to the Department of Administration, Platteville has a current, January 2018, population estimated to be 12,268 persons. This represents a 9.3% increase from the 2010 Census count of 11,225 persons, which averages to a growth rate of 1.16% per year. The median age for Platteville is 22.4 years old, representing an increase in average age from 21.9 in 2011. Much of this is due to the presence of University of Wisconsin – Platteville (UWP) students. This issue of student housing is a concern for the City of Platteville, not only from the concern of housing students, but the effect student housing has on neighborhoods and the housing market in general.

Looking at population growth by generation, Figure E.1 shows the percentage of the population contained within each generation for 2011 and 2016, according to Census ACS data.

**Figure E.1 Population Trends**

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS
Executive Summary

For purposes of this study, the Silent Generation are considered to be those 70 and older, Baby Boomers are 50 to 69, Generation X are 35 to 49, Generation Y are 20 to 34, and Generation Z are those under 20. The increase in Generation X and Y indicates both an increase in University Students as well as an increase in the number of young professionals. However, the Silent Generation and Generation Z both declined as a percentage of the Platteville population during this time period.

Figure E.2 shows Platteville’s population is projected to increase to 12,514 by 2023 and 13,547 by 2033. These numbers are similar to Department of Administration projections which show Platteville having 12,800 persons in 2025, 13,180 persons in 2030 and 13,470 in 2035. The projections in Figure 1.8 represent an overall growth rate of over 10% from now to 2033.

Taking a closer look at projected population growth by generation, Figure E.3 shows that those in the 19 or less, 35 to 49 and 65+ age groups are expected to gain in population. The growth in the 19 and under age bracket will increase the need for housing families with school-aged children. The growth in those aged 35 to 49 will create continued pressure for more workforce housing for young professionals and an increase in the number of seniors will create the need for senior housing in the medium to long-term. The flattening of growth in the 20 to 34 age bracket reflects a flattening of the University enrollment over the coming decades.

These trends and projections show a growing and changing local population who will have a range of housing needs in the next 5, 10, and 15 years. This study assesses current housing conditions, the housing needs of the current and future residents, and the opportunities and challenges of providing housing to meet those needs in the City of Platteville.
Planning Process

The City of Platteville began the process of creating a Housing Study and Needs Analysis in late April 2018. After the City’s authorization to proceed with the study, the process began with a Steering Committee kickoff meeting to review the roles, responsibilities, and milestones for completing the project. After the Kickoff Meeting, the project team deployed an online survey to gather data from residents about their current housing situation, any issues they face, and their desired housing scenarios. The survey included user-provided data on self-reported property conditions, occupancy, vacancy and rental rate, affordability, and satisfaction. These results are summarized in Appendix A. The team also invited stakeholders to attend focus group meetings to have face to face conversations with the project team. These local experts provided their insights into what they think the City needs to focus on with respect to housing.

Along with public engagement, the project team conducted an extensive assessment into the City’s existing planning efforts through a review of the City’s land use plans, relevant ordinances, and the development process in order to identify any pitfalls and inform the recommendations to be added later in the planning process. Next, the project team drafted a housing market analysis, summarized in Appendices B and C, which studied the City’s existing and projected demographics, housing stock, sales market, rental market, and areas of the City most viable for housing development and rehabilitation.

The second Steering Committee meeting included a review of the draft assessment data, site inventory, public survey, and stakeholder focus groups report. The project team gathered feedback from the Steering Committee and members of the public and made amendments to these sections.

The third and fourth Steering Committee meetings involved presentations of the Plan’s strategies and implementation matrix. The Steering Committee reviewed the document and recommended additional corrections prior to approval. The revised Plan was then presented at a Public Open House to solicit any remaining input from members of the Public before being recommended for acceptance by the Common Council.

Study Layout

This study is organized into four (4) chapters and three (3) appendices. Each of the four (4) chapters provide both quantitative data, demographics and survey results, as well as qualitative input, stakeholder and Steering Committee meetings, to assess need and solutions for four (4) different housing topics. The appendices provide detailed information which support the identification of opportunities and challenges in each of these chapters. The chapter topics cover municipal initiatives, housing rehabilitation, infill housing construction and new development on vacant land, and, finally, funding initiatives.

The qualitative data section of each chapter includes responses to the public survey, which asks questions regarding:

- Current Housing Description
- Current Household Description
- Owner Occupied – Self Reported Housing
- Renter Occupied – Self Reported Housing
- Platteville Community Needs
The quantitative data section of each chapter also includes a range of demographic, housing market, and housing stock data analysis, including:

- Demographics Current, Trends & Comparisons
- Household Characteristics – Current, Trends & Comparisons
- Housing Stock – Current, Trends & Comparisons
- Population & Housing Projections

In addition to the quantitative data, qualitative data is included in each chapter, which provides the results of the stakeholder interviews conducted with different groups of housing-related professionals, including:

- Builders/Developers
- Non-Profits
- Realtors
- Landlords/Property Managers
- Government representatives

Finally, each chapter includes an overall goal as well as objectives and strategies to accomplish the goal. Chapters 2 and 3 also include sample objectives and strategies with additional detail and example communities who have implemented these strategies.

Chapter 1. Municipal Initiatives

This chapter focuses on the overarching municipal actions that the City of Platteville can undertake to set the stage for the housing development, infill construction, rehabilitation and funding opportunities and challenges identified in the following chapters.

Specifically, this chapter assesses current community development programs which support housing development and redevelopment in the community, as well as planning documents which plan future housing growth and direct City resources. This chapter also addresses survey data gained from a public survey, housing market data, population projections, and an analysis of land with the potential for housing development. In addition, input was gathered from local stakeholder meetings, which resulted in the following key observations:

Stakeholder Interviews Guiding Observations

- Tax Increment Financing should be utilized for housing and in conjunction with economic development, where possible. The affordable housing extension should also be utilized prior to a TID closure.
- Current zoning districts are too limited and should be made more flexible in order to avoid rezoning property for development or going through a Planned Unit Development process.
- Encourage land surrounding the hospital to develop as a mixed housing type and/or mixed-use development by developing mixed-use zoning districts and supporting a senior housing project to encourage development in this area.
• Phasing of development would assist with infrastructure costs and having area plans for specific planning areas could provide guidance for phasing and future road connectivity.

• Smaller lots, including zero-lot-line homes, could help developers to built more affordable first-time homebuyers homes as well for those looking to downsize and should have appropriate zoning districts which accommodate these home types.

• Tiered communities that offer a mix of housing, including low income, senior, workforce, and other housing are needed which provide the range of housing type needed and appropriate planning, zoning and incentives should be made available to encourage these types of new developments.

This chapter provides an over-arching goal, as well as the objectives and strategies needed to address the opportunities and challenges identified through analysis of current housing-related initiatives, collected data, and public input.

**Municipal Initiatives Goal:**

To accomplish objectives and strategies which are comprehensive, address current planning efforts, and prepare the City to work with housing partners to complete the specific objectives and strategies which will enable the City to respond to identified needs and build a range of housing types for a wide range of income levels.

The objectives and strategies in this chapter seek to accomplish the overall goal of this chapter and provide the guidance, capacity, and organization needed to accomplish the goals, objectives, and strategies in the following chapters of this document. Key objectives for this chapter include:

**Selected Objectives**

• Allow for multi-family attached housing and apartments in commercial districts

• Create Mixed-Use zoning district

• Create mixed housing-type/smaller lot residential district

• Coordinate Annual Round-Table discussions with housing related professionals
Chapter 2. Housing Rehabilitation

This chapter focuses on housing condition and the need for housing rehabilitation within the City. As Platteville has an aging housing stock and a changing housing market which has had to respond the University students as well a young professionals, generational preferences, changes in the local economy and other factors, rehabilitation has become an increasingly important issue.

This chapter addresses the rehabilitation opportunities and challenges identified through analysis of survey data, and housing market data. In addition, input was gathered from local stakeholder meetings, which resulted in the following key observations;

Stakeholder Interviews Guiding Observations

- Renovations have become so expensive that houses which need work are not selling. Many are older homes that are being taken off the rental market and put on the for-sale market without the rehabilitation work needed to make them desirable.

- Renovation expenses do not allow those who are using government-assisted loan programs or down-payment assistance to purchase homes that need work. Even those who are not using government assistance to buy a home are finding that renovations are not accounted for in asking prices and a non-income based loan or grant City program would be necessary for some home purchases to make sense.

This chapter includes an overall goal directed towards encouraging rehabilitation of both owner-occupied and rental homes. The objectives and strategies in this chapter seek to fulfill the chapter goal and provide objectives and strategies to accomplish that goal.

Housing Rehabilitation Goal:

To provide direction, assistance, and incentives which encourage the rehabilitation of houses which are needed to satisfy the existing and future housing demand for a range of housing types and income levels.

The objectives and strategies in this chapter seek to accomplish the overall goal of this chapter and provide the guidance, capacity, and organization needed to accomplish that goal. Key objectives for this chapter include:

Selected Objectives

- Expand Existing and Establish Additional Home Rehabilitation Programs

- Protect existing housing stock from further rental conversion

- Encourage home rehabilitation through acquisition of code violation, unhealthy, foreclosed, and/or abandoned properties. Young professionals are willing to rent for a limited time but ultimately feel the need to make an investment and want to buy sooner than later. Also, expensive rentals lessen the length of time professionals are willing to rent.
Chapter 3. Infill Construction and New Development

This chapter focuses on the construction of housing units for smaller infill lots as well as for larger “greenfield” lots. Infill lots are identified in Growth Analysis section of Chapter 1 and can be found scattered through the City. They range in size and configuration and offer opportunities for small-scale builders, individuals, and non-profit housing partners to provide housing in existing neighborhoods. Some larger “greenfield” lots can also be found throughout the City, with large properties already zoned residential and located at the edges of the City limits. However, there are not a significant number of larger residential properties remaining.

This chapter addresses the infill and housing development construction opportunities and challenges identified through analysis of survey data, and housing market data. In addition, input was gathered from local stakeholder meetings, which resulted in the following key observations;

Stakeholder Interviews Guiding Observations

- Local contractors are willing to build homes on vacant lots but will need to be able to purchase lots at low or no cost in order to compensate for high construction costs. Some type of government incentive or assistance will be necessary to encourage infill housing by builders or by non-profits.

- Senior housing is making a comeback, realtors seeing more demand. However, seniors are looking for smaller, more affordable homes and are looking to both rent and buy.

- Sellers are looking to downsize as well and are looking at multi-family attached units as an option.

- There is a wide range of tenants looking to rent, including young couples saving to buy a home, low-income people, college students, and professionals looking for high-end rentals.

- There is a large demand from younger people to buy a first-time home, but they are struggling to afford anything over $180,000. There is some demand for smaller homes, some are downsizing and looking at one (1) and two (2) bedrooms.

- Townhomes could be a good solution for University staff as well as other young professionals, especially if newly constructed units could become available for rentals in the medium-term.

This chapter includes an overall goal directed towards encouraging infill housing construction as well as larger housing project development. The objectives and strategies in this chapter seek to fulfill the chapter goal and provide objectives and strategies to accomplish that goal.

Infill Construction and New Development Goal:

To provide direction, assistance and incentives which encourage the construction of houses which are needed to satisfy the existing and future housing demand for a range of housing types and income levels by increasing the supply of buildable site, the affordability of land development and the market exposure of available sites to potential builders, developers and non-profit housing partners.

The objectives and strategies in this chapter seek to accomplish the overall goal of this chapter and provide the guidance, capacity, and organization needed to accomplish that goal. Key objectives for this chapter include;
**Selected Objectives**

- Create off-site and/or on-site improvements grant/loan program to encourage housing development construction
- Encourage housing construction through site preparation assistance
- Increase supply and utilization of available land and proactively encourage home construction
- Proactively work with developers and investors to build identified housing projects on target properties

**Chapter 4. Funding Initiatives**

This chapter provides guidance towards increasing the utilization of funding sources to maximize the capacity of the City to engage in housing programs and initiatives. Platteville has a solid history of providing rehabilitation assistance, establishing partnerships to develop income-assisted and other housing projects, and providing rental assistance through the Housing Authority. However, in order to accomplish the goals, objectives, and strategies of the previous chapter, additional funding sources will be needed.

Throughout this chapter, housing issues and opportunities will often be defined in terms of affordability. There are many methods of defining the term “affordable” and it is important to be clear on how this term is defined. Many Federal, State, and local programs use family income as a method of determining affordability and will base program assistance on how family incomes compare to the average or median family income for a local area. These comparisons can include the terms “moderate income”, “low income” and “very low income” to describe the income of families eligible for government assistance. Generally, these terms address families whose income is either slightly lower than the local area average, “moderate income”, considerably lower than the local area average, “low income”, or those near the poverty level, “very low income.” This study will use these terms when discussing housing issues and often in the context of the level of potential government housing assistance which may be needed.

In addition, many affordable housing advocates will use the term “workforce housing.” This generally describes housing for working persons and families who may have incomes ranging from
slightly lower than the average local area income to slightly higher than the local area average income. These are people who work in the local community, make decent wages, yet may not be able to afford to live near their work and may have to commute from outside the community. As these people make significant contributions to the local economy, it is important to provide housing for them so that they can live and work in the same community.

This chapter refers to “workforce housing” when addressing housing issues for the local workforce and often in the context of potential housing opportunities and solutions to those issues, but not necessarily in need of direct government assistance or subsidies. Therefore, the term “affordable” can refer to the housing which is needed for families with lower than average incomes as well as housing which is sought after by those who may have near-average incomes, yet may still not be able to afford a place to live in the local community.

This chapter looks at survey data, housing market data, and the potential eligibility and opportunities for specific districts within the City in order to provide a full assessment of potential funding needs and sources. In addition, input was gathered from local stakeholder meetings, which resulted in the following key observations:

**Stakeholder Interviews Guiding Observations**

- City Housing Authority is seen as being helpful to local property investors, more so than many federal programs or other state-funded programs. Expanding the Housing Authority’s capabilities and funding would help to assist a greater proportion of renters, especially those on waiting lists for a voucher while making more use of government resources and encouraging greater involvement in HUD programs.
- Recent low-income housing projects built by the City only help a certain segment of the population and are not attractive to a wider range of potential renters and although they have a mix of market-rate options, there may not be enough available units.
- Any additional low-income housing projects should include a mix of market-rate units and should also target seniors who could qualify.
- Financial institutions are using federal and state homebuyer assistance programs; however, many do not qualify due to income restrictions. Assistance for a greater proportion of homebuyers would be useful and any role the City could play in down-payment or other assistance would be encouraged.
- University staff are increasingly having difficulty buying and renting homes. Some maintenance and faculty staff have the potential to qualify for low-moderate income housing and many would be able to afford housing in a mixed-housing type and mixed-income development that offered a wider range of housing options, including townhomes and apartments.
- State funding programs need to be more utilized, with the City mixing funds from different programs, and approaching housing development as an economic development project. Utilization of the housing program non-profit partners could assist with gaining access to more funding. Greater use and leverage of housing program funds could then be used to encourage more private employer participating in City housing efforts and initiatives.
This chapter includes an overall goal directed towards maximizing funding for the goals, objectives and strategies listed in this Study. The objectives and strategies in this chapter seek to fulfill the chapter goal and provide objectives and strategies to accomplish that goal.

Funding Initiatives Goal:

To encourage greater current and future utilization of Local, State, Federal, and other housing-related funding programs in order to encourage the housing rehabilitation and construction projects which result in more affordable housing stock and which provide more financial assistance options to renters and home buyers.

The objectives and strategies in this chapter seek to accomplish the overall goal of this chapter and provide the guidance, capacity, and organization needed to accomplish that goal. Key objectives for this chapter include:

Selected Objectives

- Expand access to HUD HOME program funding
- Expand access to HUD CDBG program funding
- Evaluate potential for current TIF districts to fund housing projects
- Assist in establishing new or expanding existing Community Development Corporation (CDC) to rehabilitate and build housing
- Establish coordinated homebuyer and other counseling to meet existing and new funding source requirements
Introduction

This chapter focuses on municipal actions that the City of Platteville can undertake in order to set the stage for the rehabilitation, infill construction and new development, and funding goals, objectives, and strategies in the following chapters. This chapter provides an overarching goal, as well as objectives and strategies to address the needs, opportunities, and challenges identified through analysis of current housing-related initiatives, collected data, and public input.

Specifically, this chapter assesses current community development programs which support housing development and redevelopment in the community, as well as planning documents which plan future housing growth and direct City resources. This chapter also addresses survey data gained from a public survey, housing market data, an analysis of land with the potential for housing growth, and input gathered from local stakeholder meetings. The objectives and strategies in this chapter seek to accomplish the overall goal of this chapter and provide the guidance, capacity, and organization needed to accomplish the goals, objectives, and strategies in the following chapters of this document.

Community Development Programs

The City has recently permitted some affordable multi-family projects which are supplying the rental market income restricted apartments and multi-family units. Platteville has also recently permitted senior-oriented multi-family units which offer a continuum of care option for older residents.

Housing Authority

The Platteville Housing Authority administers the housing choice voucher program for the community. The voucher program is intended to assist very low-income families, elderly and disabled citizens afford decent, safe, and sanitary housing units available on the private market. Regulation and funding for the program is provided by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Rather than limit eligible families to units located in subsidized housing projects, the program allows applicants to find housing anywhere in the city subject to program requirements.

Applicants who meet eligibility requirements will be placed on the waiting list until a voucher becomes available. Once an applicant receives a voucher, they are responsible for finding a rental unit in the Platteville 53818 zip code within Grant County. The desired unit’s owner must agree to rent under the program, and the unit must meet minimum quality standards for health and safety. Upon approval, the participant pays 30-40% of their adjusted gross income for rent and utilities, and the program pays the balance directly to the property owner. The Housing Authority is authorized to do additional housing related work, but would need separate funding and additional staff.
**Redevelopment Authority (RDA)**

The RDA was formed by a 2005 Common Council resolution and shortly thereafter formed Redevelopment Area #1 for the downtown. The RDA seeks to improve the physical and economic conditions of the downtown through financial assistance to building owners. Financial assistance is provided through two programs: (1) a revolving loan fund and (2) a curb appeal grant. The RDA encourages participants to make improvements to buildings while maintaining their historic charm.

**Home Rehabilitation Loan Funds**

The City of Platteville offers rehabilitation loans to eligible residents. These loans can be used for three purposes:

- **Necessary improvements or repairs of owner-occupied homes** (homeowner must apply)
- **Necessary improvements or repairs of rental or investor-owned properties** (landlord or property owner must apply)
- **Down payment and closing cost assistance for eligible first-time buyers**

“Necessary improvements or repairs” include repair or replacement of the roof, siding, windows and doors, electrical, heating system, plumbing system, handicapped accessibility improvements or modifications, energy efficiency improvements, and other general improvements. The down payment and closing cost assistance requires the home purchaser to contribute $1,000 toward the purchase of the home and secure a mortgage. The home must be vacant or owner-occupied when the offer to purchase is signed, and the homebuyer must complete a HUD-approved homebuyer counseling program before purchasing.

Rehabilitation and home purchase loans are no-interest, deferred payment loans that do not come due until the home is no longer the borrower’s principal residence. Rental or investor-owned loans are low-interest loans repaid to the City over a 5-year period. All loans are secured by a mortgage on the property. Eligibility for rehabilitation or home purchase loans is based on total household income, residency, affordability, and project scope.

**Historic Preservation**

Chapter 27 of the City’s Code of Ordinances created the Historic Preservation Commission, which administers regulations concerning exterior modification of properties that have been designated as locally historic. The Commission makes recommendations to the Plan Commission and Common Council about razing buildings within the Historic District and maintains a register of historic landmarks and sites throughout the City. The Commission also administers educational programs to guide and assist owners of historic properties with preservation and rehabilitation efforts.
Tax Increment Finance (TIF) Districts

TIF is a financing tool available to local governments to spur economic development that would not otherwise occur without public assistance. When tax increment districts (TIDs) are opened, the municipality borrows money to fund development projects. As property values rise, the increased property tax paid on the new development is used to pay off project costs. Once all eligible costs are paid, the municipality closes the TID and the full value of the expanded tax base is shared between the municipality and any taxing jurisdictions in the district.

The City currently operates four open TIDs. Three of these TIDs – No. 5, 6, and 7 – cite improvements to housing quality or expansions to housing stock in their project plans. Mixed Use and Blighted TIDs can also be important tools for local governments to address affordable housing. Closing a TID allows for a 1-year affordable housing extension where funds can be made available anywhere in the City.

Recent Planning Efforts and Documents

This section explores the past and current planning efforts that affect housing in the City of Platteville. The documents below represent the major planning initiatives and City policies that regulate where and what housing projects can be built.

Town & City of Platteville Smart Growth Comprehensive Plan

In 2010, the Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SWWRPC) prepared a comprehensive plan as a guide for the long-term growth and development of the City and Town of Platteville. It was intended to anticipate change and to plan for the preservation of the unique community resources identified by the community. The Plan includes a vision to guide future development and includes a number of goals and objectives related to housing.

Housing

- Encourage private developers to provide additional rental housing.
- Encourage and support property maintenance and the maintenance of housing stock throughout the community.
- Encourage and support neighborhood groups and others, as they may organize regarding issues and concerns specific to the individual neighborhoods.
- Promote neighborhood beautification programs.
- Encourage more affordable and low-income housing.
- Expand design standards to include additional housing types.
- Respond to senior housing demands and other segments (low income) of the housing market which are underserved.
• Amend the zoning ordinance to permit neo-traditional neighborhoods.
• The City should support the dissemination of educational materials, and forums promoting historic preservation.
• Adjust the zoning code to allow smaller lot sizes for new subdivisions and thus make available the opportunity for additional development, taking into consideration the impact on existing neighborhoods.
• Design new residential areas to foster quality growth and development of the community.
• Zone additional land for multi-family housing.
• Add a multi-family only zoning district to the zoning ordinance.
• Investigate a zoning change that would require a certain percentage of rental housing as part of all residential developments.
• Add a small-lot district to the zoning ordinance.
• Provide educational materials and forums promoting historic preservation to homeowners/property owners.

Land Use

• Locate residential development in areas convenient to community facilities, including parks, schools, and retail.
• Encourage infill development to occur within the City.
• The City and Town strongly encourage infill development and redevelopment on lands that are vacant, blighted or underutilized, using TIF, a redevelopment authority, etc.
• New development near the USH 151 interchanges and along community entry corridors such as STH 80/81 should be clustered in highly planned, mixed-use activity centers.
• Mixed Use areas should be developed as highly planned, compact activity centers or nodes rather than uncoordinated, poorly planned strip development.
• This mixed-use development along highway 80/81 takes advantage of its proximity to highway 151 and the Southwest Health Center.
• Delineate future right-of-ways to provide efficient connections to existing infrastructure.
• Encourage mixed-use development that can accommodate a variety of housing and commercial needs.
• Efforts should be made to reinforce the needs and assets of the Southwest Health Center.
• While there is a need to provide for affordable housing near campus to meet the needs of an increasing student/staff population, it is important that those needs are met without sacrificing the integrity of the surrounding neighborhood.

The Proposed Land Use map from the City’s 2013 Comprehensive Plan shows the Mixed Use land use districts along Highway 151.
Chapter 1: Municipal Initiatives

2010 Downtown Revitalization Plan

This plan was completed during the fallout of the Great Recession when the housing market was still recovering from the subprime mortgage crisis. Housing values at the time had fallen back to 2003 levels, with declining rates of home ownership, and household wealth fell back to 1995 levels. The Plan’s market analysis section found several interesting pieces of information. The plan found that students regard cost as the most important factor in determining their housing choice, with walking distance second. At the time, a majority of students preferred living downtown subject to cost parameters, and that about 50% of students go home 1-2 times each month.

Chapter 5 of the plan identifies market demand for condominiums and student apartments, with particular emphasis on areas that are pedestrian friendly and have convenient access to shopping and entertainment amenities. The plan lists two specific actions to advance the housing recommendations, which include:

- Work with property owners to actively promote potential redevelopment sites for residential or mixed use, including the proposed University related housing sites identified in the plan’s Future Land Use map.
- Aggressively enforce existing City codes that regulate rental units to ensure occupant safety and neighborhood stability.
- The Future Land Use map proposes high-density residential development along Main Street at the eastern and western ends of the Downtown planning area, near the intersection of Mineral and Broadway Streets. The map also proposes university housing in four designated mixed-use areas of the Downtown. Refer to Figure 4.1 of the plan for more detailed information.
**Subdivision Ordinance**

The Subdivision Ordinance establishes the procedures for the orderly development of land in the City and articulates the City’s requirements for land division applications. Land divisions procedures are laid out for certified survey maps, subdivision plats, and plats outside the corporate limits. The Community Development page on the City’s website contains step-by-step instructions for the CSM and plat process for prospective applicants.

**Zoning Ordinance**

The Zoning Ordinance establishes three districts for the purpose of residential development, along with a Planned Unit Development (PUD) district, and a limited occupancy residential overlay (R-LO) district. The latest version of the City’s Zoning Map shows vast areas of the City designated for R1 and R2 zoning. R1 districts are for single-family homes, while R2 districts are for single and two-family structures. R3 is the City’s designated multifamily residential district, accommodating higher densities than R1 and R2 and a greater mix of densities within a single district. The largest R3 concentration is a contiguous group of parcels located northeast of the University of Wisconsin-Platteville to provide housing for students. Other pockets of R3 parcels are located throughout the City, with another large contiguous group along STH 80 at the City’s northern boundary. The Community Development page on the City’s website also contains step-by-step instructions on the PUD process, providing an option for development-specific zoning designations which could include a residential component.

![Map 1.1: Zoning Map](image_url)
2010 Grow Southwest Wisconsin

In 2010 southwestern Wisconsin was one of 45 regions in the United States to receive financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to plan for the region’s social and economic resiliency and self-sufficiency. As a result, the Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SWWRPC) prepared the Grow Southwest Wisconsin report. The overall objectives of the effort were to identify and capitalize on local resources, better produce our own energy and food, minimize commutes, and maximize employment. The planning process produced a series of recommendations to improve regional efficiency relating to key focus areas of interest to the region, including housing. Some key housing goals and strategies included:

- Have more case management services to work directly with landlords/tenants.
- Coordinate between regional housing agencies such as Neighborhood Housing Services and Southwestern Wisconsin Community Action Program.
- Integrate information from realtors, lenders, and government agencies to coordinate the process for first-time homebuyers.
- Establish financing for disadvantaged buyers.
- Do County sponsored workshops on an annual basis to inform potential home buyers.
- Provide online consumer education programs to let potential homeowners know what they need to do.
- Establish “forgivable” housing loans from employers who want to retain workers.
- Utilize or establish redevelopment authorities.
- Assure that the master plans, land use plans, and comprehensive plans are followed and updated.
- Make housing more attractive.
- Improve housing quality.
- Stop granting building permits for underutilized housing types.
- Improve building codes and building code enforcement.
- Pursue the creation of financing types applied to housing.
- Create a database of financing types including banks, USDA Rural Development, VA.

2013 UWP Housing Analysis

In 2013, Baker Tilly Virchow Krause, LLP conducted a preliminary rental housing analysis of the Platteville area rental market to evaluate the potential for multifamily rental housing that targets UWP students. The analysis found that total enrollment on the campus had been increasing at an average rate of 3.6 percent annually over the past 11 academic years. Since 2002-2003, full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment has increased by 2,130 students or 42.5 percent. UWP officials indicated their intention to increase freshman enrollment by 50-75 students annually for the next five years. Upperclassmen enrollment jumped by an average of 3.1 percent annually over the past 11 academic years.

The UW-system mandates that all freshmen and sophomores must live on campus at UWP. An analysis of off-campus rental developments found that many of the existing multifamily developments in the area were older, in poor condition, and lacked amenities. The analysis also noted plans to build a new multifamily development in the area and identified two existing...
developments that were most comparable in character to the proposed new development. These developments were: Washington Place, 230 North Washington Street, Platteville, WI and Fox Ridge, 1115 Fox Ridge Road, Platteville, WI. Both offered market rate housing for one-year leases and students comprised the majority of tenants.

Recent Planning Efforts and Documents
Guiding Observations
Platteville has been engaged in a number of important planning efforts which have resulted in guiding documents that the City uses to guide growth and development. A number of strategies and action items from those documents are applicable to this study and should be implemented as part of the strategies listed in this document. In particular, the following action items from previous planning documents have been included in the implementation items in this study:

2013 Comprehensive Plan
- Amend the zoning ordinance to permit neo-traditional neighborhoods.
- Adjust the zoning code to allow smaller lot sizes for new subdivisions and thus make available the opportunity for additional development, taking into consideration the impact on existing neighborhoods.
- Design new residential areas to foster quality growth and development of the community.
- Zone additional land for multi-family housing.
- Encourage infill development to occur within the City.
- The City and Town strongly encourage infill development and redevelopment on lands that are vacant, blighted or underutilized, using TIF, a redevelopment authority, etc.
- New development near the USH 151 interchanges and along community entry corridors such as STH 80/81 should be clustered in highly planned, mixed-use activity centers.
- Mixed Use areas should be developed as highly planned, compact activity centers or nodes rather than uncoordinated, poorly planned strip development.
- Delineate future right-of-ways to provide efficient connections to existing infrastructure.

2010 Grow Southwest Wisconsin
- Establish “forgivable” housing loans from employers who want to retain workers.
- Utilize or establish redevelopment authorities.
- Assure that the master plans, land use plans, and comprehensive plans are followed and updated.
Survey Data
An online survey was conducted at the beginning of the housing study in order to gather public input in a more confidential manner than at a public meeting. Survey responses yielded a number of important observations which are used in comparison to Census and other data analysis to provide a full picture of the housing market in Platteville. A complete summary of the survey results can be found in Appendix A. The following lists important observations from the survey results which are relevant to this Chapter;

Survey Data Guiding Observations
- A high number of respondents to the survey had children present in their household.
- Respondents generally had strong representation in the middle and upper-income brackets and almost half spent less than 20% of their income on housing.
- Many were satisfied with their current neighborhoods in terms of walkability and proximity to work; however, a high percentage were not satisfied with proximity to commercial and entertainment establishments.
- Most respondents believe the City needs more affordable homes for first-time buyers.
- A high percentage believe the City needs a few more residential subdivisions, but not a lot more.
- A strong majority thinks new residential developments should be designed as traditional neighborhoods with grid streets, alley, sidewalks and connectivity.
- Nearly half of the respondents think the City should have more homes targeted to seniors.

Housing Market Assessment
Studying the demographic changes in Platteville identified a number of general housing and community opportunities and challenges for the near, medium and long term. Overall demographic data can be found in Appendix B and an analysis of demographics and housing market assessment data specific to this chapter can be found in Appendix C. The data and analysis from both Appendices highlights a number of important observations, including:

Housing Market Guiding Observations
- A decrease in the percentage of older residents indicates less need for senior housing, but the increase in the percentage of Baby Boomers could create senior housing issues as they age.
- Seniors may not have increased recently as a percentage of the population; however, they will be looking to downsize and will have rental needs and different housing type needs with less maintenance, no stairs, and handicap accessibility.
- An increase in young professionals from both Generation X and Generation Y will present short-term rental and homeownership issues as these young professionals become established.
- A disparity in per capita versus median household incomes could also result in the need for affordable housing types which can accommodate single persons with lower income, both older and younger. Also, should the recent significant decline in vacancy rates continue, Platteville’s already low overall 5.5% vacancy rate could fall to
even lower levels and make current housing issues worse.

- With Platteville’s already high value to income ratio, availability of housing more closely aligned with local incomes will likely become the highest priority.

- The result of the demographic changes described in this chapter could require new housing types to accommodate families with children, as well as young professionals and seniors living alone or with others.

- Future residents will need a mix of rental options as well as affordable ownership options.

- Current and future residents may not have the capacity to renovate existing homes and many simply do not want to renovate existing homes.

- Beyond rehabilitation of existing homes, which is discussed in the next chapter, a supply of newer affordable homes which accommodate a wide spectrum of renters and buyers will be needed in the near, medium and long term.

- Those renters and buyers will have a wide range of incomes. Therefore, innovative solutions will be required to ensure housing supply is affordable to the local workforce.

- Platteville has the available land to meet this demand; however, careful land use planning will be needed to ensure the right mix of housing is built over the next few decades.
Growth Analysis

A Growth Analysis has been conducted which summarizes vacant residentially zoned properties and, using minimum lot size requirements, estimates the amount of new housing which could be built on that vacant land to meet current and future demand. Map 1.2 shows the location of vacant lots by zoning category. The study does not take into account the size or continuity of the available parcels. Nor does the study take into account the status of the properties and whether they are for sale or not. Therefore, the provided calculations are only intended to provide an overall estimate of the maximum potential for new residential construction should each parcel be developed at the minimum lot size.

Regarding single-family housing, Figure 1.1 shows a total of 1,306 units could be built on 363 acres of vacant residentially zoned land within the City. Looking at multi-family units, a total of 1,192 units could be built on 802 acres of R2 and R3 vacant land.

This analysis appears to show the potential to build a considerable number of single-family homes in new subdivisions as well as on infill lots or existing subdivisions with unbuilt lots. This analysis also appears to show the potential to build a considerable number of multi-family units as well. However, these properties may not be for sale and may require considerable infrastructure and other improvements to be developed. Therefore, the amount of buildable land and potential new units is likely considerably lower. However, as there is high demand for housing in the City and there are some large parcels which can be developed without a rezoning, yet are still vacant, there is the potential for current development regulation to offer more flexibility to compensate for changing market conditions. An ever greater consideration is that land prices are likely too high for developers to make a profit under current market conditions. Other market conditions which could also represent a barrier to new housing construction also include the cost of labor, cost of building materials, price points of potential home buyers and renters, and the cost of infrastructure.

Figure 1.1 Potential Area and Number of New Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Minimum SF Lot Area per Unit</th>
<th>Potential SF Units</th>
<th>Minimum MF Lot Area per Unit</th>
<th>Potential MF Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>215.68</td>
<td>9,395,174</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>3,294,457</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>71.65</td>
<td>3,120,894</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>362.96</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential SF Units * 75%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential MF Units * 75%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Local GIS & Zoning Data
Stakeholder Interviews

Stakeholder interviews were also conducted at the beginning of the housing study in order to gather input from housing and housing industry-related professionals in a workshop atmosphere where different housing market factors could be discussed in detail. Stakeholder input yielded a number of important observations which are used in comparison to survey results as well as Census and other data analysis to provide a full picture of the housing market in Platteville. The following lists the stakeholder observations which are relevant to this Chapter.

Realtors

- City’s Tax Increment Financing money seems to be going towards commercial and industrial projects, not towards housing. More of these funds should be used for housing.
- New homes in Platteville on the outskirts of town do not seem to be screened very well from commercial neighbors. Difficult to sell houses with a view of the rear of the shopping center.
- Availability of land is not the problem. There is land, although much of it could be rezoned to accommodate a wider range of housing.
- The hospital is a good location, especially for senior housing, and should be seen as a place for the City to invest some money to help with new housing construction.

Landlords

- City and landlord relationship needs to be improved. They are not on the same page. Outside investors and builders seem to be treated better by the City and the Council when it comes to providing housing.
- The City needs a cost-benefit analysis of the resources they are spending on attracting new development versus the money they spend on improving the existing neighborhoods and the existing housing stock and amenities.
- Individual projects need to have better market studies to make sure the right mix of renters and owners, low income and market rate, are supplied. Right now, too many low-income rental units are being given priority.

Builder/Developers

- Rezoning in the City can be difficult. The rezoning process can take an extended period of time for difficult projects, such as for redevelopment housing.

Financial Institutions

- The City can do more to encourage housing development. Benton is a good example of using TIF funds.

City Representatives

- There are impediments to development in the City. There generally is not phasing. All water, sewer, curb, gutter, and pavement has to be installed for the entire development. Developers complain about sidewalks on both sides of the street and the width requirement for the streets.
- Homes are only reassessed when permits are issued.
- The City has paid 25% of infrastructure costs in the past, resulting in three (3) new developments.
• Some Tax Increment Financing (TIF) money has been used in the past to support housing.

University of Wisconsin—Platteville

• Difficult to find rentals that are available, no great websites to help. Townhome multi-unit structures that are entirely owned by a single-owner seem to be better marketed.

Economic Partners

• The lack of housing is affecting the recruiting ability of the chamber and other economic development organizations.
• The City could also explore smaller lots sizes, including zero lot line homes.
• The City could also institute a land banking and land trust program to spur development in key areas.

Lost Prospects

• Married couples with children did not want to live near campus and need three (3) bedroom houses at a minimum. An office or study was also important.
• Some young professionals might be looking to live further from downtown in a quieter neighborhood. There is far more activity at night than during the day, which is not desirable.
• There are not enough restaurants and activities for families downtown. Not worth the loud atmosphere at night without more daytime activities.
• Need tiered communities that offer a mix of housing, including low income, senior, workforce, and other housing.

Stakeholder Guiding Observations

• Tax Increment Financing should be utilized for housing and in conjunction with economic development, where possible. The affordable housing extension should also be utilized prior to a TID closure.
• Current zoning districts are too limited and should be made more flexible in order to avoid rezoning property for development or going through a Planned Unit Development process.
• Encourage land surrounding the hospital to develop as a mixed housing type and/or mixed-use development by developing mixed-use zoning districts and supporting a senior housing project to encourage development in this area.
• Phasing of development would assist with infrastructure costs and having area plans for specific planning areas could provide guidance for phasing and future road connectivity.
• Smaller lots, including zero-lot-line homes, could help developers to built more affordable first-time homebuyers homes as well for those looking to downsize and should have appropriate zoning districts which accommodate these home types.
• Tiered communities that offer a mix of housing, including low income, senior, workforce, and other housing are needed which provide the range of housing type needed and appropriate planning, zoning and incentives should be made available to encourage these types of new developments.
Municipal Initiatives
Goals and Strategies

This section includes an overall goal as well as the objectives and associated strategies needed to accomplish that goal. The objectives and strategies are organized in an implementation matrix that includes a priority for each objective representing a ranking by City staff, the Plan Steering Committee, and consultant. The priorities for objectives in all chapters range from one (1) to six (6), with one (1) being the highest priority and six (6) being the lowest priority. The implementation matrix also includes potential cost and potential staff hours to complete. A timeframe is provided which outlines how long each strategy could take to accomplish, once undertaken. Finally, responsible organizations, such as the City, other government agencies, and housing partners, mainly non-profit organizations, are listed as the entities needed to accomplish each strategy.

Municipal Initiatives
Goal:

To accomplish objectives and strategies which are comprehensive, address current planning efforts, and prepare the City to work with housing partners to complete the specific objectives and strategies which will enable the City to respond to identified needs and build a range of housing types for a wide range of income levels.

Platteville has little control over the cost of labor and the cost of building materials. However, the City could potentially assist homebuyers and renters in finding non-profit and State and Federal assistance programs. The City also has the ability to alter development regulations to decrease the cost of acquiring land for housing construction. Current development regulations require 10,000 sq. ft. lot minimums in R1 zoning districts or 8,000 sq. ft. lots in the R2 zoning districts. However, developers are struggling to build single-family homes within the current development regulations and still make a profit.

Therefore, establishing smaller minimum lot sizes could be one method of decreasing the cost of building houses. Having minimum lots sizes that are too large is one issue the City is potentially facing and could be considered one reason housing is not being developed. Another reason housing construction might be inhibited is that rezoning to a Planned Units Development, which allows for a mixed range of houses, can appear difficult. The City may also have an issue with having homogenous residential zoning districts which need additional flexibility. For example, the R1 zoning district does not allow for housing other than detached single-family homes. The R2 zoning district does not allow for housing other than detached single-family housing and duplexes. This only leaves R3 zoning for developers.
wishing to develop a mixture single-family housing, duplexes, row houses and apartments. With only 37 acres of R3 property large enough build a residential subdivision, the maximum potential for developing a mixed housing type community on currently vacant residential land is very small.

In addition to the potential lack of flexibility within the residential zoning districts, the City may have an issue with having homogenous commercial zoning districts as well. A significant portion of the City is zoned B3. However, B3 specifically excludes residential development. Unless B3 property is rezoned to R3, the City is limited in the areas in which it can host mixed-housing type subdivisions. Unless B3 property is rezoned to CBT and gaining conditional use approval as well or rezoning to PUD, developers have essentially no ability to develop mixed-use developments either. Developers have voiced their concern and reluctance to request a rezoning due to perceived time delays and cost and, therefore, these rezoning are unlikely to be initiated.

By not allowing for mixed-use development by-right, and without a rezoning, developers are less able to share costs and profits across a range of development projects and generate economies of scale on construction and development cost. In addition, by excluding residential development from commercial districts, developers are less likely to build a customer base that can serve new commercial development or serve potential workers for new businesses. Combining commercial, office and residential uses in a new development also allows for more incentives and assistance from private and public organizations and entities as housing and economic development can be combined.

In addition, combining development types would also allow for a wider range of senior facilities, including assisted-living, to be developed along with traditional housing types. Combining development types could also allow for better phasing and allow for infrastructure to be installed as different phases come online, versus all at once. Commercial and industrial phases can afford to install spine or arterial infrastructure, while leaving secondary infrastructure to be installed by developers or others, such as the City, at the appropriate time. Finally, the lack of mixed-use development also limits the ability of the City to provide incentives to a wider range of potentially interested developers or provide subsidized infrastructure installation to projects which only contain a portion of commercial or industrial uses. In summary:

- There is high demand for housing in the City and the presence of some large parcels which can be developed without a rezoning, yet are still vacant, indicates that current development regulations could offer more flexibility to help compensate for changing market conditions.
- Having minimum lots sizes that are too large is one issue the City is currently facing and could be one reason housing is not being developed.
- The City has somewhat homogenous residential zoning districts which could be amended to offer greater flexibility to encourage additional housing construction.
- The City also has somewhat homogenous commercial zoning districts which could be amended to provide residential uses, where appropriate.
- The availability of a by-right mixed-use development zoning option might allow developers to save on street and other infrastructure costs.
• Developing a thoroughfare plan for both the industrial and mixed-use land use district areas could allow better phasing options for developers, greater ability to seek infrastructure funding assistance, more hierarchy of roads for new developments, and greater ability to designate parcels and areas which can be targeted for development.

• Combining development types could also allow for a wider range of senior facilities, including assisted-living, to be developed along with traditional housing types.

The objective and strategies needed to implement this goal are listed in the Implementation matrix at the end of this chapter. In addition, objectives and strategies from other chapters could be relevant to those listed here. Examples of strategies in greater detail and the municipalities using those strategies are listed in Chapters 2 and 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Funding Districts</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Potential Staff Hours</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
<th>Housing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create mixed-use zoning district</td>
<td>Amend proposed land use plan to encourage multi-family housing in commercial areas</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create mixed-use zoning district</td>
<td>Amend proposed land use plan to encourage mixed-use development</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Historic Districts to encompass a larger historic area in central Platteville</td>
<td>Amends proposed land use plan map and text to expand mixed-use land use districts and identity potential housing project sites</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate effect of current impact fee program on housing costs and consider reducing or eliminating for targeted housing project areas</td>
<td>Evaluate effectiveness of current implementation-based assessment schedule</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and fund a Neighborhood Planning Program</td>
<td>Establish partnerships with neighborhood development organizations to seek funding for implementation Neighborhood Associates</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Funding Districts</td>
<td>Potential Cost</td>
<td>Potential Staff Hours</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Responsible Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage developer/builder participation in local, state, federal and non-profit housing assistance and initiatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Develop &amp; distribute local, state, federal and non-profit housing assistance programs list to developers/builders</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate, advertise and host rehabilitation workshops to educate existing homebuyers on government and non-government organization/partner home rehabilitation funding</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish one-stop-shop rental listing website</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Establish or utilize existing one-stop-shop rental listing website/service, including wholhousingsearch.org</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish coordinated homebuyer and other counseling to meet existing and new funding source requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coordinate, advertise and host homebuyer and other counseling workshops needed to satisfy new and existing funding source/funding partner requirements</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Annual Round-Table discussions with housing related professionals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coordinate annual round-table discussions with landlords to assess City housing programs/projects</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate annual round-table discussions with employers, Grant County Economic Development Corporation, realtors, developers &amp; builders to assess City housing programs/projects</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2: Housing Rehabilitation
Introduction

This chapter focuses on housing condition and the need for housing rehabilitation within the City. Platteville has an aging housing stock and a changing housing market which has had to respond to the needs of University students, young professionals, and generational preferences. The City has also had to account for changes in the local economy and other housing market factors which have made rehabilitation an increasingly important issue. This chapter provides an overall goal directed towards encouraging housing rehabilitation for homeowners and landlords. This chapter addresses the rehabilitation opportunities and challenges identified through analysis of survey data, housing market data, and stakeholder input. The objectives and strategies in this chapter seek to fulfill the chapter goal and provide objectives and strategies to accomplish that goal.

Survey Data

An online survey was conducted at the beginning of the housing study in order to gather public input in a more confidential manner than at a public meeting. Survey responses yielded a number of important observations which are used in comparison to Census and other data analysis to provide a full picture of the housing market in Platteville. A complete summary of the survey results can be found in Appendix A. The following lists important observations from the survey results which are relevant to this Chapter;

Survey Data Guiding Observations

- A significant number of survey respondents have not been in their homes for very long, less than five (5) years. Many were pleased with the overall condition of their current house or apartment. Many live in a home built in the 1970s and 60% indicated they would be willing to invest additional funds into their home the next five (5) years. They anticipate spending between $5,000 and $30,000 on those renovations/remodels. However, lack of qualified contractors, cost of materials and labor, and government regulations were listed as potential obstacles to undertaking those renovations.

- Another obstacle to renovation is the poor conditions of other houses on their block, citing a need for more rehabilitation work to be done in their neighborhood before they commit to remodeling projects of their own.

- Excessive conversions to duplexes were also listed as having a negative effect on neighborhoods.
The majority of those looking to buy a home in the next two (2) years were looking for move-in ready homes and only a small percentage was looking for a fixer-upper. Few saw homes being historic as important to their buying decision; however, almost all considered energy efficiency to be important. This indicates that homes in decent condition are being sought after and renovations will likely be focused on weatherization and upgrades to windows, doors and other sources of energy inefficiency.

Overall, survey respondents have been with their current employers for a long time. Many of these employees are in the healthcare industry or other professional or management sector. Given the importance of housing to local employers and to their employees, an employer-funding housing purchase program should be considered as an option for a City housing initiative.

Housing Market Assessment

Studying the demographic changes in Platteville identified a number of rehabilitation opportunities and challenges for the near and medium term. Overall demographic data can be found in Appendix B and an analysis of demographics and housing market assessment data specific to this chapter can be found in Appendix C. The data and analysis from both Appendices highlights a number of important observations, including:

Housing Market Guiding Observations

- With a high percentage of homes built before the 1960s, Platteville has an older housing stock that will need renovations to keep up with market demand. Conversions of single-family homes to duplexes and conversions to rental houses for University students continue to add additional renovation issues, especially for homebuyers.

- Conversions to duplexes have added to the very high percentage of those housing types, compared the County and State, and account for nearly one (1) out of every ten (10) houses in Platteville.

- City building permits issued since 2006 show slow but steady single-family and duplex construction over this time period, along with a slump in apartment construction that was only recently reversed with new units in 2018. More consistent construction of apartments in the coming years would allow for pressures in the rental market to subside and for rates to lower and new inventory becomes available.
Stakeholder Interviews

Stakeholder interviews were also conducted at the beginning of the housing study in order to gather input from housing and housing industry-related professionals in a workshop atmosphere where different housing market factors could be discussed in detail. Stakeholder input yielded a number of important observations which are used in comparison to survey results and Census and other data analysis to provide a full picture of the housing market in Platteville. The following lists the stakeholder observations which are relevant to this Chapter.

Realtors
- Houses that do not need much work are selling the best and sellers are getting close to asking price if the house is in good condition.
- Many landlords are taking rentals off the market and trying to sell as single-family, creating more demand for apartments.

Landlords
- The houses that do come on the market generally need a lot of work and are not that desirable.
- Too much is being spent on infrastructure for new projects and not enough in local neighborhoods.

Builder/Developers
- Different viewpoints on how the City should grow, University and conservation viewpoints do not always line up with developer viewpoints, making rezoning a challenge.

Financial Institutions
- When existing houses do come on the market the rehabilitation costs are substantial and a 3% down loan will not work in that case, so government-assisted financing will not work.

City Representatives
- Duplexes are inspected the same as single-family homes; however, more issues are present when single-family homes are converted to duplexes or multi-family. Building a duplex on a single-family lot leads to issues. There is a lot of coverage maximum with single-family.

University of Wisconsin—Platteville
- Students have a wide range of rental options, although rents are higher than many expect.
- Many units do not include utilities as well, which is generally not considered by first-time student renters. Poor insulation is leading to higher utility costs in older units.

Lost Prospects
- Down payment assistance viewed as helpful and useful. However, housing prices in Platteville are not reflective of the amount of work needed.
- Some updating is ok, but full renovations are too much.
- Garages are not large enough.
- Renovation loans are needed that are not income-restricted.
- Duplexes were not favored and considered too expensive for not being a stand-alone house.
- Young professionals are willing to rent for a limited time but ultimately feel the need to make an investment and want to buy sooner than later. Also, expensive rentals lessen the length of time professionals are willing to rent.
Stakeholder Guiding Observations

- Renovations have become so expensive that houses which need work are not selling. Many are older homes that are being taken off the rental market and put on the for-sale market without the rehabilitation work needed to make them desirable.

- Renovation expenses do not allow those who are using government-assisted loan programs or down-payment assistance to purchase homes that need work. Even those who are not using government assistance to buy a home are finding that renovations are not accounted for in asking prices and a non-income based loan or grant City program would be necessary for some home purchases to make sense.
Housing Rehabilitation Goals and Strategies

This section includes an overall goal as well as the objectives and associated strategies needed to accomplish that goal. The objectives and strategies are organized in an implementation matrix that includes a priority for each objective representing a ranking by City staff, the Plan Steering Committee, and consultant.

The priorities for objectives in all chapters range from one (1) to six (6), with one (1) being the highest priority and six (6) being the lowest priority. Generally, those objectives which are ranked as priority one (1) or two (2) are to be implemented with the next two (2) years. Those with higher scores should be implemented within three (3) to five (5) or even six (6) or more years. The implementation matrix also includes potential cost and potential staff hours to complete.

A timeframe is provided which outlines how long each strategy could take to accomplish, once undertaken. Finally, responsible organizations, the City as well as other government agencies, as well as housing partners, mainly non-profit organizations, are listed as the entities needed to accomplish each strategy.

Example Objective and Strategies:

In order to accomplish the housing rehabilitation goal, a combination of objectives and strategies will need to be implemented. In addition, objectives and strategies from other chapters could be relevant to those listed here. For instance, many of the funding objectives and strategies in Chapter 4 are complementary to the strategies listed in the implementation matrix for this chapter. One objective in this chapter is:

Example Objective: Expand existing and establish additional home rehabilitation programs.

The implementation matrix lists four (4) strategies which can be used to achieve this objective. Integral to each of these strategies is the matching of eligible activities to potential funds from different sources in order to maximize the potential of each rehabilitation program.

Disclaimer

The complete list of strategies is located at the end of the Chapter. These are sample strategies with added detail.

Housing Rehabilitation Goal:

To provide direction, assistance, and incentives which encourage the rehabilitation of houses which are needed to satisfy the existing and future housing demand for a range of housing types and income levels.

Example Objective and Strategies:

In order to accomplish the housing rehabilitation goal, a combination of objectives and strategies will need to be implemented. In addition, objectives and strategies from other chapters could be relevant to those listed here. For instance, many of the funding objectives and strategies in Chapter 4 are complementary to the strategies listed in the implementation matrix for this chapter. One objective in this chapter is:

Example Objective: Expand existing and establish additional home rehabilitation programs.

The implementation matrix lists four (4) strategies which can be used to achieve this objective. Integral to each of these strategies is the matching of eligible activities to potential funds from different sources in order to maximize the potential of each rehabilitation program.

Disclaimer

The complete list of strategies is located at the end of the Chapter. These are sample strategies with added detail.
Example Strategy: Expand the City’s existing income-based rehabilitation fund.

The first strategy under this objective is to expand the City’s existing income-based rehabilitation fund by seeking additional funding. The City’s current rehabilitation fund is a revolving loan fund which offers rehabilitation loans to eligible residents for necessary improvements and repairs of the owner or renter-occupied homes, including: roof repair, siding windows, plumbing, and general improvements. The fund also includes down payment and closing cost assistance. Expanding the number of funds available under this program or providing funds in conjunction with other funding programs would allow for a greater number of applicants to receive funding and potentially allow for larger loans needed for larger projects. The following is a list of potential funding sources which could be used to expand the existing program:

- Local Tax Increment Financing (TIF) funds could be allocated towards this program through utilization of the affordable housing extension provision.
- HUD HOME rehabilitation funding could be sought through direct application to HUD, or a housing partner such as Southwestern Wisconsin CAP can be used as a sub-recipient to receive and administer the HOME funds. HUD HOME funding can also be acquired on a re-occurring basis, without the need to apply every year, if the City were to become a member of the HUD HOME consortium formed by Grant County and other participating jurisdictions. These funds could also potentially be used as grant funds.
- The USDA single-family housing guaranteed loan program could also be used to supplement the current fund provided the home rehabilitation is being done in conjunction with the purchase of an existing dwelling.
- Supplemental funding for the existing City rehabilitation fund could also be gained through local financial institutions, such as Clare Bank, Mound City Bank, and First National Bank, seeking to comply with Community Reinvestment Act requirements. However, these funds would be restricted to eligible Census tracts.

Example City/Project

City of La Crosse, Wisconsin – Housing Rehabilitation Loan Program

- Homeowners can receive up to $35,000 to repair items like roofing, siding, windows, electrical wiring, and other elements.
- Loan amounts are determined based on the equity in the home and the extent of repairs that may be required to bring the home up to the City of La Crosse Code and to satisfy HUD Housing Quality Standards.
- The loan is a 1% deferred loan, and the recipient makes no payments until the property is sold or no longer their place of residence.
- Must be a City of La Crosse resident, meet income requirements, own and have equity in your home.

Example Objective and Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
<th>Housing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand Existing and Establish Additional Home</td>
<td>Expand existing income-based home rehabilitation fund with supplemental</td>
<td>$50,000* + $200,000 initial year investment</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners/State Agencies</td>
<td>Neighborhood Housing Services of Southwest Wisconsin/Southwestern Wisconsin CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Programs</td>
<td>funding from TIF funds, HUD, USDA and other funding sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Households above the income requirements may qualify if they live in low-income neighborhoods. This program may be combined with any other program.

**Waupaca County – Purchase/Repair – Loans/Grants.**

• County uses the USDA 504 program to make low-interest loans for those making less than 50% of the area median income and who live in rural areas who need to rehabilitate a home.

• This program also allows for grants to assist with accessibility renovations for those 62 years and older.

County also uses the USDA 502 program to provide low-income applicants with payment assistance when buying a home in order to reduce the mortgage payment for a short time.
Example Strategy: Establish partnerships and supplement non-income based home rehabilitation partner programs which assist persons with additional needs, such as seniors, disabled persons, and veterans.

The second strategy under this objective is to establish a home rehabilitation fund which is not income-based but is based upon those with special circumstances, such as seniors, those with disabilities and veterans. The fund could operate independently or be used to leverage and match funding from other sources. The following is a list of potential funding sources which could be used to establish a special needs housing rehabilitation program:

- **Movin’ Out** provides a range of housing solutions, including home rehabilitation, to adults with disabilities and to families that include children with disabilities. Eligible persons would include those people who have permanent developmental, physical, sensory, medical or mental health disabilities, or a combination of impairments, that make them eligible for long-term care services. City funds could be used to supplement funding received through this organization.

- **Rural Housing Inc.** seeks grant funding and volunteer support to provide home repairs for senior households a range of eligible repairs and additions, such as leaky faucets, porch railings, grab bars, and accessibility ramps. Coordination with this organization and matching funds from the City could be used to access this organization’s resources and provide additional home rehabilitation for seniors. Rural Housing Inc. also runs a veteran’s assistance home rehabilitation program at the County level. Platteville could solicit Grant County to work with this organization and others to seek funding for veteran housing rehabilitation assistance.

- **CommonBond Communities** was formed in 1971 with the ambition to create affordable housing options for all. They represent one of the most effective affordable housing providers in the upper Midwest, with properties across Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin. Their model includes providing naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH), as well as negotiating real estate transactions for new construction and other developments. They have more than 7,000 rental apartments and townhomes across 56 cities. CommonBond Communities preserves, builds, and manages apartments and townhomes while providing life-changing resident services. Their homes with services help adults get and keep jobs; children succeed in school and bolster independent living and lifelong learning for seniors and people with special needs.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
<th>Housing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand Existing and Establish Additional Home Rehabilitation Programs</strong></td>
<td>Establish partnerships, provide supplemental funds to partner programs, or seek funding to establish City program to promote non-income-based home rehabilitation which assist persons with additional needs, such as seniors, persons with disabilities, and veterans</td>
<td>$50,000* + $200,000 initial year investment</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners/State Agencies</td>
<td>Neighborhood Housing Services of Southwest Wisconsin/Movin’ Out/Rural Housing, Inc./CommonBond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example Strategy: Establish a non-income-based home rehabilitation program in designated eligible funding areas

The third strategy under this objective is to establish a non-income-based home rehabilitation program in designated eligible funding areas. This program could also be limited to a duplex to single-family conversion program if seen as a higher priority than a typical rehabilitation program. The following is a list of potential funding sources which could be used to establish a designated area home rehabilitation fund program:

- Program funding for a non-income-based rehabilitation fund could be gained through local financial institutions, such as Clare Bank, Mound City Bank, and First National Bank, seeking to comply with Community Reinvestment Act requirements. However, these funds would be restricted to eligible Census tracts.

- The Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SWWRPC) is designated as coordinator for the Economic Development Administration (EDA) Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for this region, which includes Platteville. The City could propose rehabilitation funding for workforce housing as a CEDS strategy. The funding would most likely be restricted to designated Census tracts.

- Local employers could also be asked to be a funding partner, particularly if restricted to their own employers. Ideally, funding from other sources would be secured to show the local employers are part of the partnership and not asked to support a rehabilitation program on their own.

Example City/Project

City of Madison - Mansion Hill-James Madison Park Neighborhood & Greenbush Housing Renovation Small Cap TIF Loan Program

- Forgivable loan program for purchase and/or renovation of the current rental property and convert to owner-occupied.

- Forgivable loan.

- No more than 3 dwelling units.

- One unit as borrower’s principal residence.

- Land use restriction agreement.

- No income limits.

- No interest or debt service payments – principal is forgiven once work is done.

Example Objective and Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
<th>Housing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand Existing and Establish Additional Home Rehabilitation Programs</td>
<td>Establish a non-income-based home rehabilitation and/or duplex to single-family conversion program in target neighborhoods, funded by TIF funds, Financial Institution seeking CRA credit, EDA programs, potential RDA funds, other organizational funds, and local employers</td>
<td>$75,000* + $200,000 initial year investment</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners/State Agencies</td>
<td>Neighborhood Housing Services of Southwest Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Annual Cost
City of Wausau - Fix it up
- Loans to rehabilitate multi-unit buildings into fewer units.
- Owner-occupied program. If “flipper” must repay the loan when selling.
- Restrictive covenants.
- Up to $75,000 loan at 1% interest for repairs/modifications.
- City Housing inspection provided.
- No income guidelines, repayment terms based on affordability.
- The city budgeted $500,000.

The City of Mount Pleasant, MI - Owner Occupied Residential Incentive Program
- The city allocated $100,000 to provide incentives to purchase and convert rentals back to single-family owner-occupied homes.
- The program provided 5%-8% of purchase price, up to $10,000-$16,000, for the purchase of rental.
- Applied within delineated target neighborhoods.
- No longer accepting applications.

City of Green Bay – Conversion Grant Program
- This program grants an owner up to $10,000 to restore a multifamily property to its original single-family use. This program also encourages home ownership by offering an extra $5,000 deferred payment loan to those individuals that are owner occupants.
- The structure must have originally been constructed as a single-family home.
- Applicant must provide, at a minimum, 75 percent private rehabilitation investment for each 25 percent of conversion grant, with a maximum grant of $10,000.

City of Carbondale, IL – Single Family Housing Conversion Program
- $5,000 grants to home buyers of existing rental houses.
- Housing inspections provided, permit fees waived.
- Covenant on the property for 10 years.

City of Elgin, IL – Multi-Family/Residential Conversion Grant
- Provide funding to convert non-conforming multiple-unit residences back to original use.
- Compensates property owners for work required as well as loss of rental income following conversion.
- Provides up to $25,000 to $30,000 for conversions.
- Located within Census tracts that qualify as low-income and overcrowded.

The City of St. Cloud, MN – Core Neighborhood Rental Property Conversion Program
- Interest-free and payment free loan up to $20,000, paid back at the time of sale.
- No income limits.
- Must be within the core neighborhood.
- Must be a rental property.
- Funds can be for interior or exterior improvements.
- Must meet Historic Preservation Commission standards.
- Administered by Housing and Redevelopment Authority.
Example Strategy: Establish City-managed purchase, rehab or convert, and resell program to assist local housing actors.

The fourth strategy under this objective is to establish City-managed purchase, rehab or convert, and resell program to assist local housing partners, builders, investors, and homebuyers to increase the supply of available workforce housing. The City would find funding and other methods of acquiring housing which would otherwise not be rehabilitated due to cost or interest. As part of this program, the City could also include a City-Administered Home Improvement Contractors Program to give potential buyers/rehabbers confidence in going through a rehabilitation process. Other partners, such as Habitat for Humanity and The following is a list of potential funding sources which could be used to establish a designated area City-lead home rehabilitation fund program:

- Establishing a Community Development Corporation (CDC) would help the City work with housing partners to pursue additional funding. Community development corporations (CDCs) are 501(c)(3) non-profit organizations that are created to support and revitalize communities, which includes development and rehabilitation of affordable housing. CDCs often work with local governments; however, they are not considered a government entity. They are generally set up and run by community members or local groups like churches and civic associations. As non-profit institutions, CDCs are tax-exempt and may receive unlimited donations and grants from private and public sources. A significant portion of their funds generally come from local, state and federal grants, such as the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Community Development Block Grant.

- CDCs can receive funding from philanthropic foundations like the Ford Foundation and the Surdna Foundation. Importantly, CDCs may also apply for funding through intermediary organizations like the Local Initiative Support Corporation and NeighborWorks America.

- Another source of funding could come from the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (CDFI). To support emerging community development financial institutions, the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, or CDFI Fund, was established by the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994. The CDFI Fund’s purpose is to promote economic revitalization and community development in low income communities through investment in and assistance to CDFIs. CDFIs can be banks, credit unions, loan funds, microloan funds, or venture capital providers. CDFIs can assist with housing construction, rehabilitation and neighborhood revitalization. Communities can access funding through existing CDFIs or through CDCs that have gained Community Development Entity (CDE) certification.

- Another source of funding could come from FHLBanks. FHLBanks have awarded more than $5.8 billion which have assisted in the purchase, construction or rehabilitation of more than 865,000 units of affordable housing. The FHLBanks’ Affordable Housing Program (AHP) has become one of the most successful and valuable private sources of funding for the financing and building of affordable housing in the United States. The AHP was created by Congress in the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement
Act of 1989 and began operations in 1990. The AHP is designed to address local housing needs. It is administered regionally by each FHLBank, working through its financial institution members and those members' community-based partners. Such community-based partners can include local Community Development Corporations (CDCs).

- An AHP applicant must first coordinate through an FHLBank member financial institution to apply for the grant program. The AHP provides FHLBank member institutions the opportunity to partner with local developers and community organizations seeking to build and renovate housing for low- to moderate-income households. The AHP allows for funds to be used in combination with other programs and to support projects serving a wide range of community affordable housing needs. Many projects are designed for seniors, the disabled, homeless families, first-time homeowners and others with limited resources or special needs.

- Expanding the Platteville Redevelopment Authority scope and boundary could provide needed funding for purchase and rehabilitation for a larger area of the City.

- Local financial institutions, such as Clare Bank, Mound City Bank, and First National Bank, seeking to comply with Community Reinvestment Act requirements could be solicited to donate, or sell at a reduced cost, any foreclosed homes or other real estate owned (OREO) to increase the supply of homes to the program.

### City of Milwaukee – Ready-To-Go-Homes

- READY-TO-GO-HOMES are available under the City of Milwaukee’s Strong Neighborhoods Plan and the Milwaukee Challenge Fund. This initiative represents a partnership between the City of Milwaukee, the Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee and Riverworks – working together to improve homes and neighborhoods.

- Homes are fully renovated homes in the Harambee neighborhood. Homes are “move in” ready and may include a new roof, furnace, water heater interior, and exterior improvements.

### Example Objective and Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
<th>Housing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand Existing and Establish Additional Home Rehabilitation Programs</strong></td>
<td>Establish a City-managed purchase, rehab or convert, and resell program in conjunction with housing partners and potential RDA funding to assist local housing partners, builders, investors and homebuyers to increase the supply of available workforce housing</td>
<td>$50,000* + $200,000 initial year investment</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners</td>
<td>Neighborhood Housing Services of Southwest Wisconsin/Habitat for Humanity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Milwaukee – Home Improvement Contractors Program

- City licensed contractors can apply
- Work is reimbursed by segment done and City inspects work. Permits, lead pipe testing, waivers of lien required
- Escrowed rehabilitation funds held by City yet contracts are between the property owner and contractor – NIDC facilities inspection and payment processes. Funds are paid by the homeowner into an escrow account and the City reimburses the contractor from the escrow account.
- Contracts range between $10,000-$30,000

City of Milwaukee – ROOTS Landscaping Incentive Program

$500 landscaping cash award - exclusively for City-owned properties sold to owner occupants. Priority should be given to the front yard.
## Chapter 2: Housing Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Funding Districts</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Potential Staff Hours</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
<th>Housing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand Existing and Establish Additional Home Rehabilitation Programs</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Expand existing income-based home rehabilitation fund with supplemental funding from TIF funds, HUD, USDA and other funding sources</td>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>$50,000* + $200,000 initial year investment</td>
<td>20 &amp; 20*</td>
<td>&lt;2 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners/State Agencies</td>
<td>Neighborhood Housing Services of Southwest Wisconsin/Southwestern Wisconsin CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish partnerships, provide supplemental funds to partner programs, or seek funding to establish City program to promote non-income-based home rehabilitation which assist persons with additional needs, such as seniors, persons with disabilities, and veterans</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>$50,000* + $200,000 initial year investment</td>
<td>20 &amp; 20*</td>
<td>&lt;2 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners/State Agencies</td>
<td>Neighborhood Housing Services of Southwest Wisconsin/Movin’ Out/Rural Housing, Inc./CommonBond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a non-income-based home rehabilitation and/or duplex to single-family conversion program in target neighborhoods, funded by TIF funds, financial institution seeking CRA credit, EDA programs, potential RDA funds, other organizational funds, and local employers</td>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>$75,000* + $200,000 initial year investment</td>
<td>80 &amp; 80*</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners/State Agencies</td>
<td>Neighborhood Housing Services of Southwest Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a City-managed purchase, rehab or convert, and resell program in conjunction with housing partners and potential RDA funding to assist local housing partners, builders, investors and homebuyers to increase the supply of available workforce housing</td>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>$50,000* + $200,000 initial year investment</td>
<td>20 &amp; 20*</td>
<td>&lt;2 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners</td>
<td>Neighborhood Housing Services of Southwest Wisconsin/Habitat for Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourage home rehabilitation through acquisition of code violation, unhealthy, foreclosed, and/or abandoned properties</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Develop a raze or repair policy and procedures to require dilapidated properties to be repaired or demolished if repair not feasible</td>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with housing partners to acquire abandoned and distressed properties as part of a neighborhood revitalization strategy</td>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners</td>
<td>National Community Stabilization Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solicit donation or reduced purchase price for City acquisition of foreclosed homes owned by financial institutions needing CRA credit</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>&lt;2 yrs</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Clare Bank, Mound City Bank, First National Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create policy and procedures which coordinate municipal code enforcement with County health department</td>
<td>1,5,6,7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City/County</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protect existing housing stock from further rental conversion</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extend Limited Occupancy Residential Overlay (R-LO) to additional areas of the City</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt;2 yrs</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand existing development authority initiatives</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Expand Redevelopment Authority revolving loan fund to include mixed-use rehabilitation, including conversion of SF homes to office/living</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt;2 yrs</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Underutilized Space Improvement grant program, similar to Curb-Appeal grant program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt;2 yrs</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand Main Street Program initiatives</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expand Main Street Program initiatives to include assistance for SF home conversion to office/living in designated mixed use areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Expand Historic Preservation Commission Efforts</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pursue historic preservation funding to establish historic grant and/or revolving loan fund to fund housing rehabilitation in historic district(s)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City/State Agencies - WHS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3: Infill Construction & New Development
Introduction

This chapter focuses on the construction of housing units for smaller infill lots as well as for larger “greenfield” lots. Infill lots are depicted in the Growth Analysis section of Chapter 1 and can be found scattered through the City. They range in size and configuration and offer opportunities for small-scale builders, individuals, and non-profit housing partners to provide housing in existing neighborhoods. Larger “greenfield” lots can also be found through the City, with large properties already zoned residential and located at the edges of the City limits. However, a large number of potential housing development sites can be found along Highway 151 which are not zoned residential but are proposed for mixed-use in the Platteville Comprehensive Plan.

Chapter 1 provides the overarching municipal actions that the City of Platteville can undertake in order to set the stage for the construction of infill housing as well as for new housing developments. Chapter 1 advocates for smaller lots sizes, allowances for different housing types within existing zoning classifications and planning for larger developments with a mix of housing types, price points, and land uses as well.

This chapter explores the goal of further encouraging infill housing construction as well as larger housing development construction. The objectives and strategies in this chapter address the infill and housing development construction needs, opportunities and challenges identified through analysis of survey data, housing market data and stakeholder input. The objectives and strategies in this chapter seek to fulfill the chapter goal and provide objectives and strategies to accomplish that goal.

Recent Housing Projects

The City has recently permitted a number of multi-family projects which are supplying the rental market with student housing and market-rate apartments. The City has also seen single-family subdivisions platted in recent years, with ready-to-build lots available.

Newman Heights

- This project consists of 46 units that were recently permitted in 2018.
- Located at 185 S Hickory Street, Newman Heights supplies new fully-furnished 4 bedrooms 2 bathroom apartments and Studio apartments suited for University students. Located across the street from the University, it helps to meet the rental demand for this demographic.

Rountree Commons

- Rountree Commons, named after the founder of Platteville-Major John Rountree, is another apartment complex suited for University students.
• Located at 800 S Chestnut Street, it was opened in 2012 and can accommodate 620 students. The apartments are a suite-style layout with double occupancy and onsite amenities.

• Other public areas include a game room, TV area, fitness center, media room, classroom and laundry room.

Twin Pines Apartments
• This project was permitted 2012 and consists of 48 market-rate units. Located at 275 Waite Lane, this apartment complex is close to everything and features one (1), two (2) and three (3) bedroom units with locked storage area and garage. This was developed as part of the Cedar Hills condominium subdivision.

Cedar Hills Condominium Subdivision
• The Cedar Hills development is a 16-lot single-family subdivision with three (3) built single-family homes and ready-to-build lots.

• The subdivision is marketed towards young Universities staff and families. The development is also marketed towards a large number of retirees who leave the area in the winter in search of warmer weather.

Other recent apartments
• Dodge House Apartments, permitted in 2011 with 48 units

• Washington Place Apartments also permitted in 2011 with 39 units.

Keystone Estates
• The Estates at Keystone is a recent 27 lot subdivision offering ready-to-build lots. The subdivision has a private playground and connections to the Rountree Branch Trail. All the lots at Estates at Keystone are within walking distance from banks, shopping, and restaurants. Multi-family residential is allowed in this development as well.
**Recent Housing Projects Guiding Observations**

- Recent apartments directed towards University students have provided a number of rental options for this segment of the population in recent years. Additional new student housing is not seen as a pressing priority at this time. However, additional market-rate apartments would be able to supplement the University student housing supply if apartments could be built close to campus or on a bus line.

- Few general market-rate apartments have been developed in recent years and some of those units are directed towards university students and not necessarily young professionals or young families. Recent units are located closer to the city center with no units located near the Highway 151 shopping center. More apartment unit construction would complement recent student, senior, and income assisted units and appeal to a wider range of renters.

- Recent single-family subdivision lot developments are currently underutilized, with many lots remaining on the market. The high cost of construction is a likely cause for the number of available lots. Larger lots with associated higher land costs are another likely cause. In order to encourage more building activity, the City could undertake a purchase/build program, if funds from other sources, such as local employers, could be utilized to encourage construction.

- Another approach towards reviving single-family lot subdivisions which are not selling is to amend the Planned Development Zoning to allow for greater lot size and housing type flexibility. Certain lots could then be targeted for consolidation for multi-family projects or subdivided for smaller lots or zero-lot-line housing.

**Survey Data**

An online survey was conducted at the beginning of the housing study in order to gather public input in a more confidential manner than at a public meeting. Survey responses yielded a number of important observations which are used in comparison to Census and other data analysis to provide a full picture of the housing market in Platteville. A complete summary of the survey results can be found in Appendix A. The following lists important observations from the survey results which are relevant to this Chapter;

**Survey Data Guiding Observations**

- The percentage of those living in a home with two (2) bedrooms is higher than the percentage of those with four (4) or five (5) household members, resulting in almost half of respondents either looking to buy a new home or unsure if they will stay in their current home, to accommodate family size.

- A majority of respondents are looking for a single-family home with three (3) bedrooms. However, almost half of those looking to purchase a new home only want to spend between $100k and $174k.

- A significant number of those looking to purchase cited lack of down payment as a barrier to purchasing as well as lack of desired available housing type.

- The majority of respondents believe the City needs more affordable homes for first-time buyers and the local workforce.
Chapter 3: Infill Construction and New Development

Housing Market Assessment & Projections

Studying the demographic changes in Platteville identified a number of infill and new construction opportunities and challenges for the near, medium and long term. Overall demographic data can be found in Appendix B and an analysis of demographics and housing market assessment data specific to this chapter can be found in Appendix C. The data and analysis from both Appendices highlights a number of important observations, including:

Housing Market & Housing Projections Guiding Observations

- Household consolidation is leading to larger households with more children, seniors and non-family members present in the household.

- Fewer seniors are seen living alone; however, seniors not alone and downsizing will require housing with less maintenance and good accessibility.

- School enrollment is up for those in elementary and middle school, which will put pressure on households and families to find larger homes as those kids begin demanding their own bedrooms.

- Homeowner vacancy rates are extremely low and newer rentals in good condition are difficult to find, especially three (3) bedrooms.

- Owner-occupied housing in the $125,000 to $187,499 range is over-supplied by 165 units; however, with very low vacancy rates homeowners are not putting these homes on the market. This likely due to a lack of availability at the higher price points.

- Owner-occupied housing in the $187,500 to $249,000 range is also over-supplied, but only by a slim 53 unit margin. Building more homes in this range should give homeowners in lower brackets a chance to upsize and increase the number of homes for sale in the below $187,500 range.

- Renter-occupied housing affordable to those households in the lower $25,000 to $49,999 income range is considerable over-supplied at 480 excess units in the $625 to $1,249 rent range. However, much of this could likely be attributed to college-rentals.

- Renter-occupied housing affordable for those households in the $50,000 to $74,999 income range is nearly balanced with only 35 excess units in the $1,250 to $1,874 rent range. However, there is a shortage of units at the higher rent range.

- Housing projections show an immediate need for owner-occupied multi-family homes, such as townhomes, and single-family homes to achieve a healthy vacancy rate of 3.5%.

- There is also future demand through 2023 for additional owner-occupied multi-family homes and single-family homes, with little demand for apartments. However, there is medium and long-term need through 2028 and 2033 for more apartments as well as owner-occupied townhomes and other attached housing types.
Stakeholder Interviews

Stakeholder interviews were also conducted at the beginning of the housing study in order to gather input from housing and housing industry-related professionals in a workshop atmosphere where different housing market factors could be discussed in detail. Stakeholder input yielded a number of important observations which are used in comparison to survey results as well as Census and other data analysis to provide a full picture of the housing market in Platteville. The following lists the stakeholder observations which are relevant to this Chapter.

Realtors
- Local contractors are willing to build homes on vacant lots but would need to be gifted the land or have a discount on the land due to high construction costs.
- Employers are drawing in people, but most of them do not qualify and do not want to live in subsidized housing.
- Senior housing is making a comeback, seeing more demand.
- Those looking to move from a 2 bedroom to a 3 bedroom are struggling. They do not want to spend more than $250,000 and there is not much supply at that price point.
- Many sellers are looking to downsize as well. However, they are looking at condominiums and multi-family units.
- Many sellers are older and want to sell their existing house and buy a condo in the City and a condo in Florida or Arizona.

Landlords
- Rents are extremely high in Platteville because of college student demand. This is having an effect on working professionals looking for a rental.
- There is not enough for-sale inventory and almost nothing in the $180,000 to $260,000 range.
- There is a wide range of tenants looking to rent. There are low-income people, college students, and professionals looking for high-end rentals.
- Renting has become riskier and landlords are demanding a premium for the risk.

Builder/Developers
- Senior housing is needed. Seniors are looking to rent and to buy.

Financial Institutions
- Large demand from younger people, but they are struggling to afford anything over $180,000.
- One-story homes sell the quickest and are in the most demand.
- There is some demand for smaller homes, some are downsizing.

University of Wisconsin—Platteville
- For those without families, one bedroom rental units, in particular, are very hard to find.
- Homes under $150,000 are in high demand. Duplexes seem expensive to purchase but affordable to rent.
- Faculty townhomes or rowhouses could be a good solution for rental or purchase.
- Ideal housing for those looking to downsize would be a 1,100 sq. ft. condominium on 1-story, prices at about $130,000 to $140,000. Having a basement for storage would be ideal.

Lost Prospects
- One (1) and two (2) bedroom single-family houses were difficult to find during the house search.
- For singles or those without children, a two (2) bedroom and two (2) bathroom house would have been preferred.
• Young professionals are willing to rent for a limited time but ultimately feel the need to make an investment and want to buy sooner than later. Also, expensive rentals lessen the length of time professionals are willing to rent.

**Stakeholder Guiding Observations**

• Local contractors are willing to build homes on vacant lots but will need to be able to purchase lots at low or no cost in order to compensate for high construction costs. Some type of government incentive or assistance will be necessary to encourage infill housing by builders or by non-profits.

• Senior housing is making a comeback, realtors seeing more demand. However, seniors are looking for smaller, more affordable homes and are looking to both rent and buy.

• Sellers are looking to downsize as well and are looking at multi-family attached units as an option.

• There is a wide range of tenants looking to rent, including young couples saving to buy a home, low-income people, college students, and professionals looking for high-end rentals.

• There is a large demand from younger people to buy a first-time home, but they are struggling to afford anything over $180,000. There is some demand for smaller homes, some are downsizing and looking at one (1) and two (2) bedrooms.

• Townhomes could be a good solution for University staff as well as other young professionals, especially if newly constructed units could become available for rentals in the medium-term.
Infill Construction and New Development

Goals and Strategies

This section includes an overall goal as well as the objectives and associated strategies needed to accomplish that goal. The objectives and strategies are organized in an implementation matrix that includes a priority for each objective representing a ranking by City staff, the Plan Steering Committee, and consultant.

The priorities for objectives in all chapters range from one (1) to six (6), with one (1) being the highest priority and six (6) being the lowest priority. Generally, those objectives which are ranked as priority one (1) or two (2) are to be implemented with the next two (2) years. Those with higher scores should be implemented within three (3) to five (5) or even six (6) or more years. The implementation matrix also includes potential cost and potential staff hours to complete.

A timeframe is provided which outlines how long each strategy could take to accomplish, once undertaken. Finally, the responsible organizations, such as the City, other government agencies and non-profit or for-profit housing partners are listed as the entities needed to accomplish each strategy.

Example Objective and Strategy:

In order to accomplish the infill construction and new housing developments goal, a combination of objectives and strategies will need to be implemented. In addition, objectives and strategies from other chapters could be relevant to those listed here. For instance, many of the funding objectives and strategies in Chapter 4 are complementary to the strategies listed in the implementation matrix for this chapter. Contacting relevant State Agencies and housing partners for assistance in seeking funding will allow the housing construction strategies to be implemented with less direct funding from the City and more funding from other sources.
Example Objective: Increase the supply and utilization of available land.  

The implementation matrix lists a number of strategies which can be used to achieve this objective. One strategy in particular, “Develop new home construction program which provides financial assistance to builders, non-profits, and investors participating in the City’s land banking program to build homes on acquired parcels” provides an example of a strategy which is proactive and involves significant City initiative which utilizes a number of housing partners and funding resources.

Disclaimer

The complete list of strategies is located at the end of the Chapter. Enclosed is a sample strategy with additional detail.

Example Strategy: Develop new home construction program which provides financial assistance to builders, non-profits, and investors participating in the City’s land banking program to build homes on acquired parcels.

This strategy includes the following steps:

- Implement the strategies under the “Encourage housing construction through site preparation assistance” objective to ensure lots are being sold or donated which do not have hidden environmental concerns.
- Apply for HUD HOME funding directly to HUD or as part of a HUD HOME consortium to acquire lots for income-restricted home construction.
- Establish a Community Development Corporation (CDC) to help the City work with housing partners to pursue Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (CDFI) funding.
- Expand the Platteville Redevelopment Authority scope and boundary to provide needed funding for construction assistance.
- Funding could also be sought from local financial institutions, such as Clare Bank, Mound City Bank, and First National Bank, seeking to comply with Community Reinvestment Act requirements. However, these funds would be restricted to eligible Census tracts.
- Implement the other strategies under this objective to ensure a supply of lots is made available to the program.
- Housing partners, such as Habitat for Humanity and Neighborhood Housing Services of Wisconsin would be valuable partners in finding funding as well as customers of the program will to buy lots and build homes.

Example Objective and Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
<th>Housing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase supply and utilization of available land and proactively encourage home construction</td>
<td>Develop City-led new home construction program in conjunction with housing partners and potential RDA funding which provides financial assistance to builders, non-profits, and investors participating in the City’s land banking program to build homes on acquired parcels</td>
<td>$350,000*</td>
<td>City/State Agencies/Housing Partners</td>
<td>Neighborhood Housing Services of Southwest Wisconsin/Habitat for Humanity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example City/Project

City of Green Bay – New Homes in Your Neighborhood (NYIYN)

- The program provides funding to construct a single-family home for owner occupancy on existing neighborhood infill sites owned by the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Green Bay.

- Available parcels listed on a website and can be utilized in various ways, from new development to the expansion of neighboring parcels and can range in price from free to market-rate.

- Applicants must submit a proposal in response to RDA RFP to purchase a lot.

- For construction, individuals or builder/developers must complete the RDA application process and submit a construction plan and providing adequate proof of funding for the project.

- An applicant may apply for a 60-day planning option to complete due diligence in obtaining construction plans, gathering financing and completing any other necessary research.

- The final structure must be an owner-occupied single-family home.

- Design and character must fit that of the neighborhood as approved by staff.

- Each parcel in the program is eligible for a grant of up to $20,000. (Amount of grant dependent on parcel selected).

- No income restrictions on person/person building or occupying the home.

- Forgivable recorded, second mortgage loan at 0% interest.

- No interest, no payments.

- The loan will be forgiven at closing of the construction loan and can be utilized at first construction draws.

- The second mortgage will be satisfied upon receipt of Certificate of Occupancy.
## Strategy: Infill Construction and New Development

### Objective: Encourage housing construction through site preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$350,000*</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$300,000 +</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$200,000+</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective: Directly provide off-site and on-site improvements, grant loan and construction guarantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective: Create off-site, and on-site improvements grant loan program to encourage housing construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective: Increase supply and utilization of available land and parcel assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5 yr</td>
<td>City/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Funding Districts</td>
<td>Potential Cost</td>
<td>Potential Staff Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Main Street Program initiatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expand Main Street Program initiatives to include assistance for construction of new mixed-use projects which include housing Initiate partnership between Main Street Program and Redevelopment Authority and/or Housing Authority and/or new Community Development Authority to develop mixed-use projects which include housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactively work with developers and investors to build identified housing projects on target properties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identify and assess potential target housing sites &amp; list potential incentives and cost for each site Amend existing Planned Unit Developments to allow for greater flexibility regarding lot size and housing types for single-family lot developments which are not selling Prepare site proposal packets for target sites, including any PSA and/or environmental assessment and/or remediation Report, and distribute to developers and other potential project partners</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4: Funding Initiatives
Introduction

This chapter provides guidance towards increasing the utilization of funding sources to increase the capacity of the City to engage in housing programs and initiatives. Platteville has a solid history of providing rehabilitation assistance, establishing partnerships to develop income-assisted and other housing projects, and providing rental assistance through the Housing Authority. However, in order to accomplish the goals, objectives, and strategies of the previous chapter, additional funding sources will be needed. This chapter looks at survey data, housing market data, stakeholder input, and the potential eligibility and opportunities for specific districts within the City in order to provide a full assessment of potential funding needs and sources.

Throughout this chapter, housing issues and opportunities will often be defined in terms of affordability. There are many methods of defining the term "affordable" and it is important to be clear on how this term is defined. Many Federal, State, and local programs use family income as a method of determining affordability and will base program assistance on how family incomes compare to the average or median family income for a local area. These comparisons can include the terms "moderate income", "low income" and "very low income" to describe the income of families eligible for government assistance. Generally, these terms address families whose income is either slightly lower than the local area average, "moderate income", considerably lower than the local area average, "low income", or those near the poverty level, "very low income." This study will use these terms when discussing housing issues and often in the context of the level of potential government housing assistance which may be needed.

In addition, many affordable housing advocates will use the term "workforce housing." This generally describes housing for working persons and families who may have incomes ranging from slightly lower than the average local area income to slightly higher than the local area average income. These are people who work in the local community, make decent wages, yet may not be able to afford to live near their work and may have to commute from outside the community. As these people make significant contributions to the local economy, it is important to provide housing for them so that they can live and work in the same community.

This chapter refers to "workforce housing" when addressing housing issues for the local workforce and often in the context of potential housing opportunities and solutions to those issues, but not necessarily in need of direct government assistance or subsidies. Therefore, the term "affordable" can refer to the housing which is needed for families with lower than average incomes as well as housing which is sought after by those who may have near-average incomes, yet may still not be able to afford a place to live in the local community.
Recent Affordable Housing Projects

The City has recently permitted some affordable multi-family projects which are supplying the rental market income restricted apartments and multi-family units. Platteville has also recently permitted senior-oriented multi-family units which offer a continuum of care option for older residents.

Ruxton Apartments

This housing project was permitted in 2018 and will have 71 units available in fall of 2019. The multi-family apartment is designed for seniors, disabled persons and 60 units for low to moderate income persons. The property is located at 75 N. Oak Street and is centrally located. The project was developed on the former Pioneer Ford Site and involved a City-led Request for Proposal (RFP) for demolition and redevelopment. The project will also include approximately 5,300 square feet of commercial space.

Villas at Pool Park

This project was permitted in 2015 and has 34 income-restricted units. Located at 1245 N Fourth Street, the Villas at Pool Park is an affordable housing community near the Platteville Family Aquatic Center and Pool Park. The complex is also located near the bus route and offers amenities for both families and retirees. This project is a recent WHEDA monitored Tax Credit Project, so it income-restrictions will not expire for over a decade.

Park Place Senior Living

This project is a relatively newer senior living located at 1100 5th Avenue, adjacent to the Platteville Aquatic Center and Pool Park. The development has age-restricted apartments, assisted living apartments and a memory care facility in a campus setting. Park Place is the result of cooperation between Southwest Health Center and ElderSpan Management. The project features one (1) and two (2) bedroom apartment homes and has 24-hour staff and available medical assistance.

Recent Affordable Housing Projects

Guiding Observations

- Recent income-restricted housing is helping to satisfy the demand for those people and families with low to moderate incomes. The central location of the project allows for easy access to downtown amenities and facilities. However, no assisted-income units have been built near commercial activity centers and potential employers near Highway 151.

- Recent senior housing options are helping to supply senior as well as continuum-of-care options or seniors. The recent campus is near downtown, but not near Southwest Health.
Additional income-restricted and senior projects will be needed in the near and medium term. However, new income-restricted units could be combined with mixed-housing type and mixed-use development near Southwest Health on the eastern side of the City. They could be developed as part a larger project intended to spur development in this section of Platteville. Senior living housing could also fill this role as a catalyst for further development near Southwest and could potentially attract funding from the hospital as well as developer interest.

Survey Data

An online survey was conducted at the beginning of the housing study in order to gather public input in a more confidential manner than at a public meeting. Survey responses yielded a number of important observations which are used in comparison to Census and other data analysis to provide a full picture of the housing market in Platteville. A complete summary of the survey results can be found in Appendix A. The following lists important observations from the survey results which are relevant to this Chapter;

Survey Summary Guiding Observations

- Survey respondents have been with their current employers for a long time. Given the importance of housing to the local healthcare industry and to their employees, companies within this industry may be willing to sponsor and/or fund any workforce housing rehabilitation and/or construction initiatives undertaken by the City.
- Few respondents utilized down-payment assistance when buying their homes and most have a conventional mortgage. However, a number of respondents cited lack of down-payment as the primary barrier to buying a home. Getting more homeowners into the market will most likely have to include greater participation in down-payment assistance than at the levels currently indicated.
- Nearly one (1) in ten (10) respondents receive rental assistance, indicating even greater renter financial need than for homeowners.
- When asked whether they knew of someone in the region struggling to pay housing costs and may be in danger of becoming homeless, 27% responded “yes”, highlighting affordability issues for some.
Housing Market Assessment

Studying the demographic changes in Platteville identified a number of affordable and workforce housing opportunities and challenges for the near, medium and long term. Overall demographic data can be found in Appendix B and an analysis of demographics and housing market assessment data specific to this chapter can be found in Appendix C. The data and analysis from both Appendices highlights a number of important observations, including:

Housing Market Guiding Observations

- The number of residents living below the poverty level in Platteville is high and is not limited to University students, but is also high amongst households with children and seniors.

- The higher levels of poverty, along with lower income levels as well as high housing prices, is resulting in more owner-occupied households to pay more than 30% of their incomes on housing costs than the County or State.

- The higher levels of poverty, along with lower income levels as well as high housing prices, is forcing more renter households to pay more than 30% of their incomes on rent than the County or State. Many renters are forced to pay rent in the higher rent brackets due to lack of desirable rental housing.
Stakeholder Interviews

Stakeholder interviews were also conducted at the beginning of the housing study in order to gather input from housing and housing industry-related professionals in a workshop atmosphere where different housing market factors could be discussed in detail. Stakeholder input yielded a number of important observations which are used in comparison to survey results as well as Census and other data analysis to provide a full picture of the housing market and funding opportunities available to Platteville. The following lists the stakeholder observations which are relevant to this Chapter.

Landlords

- The City Housing Authority is more helpful than federal programs. Federal programs don’t pay enough, rents are too high to make much use of them.

Builder/Developers

- Many low-income units have been built recently and not very well mixed with the market rate or commercial or other types of uses.
- Income restricted housing could work in Platteville for seniors, due to their lower incomes.
- Building market-rate housing for seniors is not really possible due to the high costs of construction.

Financial Institutions

- Buyers are taking advantage of WHEDA loans to make the financing work. WHEDA is no longer for first-time buyers either. However, there is a chance of a tax recapture after 9 years and buyers are using other sources of assistance.
- There is some utilization of USDA loans, especially Rural Development loans. Rural development loans are 100% loans and the younger population is the biggest user.
- There is some utilization of VA loans as well. FHA loans are outsourced, independent shops processing those, not the banks.
- Down Payment Plus (DPP) grants are used as well, up to $6,000, but there are income restrictions.

University of Wisconsin—Platteville

- The faculty is struggling to find housing in Platteville.
- Professors can have one (1) and two (2) year contracts and they would prefer to rent in those cases. However, they prefer rents near $1,000 per month and they often have families.
- Those that do want to buy a house are seeing that housing is difficult to find at their price point. Adjunct faculty salaries are not very high. Maintenance salaries are not very high either.
- The City needs more affordable housing for faculty, including families. Multi-family would be a good short-term solution, but single-family homes would be ideal for the medium-term.
- Many potential faculty and staff buyers would qualify as low to moderate income. However, faculty and staff do not want to live in housing dominated by low income, prefer a mixture of low, moderate and workforce or market-rate housing developments.

Economic Partners

- The Housing Authority is using the Section 8 voucher program. They currently have about 90 to 100 participants at any one time. Limited funding from federal sources limits the number of vouchers that can be issued.
• Tenant income levels for those in need can be higher than qualification levels.
• Administrative restrictions from HUD can be limiting. Cities can be better funded if they utilized a wider range of programs.
• Southwestern Wisconsin Community Action Program (SWCAP) utilizes many programs to assist with affordable housing in Platteville and five (5) counties. They have administered the CDBG revolving loan fund for Platteville since 2006.
• SWCAP assists with owner-occupied rehabilitation loans and homebuyer purchase loans.
• SWCAP is using the Wisconsin DOA Housing Cost Reduction Initiative (HCRI) funds. They are also using HUD HOME funds for home purchase and purchase-rehabilitation. They will combine funds from both sources.
• Home purchase programs are not utilized very much in Platteville.
• Using HUD rehabilitation assistance is problematic because compliance for contractors is too high. Certification and continuing education are required. Lead-safe certification in Platteville is also required.
• There are some grant funds available though, such as USDA 502 program funds.
• There are marketing issues, not enough people know these programs exist.
• New construction is generally out of reach of beneficiaries due to higher price points.
• Permitting adds significant costs to the construction of new units.
• The City should use more of its assets to encourage affordable housing, especially targeting the workforce of potential companies looking to expand or relocate to Platteville.
• The City needs to focus on combining housing development with economic development and utilize more funding resources for this.
• Private investors and public-private partnerships need to be utilized more often as well. Partnering with Southwest Health in a public-private partnership to develop housing would be a good place to start.

Stakeholder Guiding Observations
• City Housing Authority is seen as being helpful to local property investors, more so than many federal programs or other state-funded programs. Expanding the Housing Authority’s capabilities and funding would help to assist a greater proportion of renters, especially those waiting lists for a voucher while making more use of government resources and encouraging greater involvement in HUD programs.
• Recent low-income housing projects built by the City only help a certain segment of the population and are not attractive to a wider range of potential renters, and although they have a mix of market-rate options, there may not be enough available units.
• Any additional low-income housing projects should include a mix of market-rate units and should also target seniors who may qualify.
• Financial institutions are using federal and state homebuyer assistance programs; however, many do not qualify due to income restrictions. Assistance for a greater proportion of homebuyers would be useful and any role the City could play in down-payment or other assistance would be encouraged.
• University staff are increasingly having difficulty buying and renting homes. Some maintenance and faculty staff have the potential to qualify for low-moderate income housing, and
many would be able to afford housing in a mixed-housing type and mixed-income development that offered a wider range of housing options, including townhomes and apartments.

- State funding programs need to be more utilized, with the City mixing funds from different programs, and approaching housing development as an economic development project. Utilization of the housing program non-profit partners could assist with gaining access to more funding. Greater use and leverage of housing program funds could then be used to encourage more private employer participating in City housing efforts and initiatives.

### Funding Districts

In order to better understand how Platteville can better utilize State and Federal housing-related funding programs, this Study has developed a total of eleven (11) different funding districts in order to delineate the various financial and other geographic areas of the City which would be most likely to qualify for funding assistance. Certain financial, demographic and land use characteristics have been mapped and combined to create the funding districts and include: low to moderate income Census Block Groups, opportunity zones, and potential Economic Development Administration (EDA) assistance eligible Block Groups. The funding districts also reference the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, particularly the Proposed Land Use Plan map. Finally, the districts take into account the larger vacant residential and non-residential areas identified in the growth analysis in the previous chapter.

Map 4.1 shows selected Proposed Land Use districts from the 2013 City and Town of Platteville Comprehensive Plan. These areas represent areas with significant development potential and opportunity for public and private investment.

Map 4.2 shows the Census Block groups which have 50 percent of households with incomes below 60 percent of the Area Median Gross Income. This is not a guarantee of eligibility for funding programs; however, these Block Groups do represent areas which have a better chance of qualifying for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and other funding.

Map 4.3 shows the Census Tract submitted by the Wisconsin Governor and defined by the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act as an area meant targeted to spur private investment through tax incentives. This designated Census Tract encourages private investors to invest funds into projects in these areas, including housing projects, which further
economic growth and development. This Opportunity Zone is best coupled with other funding programs, such as HUD funding programs, in order to encourage investment.

Map 4.4 shows Block Groups that have a per capita income of 80 percent or less of the national average. This is one qualification for US Economic Development Administration (EDA) funding and, although not a guarantee of funding, represents good areas to study for potential assistance.

Map 4.5 shows the Funding Districts which represent areas of the City with the particular characteristics associated with the previous maps.

The following is a summary of the characteristics of each area:

**District 1**
- EDA funding potential
- Low- Moderate Income funding potential

**District 2**
- EDA funding potential

**District 3**
- EDA funding potential
- University Property

**District 4**
- EDA funding potential
- Low- Moderate Income funding potential

**District 5**
- EDA funding potential
- Low- Moderate Income potential
- Historic potential
- Downtown Area

**District 6**
- Historic potential
- Vacant Land/Development potential

**District 7**
- EDA funding potential
- Low- Moderate Income funding potential
- Opportunity Zone

**District 8**
- EDA funding potential
- Low- Moderate Income potential
- Opportunity Zone
- Predominantly “Mixed-Use”
- Platteville Proposed Land Use
- Map designation

**District 9**
- EDA funding potential
- Low- Moderate Income potential
- Opportunity Zone
- Predominantly “Manufacturing”
- Platteville Proposed Land Use
- Map designation

**District 10**
- EDA funding potential
- Low- Moderate Income potential
- Opportunity Zone
- Predominantly “Business”
- Platteville Proposed Land Use
- Map designation

**District 11**
- EDA funding potential
- Low- Moderate Income potential
- Opportunity Zone
- Predominantly “Low”, “Medium”, and “High” density residential
- Platteville Proposed Land Use
- Map designation
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Funding Initiatives

Goals and Strategies

This section includes an overall goal as well as the objectives and associated strategies needed to accomplish that goal. The objectives and strategies are organized in an implementation matrix that includes a priority for each objective representing a ranking by City staff, the Plan Steering Committee, and consultant.

The priorities for objectives in all chapters range from one (1) to six (6), with one (1) being the highest priority and six (6) being the lowest priority. Generally, those objectives which are ranked as priority one (1) or two (2) are to be implemented with the next two (2) years. Those with higher scores should be implemented within three (3) to five (5) or even six (6) or more years. The implementation matrix also includes potential cost and potential staff hours to complete.

A timeframe is provided which outlines how long each strategy could take to accomplish, once undertaken. Finally, responsible organizations, the City as well as other government agencies, as well as housing partners, mainly non-profit organizations, are listed as the entities needed to accomplish each strategy.

Funding Initiatives

Goal:

To encourage greater current and future utilization of Local, State, Federal, and other housing-related funding programs in order to encourage the housing rehabilitation and construction projects which result in more affordable housing stock and which provide more financial assistance options to renters and home buyers.

The objective and strategies needed to implement this goal are listed in the Implementation matrix at the end of this chapter. In addition, objectives and strategies from other chapters could be relevant to those listed here. Examples of strategies in greater detail and the municipalities using those strategies are listed in Chapters 2 and 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Funding Districts</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
<th>Potential Staff Hours</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsible Organizations</th>
<th>Housing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand existing development authority initiatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Expand Housing Authority funding and impact by applying directly to DOA or to a new HUD HOME Consortium for Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBR)</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt;2 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners/State Agencies - DOA</td>
<td>Southwestern Wisconsin CAP/Wisconsin Partnership for Housing Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If committees are duplicating work between organizations then consider forming a Community Development Authority by consolidating Redevelopment Authority and Housing Authority (while maintaining any federal funding sources as defined in annual HUD plans)</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt; 2 yrs</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expand Main Street Program initiatives to include assistance for SF home conversion to office/living in designated mixed use areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expand Main Street Program initiatives to include assistance for redevelopment of larger mixed-use properties</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expand Main Street Program initiatives to include assistance for construction of new mixed-use projects which include housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiate partnership between Main Street Program and Redevelopment Authority and/or Housing Authority and/or new Community Development Authority to develop mixed-use projects which include housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiate partnership between Main Street Program, local partners, State agencies, and investor/advisors to pursue funding, including use of New Market Tax Credits (NMTC)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners/State Agencies - WHEDA</td>
<td>Main Street USA/Forward Community Investments/WBD Advantage Fund/Waveland Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Initiate partnerships with local entities, State agencies and investor/advisors to promote affordable housing and/or mixed-use projects in a larger historic area which utilize Historic Tax Credits, New Market Tax Credits, Low Income Housing Tax Credits, and Opportunity Zone investments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>&lt; 2 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners/State Agencies - WHEDA</td>
<td>Forward Community Investments/WBD Advantage Fund/Waveland Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand access to HUD HOME program funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apply to the Department of Administration (DOA) for HUD HOME funds for targeted City housing programs and projects</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>&lt; 2 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners/State Agencies - DOA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seek Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) assistance for identified City housing programs and projects</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>&lt; 2 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seek cooperation with Grant County, other surrounding counties, existing Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs), and HUD HOME experienced non-profit partners to be included in a new Southwest Wisconsin HUD HOME Consortium</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City/County Housing Partners/State Agencies - DOA</td>
<td>Southwestern Wisconsin CAP/Impact 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiate partnership with non-profit to manage HUD HOME Consortium</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners</td>
<td>Wisconsin Partnership for Housing Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand access to HUD CDBG program funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initiate Partnership with a DOA-certified Community Development Organization (CDO) to access the Rural Economic Area Development Initiative (READI) Program for targeted City housing projects and programs</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners/State Agencies - DOA</td>
<td>Prosperity Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seek funding through CDBG Small Cities Housing Program for targeted City housing programs and projects</td>
<td>1.45.7.8.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City/State Agencies - DOA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply for CDBG infrastructure funding for mixed-use areas near the hospital or other areas with economic development potential</td>
<td>1.45.7.8.9</td>
<td>$20,000*</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City/State Agencies - DOA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand effectiveness of HUD funding utilization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Combine HUD HOME funds and CDBG funds for targeted City housing programs and projects</td>
<td>1.45.7.8.9</td>
<td>$20,000*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3-5 yrs</td>
<td>City/State Agencies - DOA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare Housing Price Study and submit to HUD for HOME/CDBG housing programs/projects for specific target area(s) to increase improvement to value amounts</td>
<td>1.45.7.8.9</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; 2 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners</td>
<td>Southwestern Wisconsin CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare Rental Rate Study and submit to HUD for HOME/CDBG housing programs/projects for specific target area(s) to increase percentage of rent paid amounts</td>
<td>1.45.7.8.9</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt; 2 yrs</td>
<td>City/Housing Partners</td>
<td>Southwestern Wisconsin CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Funding Districts</td>
<td>Potential Staff Hours</td>
<td>Potential Cost</td>
<td>Responsible Organizations</td>
<td>Housing Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish public/private partnerships to access additional funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluate potential for current CDEs to fund housing projects</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>City/SWWRPC</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>City/SWWRPC</td>
<td>Federal Agencies - US EDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in establishing new or expanding existing Community Development Corporation (CDC) as a Community Development Entity (CDE) to receive CDFI funding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Utilize CDC funding to establish a Rent-to-Own program</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>City/SWWRPC</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>City/SWWRPC</td>
<td>Federal Agencies - US EDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in establishing new or expanding existing Community Development Corporation (CDC) to receive CDFI funding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Utilize CDC funding to establish a Rent-to-Own program</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>City/SWWRPC</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>City/SWWRPC</td>
<td>Federal Agencies - US EDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above outlines various strategies and objectives related to funding initiatives. For each strategy, details are provided including the funding district, potential staff hours, potential cost, responsible organizations, and housing partners. The strategies aim to establish public/private partnerships to access additional funding, assist in establishing new or expanding existing Community Development Corporations (CDFCs) to receive Community Development Finance Institution (CDFI) funding, and coordinate with other funding sources to prioritize and fund housing projects.
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Public Survey

As part of the engagement process for the Housing Study, a city-wide electronic survey was deployed to gather data from residents related to their current housing situation, housing issues or challenges, and desired housing scenarios. The survey also asked respondents to provide data on self-reported property conditions, occupancy, vacancy, rental rates, affordability, and satisfaction with housing. The results from this survey were instrumental in creating recommended actions contained in the main body of the Housing Study. A summary of these results is provided below.

Current Housing Description

The first section of the survey gathered data on the characteristics of respondents and their housing situation. Sixty percent (60%) marked the City of Platteville as their jurisdiction of residence. Approximately 98% of respondents are full-time residents of Platteville, with the remainder comprised primarily of UW-Platteville students. Twenty-four percent (24%) of residents have been at their current residence for 1-2 years, with 22% having lived there for 3-5 years. Fourteen percent (14%) have lived at their current residence for 20 years or longer.
Thirty-two percent (32%) of people living in respondent households are under 18 years of age, followed by 22% of respondent household members who are 45-64 years of age.

A substantial majority of respondents live in single-family houses (84%), followed by 6% who live in duplexes or triplexes. Very few respondents live in multifamily apartment buildings.

Forty-four percent (44%) of respondents live in dwellings with two bedrooms, which was the most popular answer. This was followed by 30% of respondents who live in one-bedroom units, 15% of respondents who live in three-bedroom units, and 9% of respondents who live in studios.
Forty-three percent (43%) of respondents live in dwellings with two bathrooms, which was the most popular answer. Twenty-six percent (26%) of respondents live in dwellings with three bathrooms, and 23% of respondents live in dwellings with one bathroom.

Seventy-five percent (75%) of the respondents are married and living with a partner, followed by 14% who are single and never married, and 8% who are divorced.

Responses for estimated gross annual household income were relatively evenly distributed across the different income brackets. Seventeen percent (17%) of respondents listed an estimated gross annual household income of $50,000-$74,999, followed by $100,000-$124,999, $75,000-$99,999, and $25,000-$49,999 which each received 15% of responses. Eleven percent (11%) did not wish to disclose their household income, 9% estimated a household income of $125,000-$149,999, and 8% of respondents listed a household income of less than $25,000.
Similar to Question 9, responses to Question 10 were relatively evenly distributed. Seventeen percent (17%) of respondents spent between 10-14% of their income on rent or housing costs, which was equaled by 17% who spent between 15-19%, followed by 13% who spend between 20-24% of their income, and 12% who spent between 25-29% of their income. Seven percent (7%) of respondents stated they spend 50% or more of their income on rent or housing, while 4% stated they spend less than 5%.

**Current Household Description**

Question 11 gave respondents who identify themselves as Household Member 1 the option of listing their employer (by selecting ‘Other’) or electing not to answer. Popular responses for those who listed their place of employment were: UW-Platteville, Southwest Health, self-employed, John Deere, Land’s End, Platteville Public Schools, and retired.

Thirty-eight percent (38%) of respondents who identified as Household Member 1 stated they have been with their employer for at least 10 years, which was the most popular answer. This was followed by 22% who have been with their current employer for 1-3 years, 16% who have been with their employer 4-6 years, and 10% who have been with their employer less than one year.
Question 13 gave respondents who identify themselves as Household Member 2 the option of listing their employer (by selecting ‘Other’) or electing not to answer. Fifty-four percent (54%) of respondents who identified as Household Member 2 selected ‘Other’. Popular responses include: Homemaker, UW-Platteville, Southwest Health, Platteville Public Schools, self-employed, and retired.

Twenty-nine percent (29%) of respondents who identified as Household Member 2 have been with their current employer for at least 10 years, followed by 20% who have been with their current employer for 1-3 years, 19% of employees who have been with their current employer 4-6 years, and 14% who are retired or the question does not apply.

Question 15a asked respondents about their employment status. For those who identified as Household Member 1, 83% work full time, while 10% work part-time, and 5% are retired.

Question 15b asked respondents about their employment sector. Twenty-five percent (25%) of respondents who identified as Household Member 1 listed ‘Educational Services’, followed by 23% who marked ‘Healthcare’, and 14% who marked ‘Professional, research, management, or administrative’.

Sixty-six percent (66%) of respondents who identified as Household Member 2 work full time, followed by 13% who work part-time, and 6% each who were either homemakers, retired, or for whom the question is not applicable.
15b. Household Member 1: what is your employment sector?

- Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, mining, or construction: 3%
- Arts, entertainment, or recreation: 1%
- Customer services, retail, or food services, etc.: 8%
- Educational services: 25%
- Healthcare: 23%
- Finance and insurance, real estate, or rental and leasing: 5%
- Manufacturing, warehousing, or general transportation: 5%
- Professional, research, management, or administrative: 14%
- Public administration: 2%
- Other services and utilities: 5%
- Other (please specify): 9%

16b. Household Member 2: what is your employment sector?

- Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, mining, or construction: 9%
- Arts, entertainment, or recreation: 2%
- Customer services, retail, or food services, etc.: 8%
- Educational services: 19%
- Healthcare: 12%
- Finance and insurance, real estate, or rental and leasing: 5%
- Manufacturing, warehousing, or general transportation: 6%
- Professional, research, management, or administrative: 8%
- Public administration: 2%
- Other services and utilities: 10%
- Other (please specify): 17%

17. For all employed household members, how far do you travel to work if you live in Platteville, but work elsewhere?

- Over 30 miles: 16%
- Between 21 and 30 miles: 22%
- Between 11 and 20 miles: 10%
- Between 6 and 10 miles: 10%
- Between 0 and 5 miles: 41%

18. For all employed household members, how far do you travel to work?

- Over 30 miles (Madison/Other): 9%
- Between 21 and 30 miles (Other County): 14%
- Between 11 and 20 miles (Within Grant County): 15%
- Between 6 and 10 miles (Outside Platteville): 14%
- Between 0 and 5 miles (In Platteville): 49%
Question 16b asked respondents about their employment sector. Nineteen percent (19%) of respondents who identified as Household Member 2 listed ‘Educational Services’, followed by 17% who specified an employment sector that was not listed, 12% who marked ‘Healthcare’, and 10% who marked ‘Other services and utilities’. Forty-one percent (41%) of respondents who live in Platteville, but work elsewhere, travel between 0 and 5 miles to work each day, which was the most popular answer. Twenty-two percent (22%) of respondents travel between 21 and 30 miles each day to work, while 16% travel more than 30 miles, and 10% each travel between 11 and 20 miles, and between 6 and 10 miles.

Overall commutes looked similar, with just under half (49%) who travel between 0 and 5 miles each day to work, 15% who travel between 11 and 20 miles, and 9% who travel more than 30 miles.
Forty-nine percent (49%) of all employed household members work in the City of Platteville, which was the most popular answer. This was followed by 22% who work elsewhere in Grant County, and 11% who commute to Iowa each day for work.

Eighty-one percent (81%) of respondents use a personal vehicle to travel to work each day, followed by 8% who walk, and 7% who ride a bike.

**Self-Reported Housing Condition**

The next section of the survey asked respondents to comment on the standards of their current housing situation. Most respondents were pleased with the overall condition of their current home or apartment, with 43% who rated the overall condition as ‘Good’ and 42% who rated the overall condition as ‘Excellent’. Thirteen percent (13%) rated their dwelling as ‘Fair’ and 2% rated it as ‘Poor’.
Question 22 asked respondents to rate their satisfaction with characteristics related to their current housing on a scale from ‘Very Satisfied’ to ‘Very Dissatisfied’. Fifty-four percent (54%) of respondents were very satisfied with the size of their home, and 51% were very satisfied with their home’s proximity to work. An additional 51% of respondents were very satisfied with their local school district, and 50% were very satisfied with neighborhood walkability. For all eight characteristics, respondents listed ‘Very Satisfied’ as the most popular rating, followed by ‘Somewhat Satisfied’, and ‘Neutral’. Ratings of ‘Somewhat Dissatisfied’ and ‘Very Dissatisfied’ were the second least and the least popular ratings respectively for all eight characteristics of respondent housing.

Seventy-nine percent (79%) of respondents own their residence, with the remaining portion renting their residence.
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Owner Occupied – Self Reported Housing

This section asked respondents who answered ‘Owner’ on Question 23 to provide information on their housing situation.

Of those who own their home, 83% indicated they currently have a mortgage, with the remaining 17% indicating they do not have a mortgage.

Of those who own their home and have a mortgage, 92% have a conventional mortgage and 8% have another kind such as an FHA Loan, Veteran’s Mortgage, etc.
Of those who own their home, 33% typically spend $1,000-$1,499 per month on housing expenses, while an additional 25% spend $1,500-$1,999, and 19% spend $500-$999. At the extremes, 4% of respondents spend less than $500 and 3% spend $3,000 or more each month on average.

Twenty-eight percent (28%) of owners listed the approximate assessed value of their home at $200,000-$299,999 – the most popular answer. This was followed by 25% who listed the value at $150,000-$199,999, 24% who listed the value at $100,000-$149,999, and 13% who listed the value at $300,000-$399,999.

Of those who own, 77% indicated they do not have a second mortgage or home equity line of credit (HELOC), with the remaining 23% indicating they do.
Ninety-five percent (95%) of homeowners did not receive down-payment assistance on their residence from a government or non-profit agency, while 3% answered they did and 2% did not wish to disclose.

Question 30 asked respondents to indicate when their home was built. Eighteen percent (18%) stated their home was built between 2000 and 2010, which was the most selected answer, followed by 15% who selected 1970-1979, and 9% each who selected 2011-Present, 1990-1999, and 1960-1969. Five percent (5%) of respondents stated their home was built prior to 1900.

Twenty-eight percent (28%) of homeowners stated there are two people living in their household, followed by 27% who stated there are four people living in their household, 22% who stated there are at least five people living in their household, and 17% who stated there are three people in their household.
Question 32 asked homeowners to comment on how much money they have spent on maintenance and improvement within the past five years. Twenty percent (20%) of respondents spent $10,000-$19,999 along with 20% who spent $5,000-$9,999, 19% who spent $2,500-$4,999, 16% who spent $1-$2,499, and 10% who spent $20,000-$29,999.

Ninety-nine percent (99%) of owners are not currently renting a room to a non-family member.

Sixty percent (60%) of owners answered ‘Yes’ when asked whether they plan to invest additional funds into their home in the next five years. Fourteen percent (14%) stated they were likely to invest additional funds, 18% stated they were unsure, and 8% selected ‘No’. 
Of those who answered ‘Yes’ on Question 34a, 55% anticipate investing in a partial remodel or renovation to their home, while 18% anticipate investing in appliance upgrades, and 13% anticipate finishing their basement or living space.

Question 35 asked respondents to provide open-ended comments on any barriers that are preventing investment in their homes such as a lack of qualified contractors, cost, or government regulations. The most popular answer by far was the cost of materials and labor. Local government taxes were also cited frequently along with a desire to save money for other expenses such as college tuition for children. Some respondents cited a lack of qualified contractors in Platteville, while others cited frustration with the quality of their neighborhood and unwillingness to make major investments because of poor quality housing for neighbors and the large student population that has moved into single-family residences. A full list of these answers is featured on the following pages.
Renter Occupied – Self Reported Housing

This section asked respondents who answered ‘Renter’ on Question 23 to provide details on their housing situation.

Question 36 asked renters how many individuals in their housing unit pay rent to the landlord. Sixty percent (60%) of respondents listed one person, followed by 28% who listed two.

Ninety-five percent (95%) of renter respondents are year-round renters, with the remainder being mostly college students (4%).

Eighty-six percent (86%) of renter respondents selected ‘No’ when asked whether they receive rental assistance from a government or non-profit agency, followed by 11% who answered ‘Yes’ and 3% who did not wish to disclose.

36. If RENTER, how many individuals in your housing unit pay rent to the landlord?

37. If RENTER, please indicate your rental status:

38. If RENTER, do you receive rental assistance from a government or non-profit agency?
Twenty-eight percent (28%) of respondents to Question 39 listed two for the number of members in their renting household, followed by 23% who listed three, 18% who listed one, 17% who listed four, and 14% who listed five or more.

Thirty-three percent (33%) of renter respondents stated that they have not relocated to another unit within the last five years. Thirty percent (30%) stated they have moved once in the last five years, followed by 16% who have moved twice, and 11% who have moved three times.

Question 41 asked respondents to rate the quality of their landlord experience from ‘Very Satisfied’ to ‘Very Dissatisfied’. Forty-three percent (43%) of respondents were very satisfied with the handling of their security deposit, while 42% were very satisfied with the leasing process, and 41% were very satisfied with their landlord’s professionalism. A majority of respondents listed either ‘Very Satisfied’ or ‘Somewhat Satisfied’ for all six facets of their landlord experience.

Not including roommates, 14% of respondents pay between $700 and $799 per month in typical housing expenses. Thirteen percent (13%) of respondents each pay $1,000-$1,249 per month, $800-$899 per month, and $500-$599.
Housing Location & Preferences

This section asked respondents to comment on their preferences for housing location and other qualities related to desired living arrangements.

Fifty-two percent (52%) of respondents stated they were not interested in purchasing a home in the next two years or selling their current home and purchasing another. Twenty-five percent (25%) of respondents were unsure, while 23% were affirmatively interested in purchasing.

For respondents who chose ‘Interested in Purchasing’ on Question 43, 51% plan to purchase an older home that is move-in ready, followed by 37% who plan to purchase a new home or build their own. Twelve percent (12%) plan to purchase an older home that is a “fixer-upper.”

Question 44b asked respondents to rank a list of barriers that are keeping them from purchasing a home. Thirty-three percent (33%) of respondents ranked ‘Lack of down payment’ #1, followed by 19% who ranked ‘Desired housing type not offered’, and 11% who selected ‘Wish to purchase, but in a few more years’. The graph showing these results can be found on the next page.
If you are interested in purchasing, please rank any barriers you have to purchasing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of down payment</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing debt</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor credit history</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly payment would be too high</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wish to purchase, but in a few more years</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do not think existing home will sell for amount needed</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desired housing type not offered</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Available housing requires too much renovation</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Available housing does not have addition/upfit options</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lack of down payment</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Existing debt</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poor credit history</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Monthly payment would be too high</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wish to purchase, but in a few more years</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not think existing home will sell for amount needed</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desired housing type not offered</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available housing requires too much renovation</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available housing does not have addition/upfit options</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For those interested in purchasing, 16% listed $150,000 to $174,999 as their desired purchase price range, followed by 15% who cited $125,000 to $149,999 and another 15% who cited $100,000 to $124,999.

Question 45 asked respondents to rank 12 factors determining current or future housing location. Cost was most frequently ranked as the #1 factor, with 41% of votes, followed by ‘Quiet, safe neighborhood’ which received 17% of votes for #1. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of respondents ranked ‘Other’ #10. Reasons cited under ‘Other’ include: location of spouse’s prospective job, intention of moving away from Platteville, desire for a large lot, access to land for gardening or farming, and distance from UW-Platteville.
45. Rank these factors in determining your current or future housing location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Property tax rates</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dwelling type</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Proximity to amenities/services</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Proximity to Downtown</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Short commute/proximity to work</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quiet, safe neighborhood</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Walkability of neighborhood</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Variety of transportation options</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Transportation to employment</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-three percent (23%) of respondents who live in Platteville cited the fact that a household member works in Platteville as the reason for living there. Thirteen percent (13%) cited proximity to family as their reason for living in Platteville, followed by 11% who cited the availability of housing at their desired price, and 10% who cited a preference for city-sized traditional neighborhood lots and city life.

Among respondents who do not live in Platteville, 19% cited a preference for larger lots and rural life as their reason for not residing in the City. Fourteen percent (14%) cited high property taxes, and 12% stated they were content with their easy commute into the City while still living outside the jurisdictional limits.

Question 48 asked respondents what type of housing they would prefer if they were to move to or within Platteville. Eighty-one percent (81%) of respondents selected ‘Owner Single Family’ as their desired housing type, followed by 5% who selected ‘Owner Condominium’, and 4% who selected ‘Rental Single Family’.
Forty-two percent (42%) of respondents prefer three bedrooms in terms of home size, followed by 39% who prefer four bedrooms and 12% who prefer two bedrooms.

Forty-five percent (45%) of respondents prefer two bathrooms, followed by 19% who prefer two and a half (2.5) bathrooms, 17% who prefer three bathrooms, and one and a half (1.5) bathrooms.

**Housing Amenities & Preferences**

This section asked respondents to comment on their preferences for housing amenities.

Question 51 asked respondents to comment on what features are most important for a detached single-family house. Energy efficiency was judged ‘Very Important’ by 41% of respondents and ‘Somewhat Important’ by a further 49% of respondents. A high-quality kitchen and/or bath finishings was judged ‘Very Important’ by 34% of respondents and ‘Somewhat Important’ by an additional 43% of respondents. Thirty-two percent (32%) of respondents cited a large yard as ‘Very Important’ and another 41% cited a large yard as ‘Somewhat Important’. The results from this question are shown on the following page.

Question 52 asked respondents to judge features most important to them for a condo/townhome/apartment. This question received no responses, as survey takers elected to respond to Question 51 instead.
51. When considering features of a detached single family house, what features are most important to you?

- Zero barrier entry/accessible unit
- High ceilings
- Open concept
- Fireplace
- Energy efficiency
- Large detached garage (3+ cars)
- Large attached garage (3+ cars)
- Historic home
- New home
- Rear deck
- Front patio
- High quality exterior
- Formal dining
- High quality floor finishes
- High quality kitchen/bath finishes
- Home office
- Finished basement
- Unfinished basement for build-out
- Small yard/low maintenance
- Large yard

[Bar chart showing responses]
Thirty-eight percent (38%) of respondents stated they would not be willing to spend any additional funds above what they already spend for their preferred housing unit. Sixteen percent (16%) stated they would be willing to spend an additional $100-$199 for their preferred unit, and 12% stated they would be willing to spend an additional $200-$299.

**Platteville Community Needs**

This section asked respondents to reflect on the housing needs of the Platteville community at large.

Fifty-five percent (55%) of respondents judged that the community ‘Needs Much More’ affordable homes for first-time buyers, while an additional 36% of respondents think the community ‘Needs a Little More’. Thirty-six percent (36%) of respondents think the Platteville community needs significantly more single family homes in traditional neighborhoods, and 41% think the community needs a little more. Responses to this question can be found on the following page.
Appendix A: Public Engagement Results

54. Based on your experiences, please rate the housing needs of your community:

- Downtown/Above retail Downtown: Needs Much More (5%), Needs a Little More (17%), Does Not Need More (36%), Needs Less (5%).
- Executive housing: Needs Much More (5%), Needs a Little More (17%), Does Not Need More (36%), Needs Less (14%).
- Condominiums: Needs Much More (12%), Needs a Little More (20%), Does Not Need More (51%), Needs Less (8%).
- Housing targeted to seniors: Needs Much More (14%), Needs a Little More (47%), Does Not Need More (30%), Needs Less (4%).
- Apartments: Needs Much More (13%), Needs a Little More (22%), Does Not Need More (40%), Needs Less (17%).
- Single family homes in traditional neighborhoods (grid streets, alleys, & sidewalks): Needs Much More (36%), Needs a Little More (41%), Does Not Need More (21%), Needs Less (2%).
- Single family homes in new subdivisions: Needs Much More (24%), Needs a Little More (41%), Does Not Need More (21%), Needs Less (2%).
- Affordable homes for first-time buyers: Needs Much More (55%), Needs a Little More (36%), Does Not Need More (34%), Needs Less (9%).
The following pages contain an inventory of the open-ended responses to Questions 55-58.

Question 55 asked respondents to indicate where they think new single-family housing should be constructed in their community. A large variety of responses was provided, but many cited within the City close to schools and parks, as well as Downtown and close to UW-Platteville. Other respondents thought the edge of the City away from campus and rural areas outside the City were more appropriate. North of Platteville was cited by several as a desirable place, as was west of the City close to the highway heading toward Dubuque, Iowa. Several answers also expressed a desire to see the redevelopment of infill lots and improvements to existing homes in need of repair.

Question 56 asked respondents to indicate where they think new multifamily housing should be constructed in their community. Like Question 55, opinions varied greatly on this question. Many respondents felt the community does not need any more multifamily housing. Of those who gave an opinion on additional multifamily units, most responses preferred to concentrate multifamily development closer to the urban core of Platteville, especially Downtown and adjacent to the UW-Platteville campus. One respondent took the opposite view, saying that multifamily development should be away from Downtown and should be required to provide play areas for children.

Question 57 asked respondents to indicate areas of their community they think are most in need of housing stock improvement (rehabilitation or other aesthetic improvements). One respondent thought upgrading Downtown rental units above retail space was important in order to attract young professionals to the community. Main Street and Water Street were both cited by many respondents as in need of repair. A large volume of responses also cited areas around UW-Platteville as most in need of aesthetic upgrades.

Question 58 asked respondents to indicate where they think housing seems out of place and should be redeveloped into other uses in the community. Many respondents noted the owner-occupied single-family homes near UW-Platteville as not ideal due to the presence of a large number of student renters. The housing behind Menard’s and Walmart in Platteville was also cited by many respondents. Several respondents noted how Platteville seems to have an odd and inconsistent mixture of rental homes, apartments, and owner-occupied single family homes that should be better regulated through zoning.

Answers to each of these questions can be found on the following pages.
Other Concerns

This section asks respondents to share their thoughts on any other housing issues that have not been covered by the survey.

Ninety-seven percent (97%) of respondents answered ‘No’ when asked whether anyone lives with them who do not have permanent living arrangements.

Sixty-eight percent (68%) of respondents answered ‘No’ when asked whether they knew someone in the region who is struggling to pay housing costs and may be in danger of becoming or currently is homeless. Twenty-seven percent (27%) answered ‘Yes’, while 5% stated that their household is struggling.

Question 61 asked respondents to comment on what other items they think the community should be concerned about with regard to future housing demands. Several respondents cited excessive conversion of owner occupied single family units into rentals for students, a shortage of workforce housing, a shortage of affordable single family homes in the $100,000 to $200,000 price range, and high property taxes as major issues.
Introduction

This appendix includes figures (tables and charts) which show a range of population, household, economic, housing and financial characteristics from the 2011 and 2016 US Census American Community Survey (ACS), and other sources, for Wisconsin, Grant County, and the City of Platteville. These characteristics include total numbers, percentages of total, and growth estimates, where appropriate. Total numbers, percentages and ratios are generally provided for Grant County and Platteville, whereas only percentages and ratios are generally provided for Wisconsin. This provides the estimates for County and City needed for analysis and planning purposes, while maintaining the readability of charts. Wisconsin percentages and ratios are included in tables and charts as these numbers are generally within the same bounded scale, 1 to 100 percent, and do not alter the readability of the various charts. Providing the data in this manner allows for the ability to compare characteristics between the three geographies and develop benchmarks and narrative explanation of the data in context for Platteville. Comparisons and benchmarks also allow needs to be assessed in this Appendix and allow for identification of any related Issues and Opportunities in that section.

Population and Households

Figure B.1: General Population Characteristics: 2011-2016, shows total and percentage change numbers for various population characteristics for the three geographies. Total population for Platteville was 12,020 in 2016, representing 8.3% increase since 2011. This equals a 1.66% increase in population per year. Figure B.2: Total population % Change 2011 – 2016 illustrates this population growth compared the State and County and shows Platteville to have a significantly higher growth rate.

Figure B.1: General Population Characteristics: 2011-2016 also shows median age for Platteville to be 22.4 years of age in 2016. This is an increase in age of 2.3% from 2011, similar to the State, but higher than the County, which had a -0.08% rate and an overall population this is getting younger. This figure also shows a sex ratio, or males to 100 females ratio, that has Platteville to have a higher ratio of males to females in 2016 than the State or County, and an increase in that ratio of 9.5% since 2011. This figure also shows a ratio of the population which is either a dependent child or dependent older person (over 65 years of age), as compared to those persons between 18 to 64 years of age. The ratio for Platteville is 28, or 28 dependents for every 100 persons between 18 to 64 years of age, in 2016. This is significantly lower that the State or County.
The old-age dependency and child dependency ratios show these two classes of persons separately. Regarding child dependents, Platteville has a 15.4 ratio, which is significantly lower than the State or County. The old-age dependency ratio is 12.6, also significantly lower than the State or County. In addition, Figure B.3: Old-age dependency ratio % Change 2011 – 2016, graphically shows this ratio to have fallen by 8.7% between 2011 and 2016, whereas the State and County gained dependents during this time period.

Figure B.4: General Household Characteristics - 2016 shows attributes for a range of household characteristics. Total number of households for Platteville is 3,758, with the majority of those being married-couple households and nonfamily households. Nonfamily households outnumbered married-couples in Platteville, the opposite of that observed in the State and County. This figure also shows average household size for the total population is 2.48 persons for Platteville, slightly higher than for the State and County.
Nonfamily household sizes are much higher than for the State and County though at 2.09 persons per household. Households with one or more people under 18 years are comparatively lower for Platteville, at 20.3%. However, the percentage of households with children and having a female householder with no husband is higher than the State and County at 87.5%.

Those households with one or more people 60 years and older was much lower for Platteville, at 28.4%. Householders living alone in Platteville comprise 31.6% of total households, slightly higher than the State and County. Nonfamily householders living alone only represented 53.8% of total nonfamily households in Platteville, far lower than for the State and County.

This figure represents nonfamily households which have multiple families living in these same household that are unrelated to each other. Those alone and 65 years of age or older in Platteville comprised 10.8% of total households, slightly lower than for the State and County.

**Figure B.4: General Household Characteristics - 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total households</th>
<th>Average household size</th>
<th>Households with one or more people under 18 years</th>
<th>Households with one or more people 60 years and over</th>
<th>Householder living alone</th>
<th>Alone &amp; 65 years and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,310,246</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple household</td>
<td>1,136,924</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife</td>
<td>103,841</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband</td>
<td>230,549</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily household</td>
<td>838,932</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,353</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple household</td>
<td>9,855</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily household</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platteville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple household</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily household</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS
Looking at population growth by age from 2011 to 2016, Figure B.5: Percentage by Age Group for 2011 and 2016 shows the percentage of the population contained within each age group for 2011 and 2016. Thirty-four percent (34%) of the City’s population is between 20 and 24 years old, and 16.4% are between 15 and 19 years old. The 20 to 24 category increased and the 15 to 19 year category decreased significantly. Since 2011, the 5 to 9 year and 10 to 14 year categories have marginally increased. Figure B.6: Change in Average Household Size, 2011-2016 shows household size has increased since 2016 as well.

Figure B.7: Households with one or more people under 18 years % Change 2011-2016 shows the number Platteville households with children to have increased by 4.6% from 2011, with both the State and County showing decreases. Figure B.8: Households with people 60 years+ % Change 2011-2016 shows the number of Platteville households with older persons to have grown at 10.1%, nearly the same rate as the County, yet slower than the State. These figures combined with Figure B.1, show that although Platteville households had lower numbers of younger dependents than the State or County, the City is catching up with higher growth rates in this category. However, Platteville has fewer older dependent households and, although gaining in older person households, City households are not aging to the same extent as the State and County. This is further highlighted by Figure B.9: Alone & 65 years and over % Change 2011-2016, which shows a significant decline in persons living alone for Platteville while the State shows a significant increase.

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS
Figure B.7: Percent Change in Households with One or More People <18 Years of Age, 2011-2016

- Wisconsin: -6.1%
- Grant County: -1.5%
- Platteville: 4.6%

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS

Figure B.8: Percent Change in Households with People Aged 60+ Years, 2011-2016

- Wisconsin: 14.2%
- Grant County: 9.1%
- Platteville: 10.1%

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS

Figure B.9: Percent Change in Households with People Aged 65+ Years and Living Alone, 2011-2016

- Wisconsin: 10.0%
- Grant County: -0.8%
- Platteville: -14.3%

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS
Economic Characteristics

Looking at School Enrollment, Figure B.10: School Enrollment shows the total counts for enrollment for the City and County for 2011 and 2016. Figure B.11: Percent School Enrollment shows percentage of population enrolled in school for the City and County in 2016. This figure shows Platteville to have lower percentages in all categories except those in Middle School. Lower percentages of Preschool and Kindergarten, Elementary School and High School students show a population comprised of growing families with younger children. This is reflective of the low Median Age, 22.4, and the low child dependency ratio, 15.9, previously identified. Platteville is a community with young pre-teen children, but with fewer toddlers and teenagers. In addition, looking at Figure B.12: School Enrollment Change 2011 – 2016, the school enrollment attributes for Platteville changed significantly during this time period. Enrollment dropped for Preschool and Kindergarten, and High School, while enrollment increased for Elementary School and Middle School.

Figure B.13: Percent Educational Attainment shows educational attainment as a percentage of the population for the City, County and State in 2016. Platteville has lower percentages for those having a high school education or less. However, Platteville has a slightly higher percentage of those with some college education, 25.2% and a higher percentage of those with a graduate or professional degree, 17.8%. Those with a Bachelor’s degree is similar to the State and slightly higher than for the County. This is reflective of the high percentage of those enrolled in college. This also indicates that many of those who gain a local Bachelor’s degree either leave the City when they graduate or stay to gain a graduate degree. This also indicates the presence of school faculty holding Master’s degrees working and living in the City.

### Figure B.10: School Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th>Platteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled in School</td>
<td>7,128</td>
<td>7,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery school, preschool, Kindergarten</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school: grade 1 to grade 5</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>2,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school: grade 6 to grade 8</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school: grade 9 to grade 12</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Public Instruction
Taking a specific look at the University of Wisconsin at Platteville, Figure B.14: Unduplicated Headcount, shows Undergraduate and Graduate students enrolled in UWP in both 2011 and 2016. In 2016, there were a total of 10,072 students enrolled at the University. The number of total, Undergraduate and Graduate students all increased since 2011. Figure B.15: Degrees Awarded shows the number of Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees awarded in 2011 and 2016. The Bachelor’s degree students represent the number of local student residents potentially leaving every year that could be retained to either seek a graduate degree or teach at a local school or institution. These also represent an educated workforce that can be retained to work for local business and industry.

![Figure B.11: Percent School Enrollment](image1)

![Figure B.12: School Enrollment Change](image2)

Source: Wisconsin Department of Instruction
Figure B.16: Length to Completion Times by Percent, shows the percentage of students by time to gain a Bachelor’s degree. As these percentages measure cohorts of students, by year enrolled, and those enrollment and student numbers change, the percentages will not add up to 100%. Also, statistics are not available for 5 and 7 year time spans. Therefore, 6 years would be a good approximation of how long each student would reside in the City before potentially leaving. Some would leave early, others would gain a Master’s degree and stay longer.

Figure B.13: Percent Educational Attainment

Source: 2016 ACS

Figure B.14: Unduplicated Headcount

Source: 2011 & 2016 NCES IPEDS
Looking at UWP staff, Figure B.17: Full Time Equivalent Staff shows total staff in 2011 and 2016. Staff has grown slightly from 822 to 878 in the past 5 years. Figure B.18: Average Salaries, shows average salaries have also increased during that time frame from $56,152 to $58,741.

Looking at the Labor Force as a whole, Figure B.19: Labor Force, shows the total labor force for the City and County in 2016. Figure B.20: shows the unemployment Rate for the City, County and State for 2016. Platteville’s rate, 5.4%, is slightly lower than the State at 5.5%, yet higher than for the County at 4.3%. Looking at Class of Worker, three figures, B.21, B.22, and B.23 show general worker classification for the City, County and State for 2016.
Figure B.18: Average Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$56,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$58,741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 & 2016 NCES IPEDS

Figure B.19: Labor Force Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th>Platteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 16 years and over</td>
<td>42,305</td>
<td>10,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force</td>
<td>27,462</td>
<td>6,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force</td>
<td>27,462</td>
<td>6,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>26,279</td>
<td>6,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS

Figure B.20: Unemployment Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platteville</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS

Figure B.21: Platteville Class of Worker - 2016

- Private wage and salary workers: 83%
- Government workers: 12%
- Self-employed: 5%
- Unpaid family workers: 0%

Source: 2016 ACS

Figure B.22: Grant County Class of Worker - 2016

- Private wage and salary workers: 72%
- Government workers: 23%
- Self-employed: 3%
- Unpaid family workers: 3%

Source: 2016 ACS

Figure B.23: Wisconsin Class of Worker - 2016

- Private wage and salary workers: 76%
- Government workers: 12%
- Self-employed: 7%
- Unpaid family workers: 5%

Source: 2016 ACS
Figure B.24: Commuting to Work shows mode of transportation to work for the City, County and State. Most trips to work were taken by drive alone car, truck or van. However, Platteville has the lowest percentage of this mode, 71.9%. Platteville also had the highest percentage of those who walked to work, 15.9%. This is presumably because of University Students and Staff. Figure B.25: Mean travel time to work (minutes) shows mean travel time to work was lower than for the County and State at 15.3 minutes.

**Figure B.25: Mean Travel Time to Work (in Minutes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th>Platteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>80.70%</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
<td>71.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean travel time to work (minutes)</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS
Figure B.26: Worker Inflow/Outflow – City of Platteville

Platteville shows there 3,462 workers who live outside of Platteville and drive into the City to work. This figure also shows there are 1,571 workers who both live and work inside of Platteville and 2,426 workers who live in Platteville and work outside of the City limits. This would account for the low commute time as half the workers in the City don’t live in Platteville and their commuting times were not counted towards the Platteville census counts.

Figure B.27: Worker Inflow/Outflow – Grant County

Grant County shows very different results than for the City. In 2015, there were 6,277 workers who lived outside of Grant County yet worked within. However, there were 10,026 workers who both lived and worked inside the County and 11,773 workers who lived in the County and commuted elsewhere.

Looking at the effect of labor migration, and other factors, on housing, the impact can be seen by Figure B.28: Year Moved by Percent. This figure shows Platteville to have had the highest percentages of those who moved since 2015 as well as from 2010 to 2014. These could be residents moving from one location Platteville to another, but also represent residents who moved from outside of Platteville, most likely for work.
Figure B.29: Percent Employed by Industry compares percent of the workforce employed for each industrial sector for the City, County and State in 2016. Platteville had a higher percentage of those in Agriculture, 8.9%, than the State, but less than the County. Platteville also had a lower percentage, just 2.4%, in Construction than for the County or State. Manufacturing was lower as well at 12.8%. Employment in the Retail Trade sector, 15%, was higher for the County and State.

However, Transportation, Information and the Finance, Insurance and Real Estate employment percentages were all lower for Platteville than the State or County. The strongest sector for Platteville was the Education and Health Care industry, with 29.8% of the workforce employed, higher than the County and State. This would be due to the presence of the University as well as Southwest Health. Platteville had a higher percentage, 19.2%, of workers in the Arts, recreation, accommodation and food sector.

Figure B.28: Year Householder Moved into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Householder Moved into</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th>Platteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 2015 or later</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 2010 to 2014</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 2000 to 2009</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 1990 to 1999</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 1980 to 1989</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in 1979 and earlier</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS
Figure B.29: Percent Employed by Industry

Source: 2016 ACS
Figure B.30: Percent Change in Employment by Industry: 2011-2016 shows the percentage change in employment by industrial sector for the City, County, and State. For the State, growth is occurring in the Professional and Scientific sector, as well as in the Educational and Health Care sector. Some growth is also found in the Arts, Recreation, Accommodation and Food sector. The rest of the industrial sectors in the State are either experiencing flat growth or declines. Platteville has shown a different growth pattern however. Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing has seen a 2.1% increase since 2011 and Manufacturing has seen as 5% increase. The Professional and Scientific industrial group also increased at a rate of 1.1% since 2011. This is a higher increase than for both the County and State. However, the Education and Health Care sector experienced a decline of -1.8%, indicating a slight slowdown in this sector.

Vierbicher consolidated data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) in order to match wages with the Industrial sectors defined in the US Census for Platteville in 2017. Looking at Figure B.31: Annual Wages by Industry, the highest wages were estimated to be paid to the Professional and Scientific sector at $54,743 per year. The second highest was for Finance, Insurance and Real Estate at $52,520 per year. In the Strategy section of this report, Wage data is matched with the percent employed by industrial sector and the percentage growth data to create forecasts for current and future worker available salary by sector. This will be used to gauge price points for potential housing rents and mortgage costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Grant Co.</th>
<th>Platteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance, real estate</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational, health care</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, recreation, accommodation, food</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS
Figure B.31: Annual Wages by Industry

Source 2017 BLS & Vierbicher
Figure B.32: Income shows different income types for the City, County and State in 2016. Looking at median family income, Platteville income is at $68,542, slightly lower than the State and almost 10% higher than the County. Per Capita income, however, is only $17,235, lower than the County and considerably lower than the State. Median household income is $41,867, which is also lower than median household income for the County and State. Figure B.33: Median Household Income 2011 – 2016 focuses on median household income specifically and shows incomes to have increased during this period for the City, County and State. Platteville median household income increased from $38,582 to $41,867, which represents an 8.5% increase since 2011. Figure B.34: Percent Change in Median Household Income 2011-2016 shows the County to have a higher rate of income growth and the State to have a much smaller growth rate than the City or County.
**Housing Stock**

Information on the local housing stock was collected from a variety of sources, including local tax assessor data, realtor association data, website listings and Census data. Census data serves as a preliminary owner-occupied and rental overview and allows similar information to be compared between Platteville, the County and the State. However, Census estimates are outdated, self-reported and includes housing of all sizes and conditions, including homes which are not market-ready or do not reflect market reality. Therefore, Census estimates are not a particularly accurate reflection of the local value market. In addition, Census estimates can also include government subsidize low income units which may not reflect market reality either. However, this information is important to include and to consider, since this information can be mandated baseline information for grant and loan applications and may need to be updated through small area data analysis or local surveys. With these limitations in mind, an analysis of Census data does yield useful analysis for the City, County and State and does provides information that is not available from other sources.

Figure B.35: Housing Units and Occupancy shows total housing units for the City and County for 2011 and 2016, as well as the percentage growth of housing units during that time period. Occupancy is shown for both jurisdictions as well. Looking at total housing units, Platteville experienced a 2.7% change, while the County only experienced a 1.3% change. These additional units for Platteville were also being occupied, as shown by the increase in occupancy of 6.2% during that timeframe. County change in occupied units was nearly flat at 0.6%. The County also had an increase in vacant units of 6.7%. The City had a significant decline of -34.7%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units</td>
<td>21,508</td>
<td>21,783</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>19,230</td>
<td>19,353</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3,539</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-34.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS
Figure B.36: Percent Housing Occupancy and Figure B.37: Percent Tenure show occupancy as a percent of total housing units for the City, County and State in 2016, as well as the Tenure, or owner versus renter, characteristics of those units. The first figure shows Platteville to have the highest percent of occupancy at 94.5%, with a correspondingly low vacancy rate of 5.5%. The second figure shows Platteville to have the lowest owner-occupied percentage at just 47%, and a correspondingly high renter percentage at 53%.

Figure B.38: Average Household Size by Tenure, shows average household size for the City, County, and State by Tenure. Platteville has the lowest owner-occupied household size at 2.35 persons per household and the highest renter-occupied household size at 2.38, as compared to the County and State. Figure B.39: Percent Tenure Change 2011-2016, shows the percentage change in household size from 2011 to 2016 by Tenure. Platteville household sizes are nearly flat with almost no change. The County and State both experienced increases in renter household size and decrease in owner household size.
Figure B.40: Vacancy Rates by Tenure, 2011 & 2016, shows vacancy rates by tenure for the City, County and State over a five (5) year timeframe. Rental vacancy rates for Platteville increased from 2011 to 2016 from 4% to 5.8%. However, these rates are still low, compared to the County, although nearer to the State rate. Looking at homeowner vacancy rates, Platteville is reported as having a 0% vacancy rate. This is down from 2.8% in 2011 and lower than the County and State, although both of those jurisdictions have low homeowner vacancy rate as well.

Taking a closer look at vacancies, Figure B.41: Vacancy Type by Jurisdiction shows the different types of vacancies for the City, County, and State by number and percentage. Of those vacancies, Platteville had the highest percent of those for rent, at 56.4%. The County and State had the highest percentage of vacancies in the seasonal and recreational category. Platteville had very little vacancies in the category, at only 5.5%. Figure B.42: Vacancy by Type - Platteville further illustrates the City’s vacancy percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Platteville</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>339,351</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For rent</td>
<td>39,817</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented, not occupied</td>
<td>9,747</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For sale only</td>
<td>26,248</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, not occupied</td>
<td>6,471</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>188,664</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For migrant workers</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vacant</td>
<td>67,858</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure B.42: Vacancy by Type - Platteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• For rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rented, not occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For sale only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sold, not occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For migrant workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS

**Figure B.43: Units in Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th>Platteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>16,494</td>
<td>2,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS

**Figure B.44: Percent Units in Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th>Platteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS
Figure B.43: Units in Structure and Figure B.44: Percent Units in Structure shows the units per structure by number of structures for the City and County and by percent for the City, County and State. These figures clearly show single-unit, detached, to be the predominant housing type, although Platteville does have the lowest percentage at 57.6%.

Figure B.45: Percent Units per Attached Structure shows the percentages for just the attached units for the City, County and State. Platteville has the highest percentages in the 2-units, 5 to 9 units, 10 to 19 units, and 20 or more units per structure categories.

![Figure B.45: Percent Units per Attached Structure](image-url)
Figure B.46: Percent Year Built shows percent of housing units built by time period for the City, County and State. Platteville has the lowest percentages in many of the newer time periods, including those from 1970 to 2009. In particular, the percentage of homes built between 1990 and 1999 was much lower, 7%, than for the County or State. However, the City has higher or similar percentages in historic homes, those from 1940 to 1969, as well as new homes from in the 1980s and from 2010 to 2013. This represents a fairly even distribution of housing stock that is fortunately lacking in the 1970s, which have fewer historic features to restore and lack many of the modern construction methods employed in the 1980s and beyond.

**Figure B.46: Percent Year Built**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th>Platteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 or later</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2013</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2009</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1969</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to 1949</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS
Figure B.47: Bedrooms per Unit shows bedrooms per unit for the City, County and State. Platteville has the highest percentage in the no bedroom, one-bedroom, two-bedroom and four-bedroom categories. However, the City has the lowest percentage in the three-bedroom category. Many of the no-bedroom and four-bedroom units may be student rentals that have been converted from carriage houses and larger homes.

Source: 2016 ACS
Homeowner Financial Characteristics

Figure B.48: Median Home Value 2011-2016 and Figure B.49: Number of Homes by Value, show median home values for 2011 and 2016, as well as percentage change and number of homes by category. Median home value for the City is $136,400, which is higher than the County and lower than the State. However, median home values actually declined for the City from 2011, while median home values increase for the County. Looking at change in percentage of homes by value category for the City, increases in value were seen in the $110k to $149k range as well as the $150k to $199k range. A smaller decline was seen in the $200k to $299k range and substantial decline, -57.1%, was seen in the $300k to $499k range. This is most likely a result of those homes in the highest categories experiencing lower asking home prices or homes being purchased at lower home values than previously valued. Lower, realtor comparables and assessments likely followed.

In addition, more homes in the $150k to $199k range were also likely built, adding to this category. The County, however, showed gains in the $200k to $299k and $300k to $499k categories, with flat or negative growth in the less expensive categories.

Figure B.50: Percent of Homes by Value shows the distribution of houses by category and by percentage for the City, County, and State. Platteville has the highest percentage of total housing units in the $100k to $149k and $150k to $199k categories.

### Figure B.48: Median Home Value, 2011-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$169,700</td>
<td>$167,000</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>$121,500</td>
<td>$135,400</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platteville</td>
<td>$150,600</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS

### Figure B.49: Number of Homes by Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Platteville</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>-20.7%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td>3,229</td>
<td>-19.6%</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>3,523</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>2,437</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to $299,999</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000 to $499,999</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 or more</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS
Figure B.51: Median Monthly Housing Cost of Homes with Mortgage shows the monthly costs for homeowners from 2011 to 2016 for the City, County and State. Platteville had higher costs for 2016 than for the County, yet lower median costs than the State. Costs were flat from 2011. Figure B.52: Monthly Housing Cost by Percent of Homes with Mortgage 2011 shows the distribution of those households with a mortgage and shows Platteville to have the highest percentage in the $700 to $999 category, as well as a comparable percentage in the $1,000 to $1,499 category.

Figure B.53: Monthly Housing Cost by Percent of Homes with Mortgage 2016 shows the distribution for 2016 and shows Platteville as now having a lower percentage in the combined $500 to $999 category and the highest percentage in the $1,000 to $1,499 category. Clearly, even though median housing costs have not increase since 2011, the middle-cost households have seen significant increases. In fact, the $1,000 to $1,499 per month category is a much higher percentage of total homeowner households than the County or State.

**Figure B.50: Percent of Homes by Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Range</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th>Platteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to $299,999</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000 to $499,999</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 or more</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS
**Figure B.51: Median Monthly Housing Cost – Homes with Mortgage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$1,460</td>
<td>$1,391</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>$1,157</td>
<td>$1,178</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platteville</td>
<td>$1,280</td>
<td>$1,280</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS

**Figure B.52: Monthly Housing Cost by Percentage of Homes with Mortgage, 2011**

Source: 2011 ACS
Figure B.54: Monthly Housing Cost as Percent of Income for Households with Mortgage shows the distribution of households by how much of their income they’re paying for owner-occupied housing with a mortgage. Platteville had the highest percentage of those paying 30% of their income for housing at 31.1%.

Platteville also had the lowest percentage of those paying less than 20% of their income on housing, at 39.8%. In addition, the City had an increase in those paying more than 30% from 2011, yet the County and State both had significant declines.

Figure B.53: Monthly Housing Cost by Percentage of Homes with Mortgage, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 20 percent</th>
<th>34.0%</th>
<th>38.1%</th>
<th>45.7%</th>
<th>37.4%</th>
<th>39.8%</th>
<th>2.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 to 30 percent</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 30 percent</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS
Renter Financial Characteristics

Figure B.55 shows average reported monthly rent for 2016, as well as the percent change since 2011 for the City, County, and State. Median rent increased for Platteville by 5.9% since 2011 while rents increased at a higher rate for both the County and State. However, Platteville median rent was significantly higher for Platteville than for the County in 2011 and 2016. Figure B.56: Monthly Rent by Percent of Renter Households shows the percentage of households by rent category for the City, County and State for 2016. Platteville has the highest percentage of those in the $1,000 to $1,499 per month category, when compared to the County or State. Looking at percent of household income spent on rent, Figure B.57: Monthly Rent by Percent of Renter Household Income shows Platteville to have the highest percent of those paying over 30% of their income on rent. However, Figure B.58: Monthly Rent by Percent of Renter Household Income, 2011-2016 shows that percentage declined from 2011.

Figure B.55: Average Reported Monthly Rent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter Type</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$735</td>
<td>$789</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>$602</td>
<td>$656</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platteville</td>
<td>$697</td>
<td>$738</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS

Figure B.56: Monthly Rent by Percent of Renter Households

Source: 2016 ACS
Looking at realtor data as well as a spot check of the for-sale housing market, a sales market analysis examines the current market for home sales in terms of average construction trends, availability and market prices. Data for the average monthly number of homes sales, average monthly median sales price, number of homes currently for sale, and other market characteristics are included below. This data serves to fact-check Census data and provide a more accurate picture of the current for-sale housing market.

Regional Home Sales

The Wisconsin Realtors Association (WRA) compiles data from the Multiple Listing Service (MLS), showing the total number of single family home sales each month for every county in Wisconsin. The organization also groups counties into one of six regions throughout the state and provides monthly sales and price data for each region. We analyzed sales data for Grant County, South Central Wisconsin, and the State of Wisconsin. Unfortunately, the WRA does not track data at the municipal level, so we were not able to look at home sales specific to the City of Platteville. Average monthly home sales in Grant County, South Central Wisconsin, and the State of Wisconsin as a whole were calculated by averaging the total home sales for each year and dividing by the number of months for which data was provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 20 percent</th>
<th>20 to 30 percent</th>
<th>Greater than 30 percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platteville</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS
For 2007-2017 we were able to obtain data for the full twelve months of the year, while 2018 reflects data from January through May.

For both Grant County and Wisconsin, average monthly home sales were highest in 2017, while the South Central Region saw higher sales in 2016. Across the County, Region, and State, home sales were lowest around the time of the economic recession. Grant County averaged 20 homes sold each month during 2008, while County averaged 36 homes per month in 2017 and 30 homes per month in 2018.

**Regional Median Price**

The WRA also tracks data on the median sales price for single family homes for each month of the year dating back to 2007. Like home sales, this data is tracked at the county, region, and state levels. Results show that the average monthly median sale price for 2018 in Grant County is $133,650, which is lower than the State at $175,400, and substantially lower than the South Central Region at $219,212. At all three geographic levels, the market appears to be rising in price each year. Sale prices were lowest in 2011 and 2012, as the market began to recover in the aftermath of the economic recession.
**Platteville Sales Market**

Platteville, like many communities in Wisconsin and across the country, is currently a seller’s market. The median list price for homes in the City is a bit over $185,000, and homes are selling for an average of 110% of their listed price. The median number of days a home stays on the market is 72 days. There are currently 120 properties listed on the market, many of which are vacant land. The median price per square foot for a single family home is $92.

The following summarizes the availability and pricing of single-family as well as multi-family homes in the City of Platteville in July 2018 by number of bedrooms. While the market experiences highs and lows in availability, the following findings provide a good snapshot of the typical market for homes in the City. Data was gathered using Realtor.com and Zillow.

**Studio Units**

Neither Realtor.com nor Zillow listed any studio units available within the Platteville City limits. Realtor.com lists one studio unit available within 20 miles of the City – a 1,395 square foot unit being marketed as a single family home in the structure of a former country school. The unit is on sale for $34,900.

**One-Bedroom Single-Family Units**

Neither Realtor.com nor Zillow listed any one bedroom units available in the City limits. Realtor.com lists 39 one bedroom units available within 20 miles of the City, most of which are located in Galena, Illinois. These units range in price from a $34,900 home in Dubuque, Iowa to a 6,300 square foot one bedroom former U.S. Marine Hospital in Galena, Illinois with an asking price of $749,000.

**Two-Bedroom Single-Family Units**

There are only two (2) two-bedroom homes available for sale within the Platteville City limits. These units are listed at $129,900 and $189,900 and both have two (2) bathrooms.

**Three-Bedroom Single-Family Units**

There are 22 three-bedroom homes for sale within the City limits. These units range in price from $139,000 to $598,000, with an average asking price of $232,772. The median asking price is $219,000.

**Four-Bedroom Single-Family Units**

There are 19 units with four bedrooms for sale within the City limits. Prices for these units range from $109,900 to $699,000, with an average asking price of $249,175 and a median asking price of $265,000.

**Five-Bedroom Single-Family Units**

There are only four (4) units with four bedrooms for sale within the City limits. Prices for these units range from $129,900 to $309,000, with an average asking price of $232,450.

**Two-Bedroom Duplex/Townhome Units**

There are only three (3) multi-family units with two (2) bedrooms for sale within the City limits, two (2) duplexes and one older (1) townhome. Prices for these units are listed at $139,900 for the townhome and $205,900 and $209,900 for the duplexes.

**Three-Bedroom Duplex/Townhome Units**

There are only three (3) multi-family units with three (3) bedrooms for sale within the City limits, two (2) duplexes and one older (1) townhome. Prices for these units are listed at $169,900 for the townhome and $185,500 for the duplexes.
Rental Market Analysis

The following figures show both a spot check of the local rental market as well as available comparables from past listings on a variety of sites. This rental analysis was conducted in order to provide more recent and more applicable rental data for Platteville. Rent and vacancy data, where available, was collected for a variety of single-family and multi-family rental units. Two bathrooms were chosen for all units. The results were averaged in order to provide a single rent and vacancy figure by rental type. Census results by unit size and type were included and averaged into the final figure. Some sources provided proprietary area rents as well, which were included. Vacancy rates were difficult to obtain and Census rate were substituted for the single-family listings. In cases where housing did not appear to be market-ready they were excluded from the study in order to not skew the averaged results.

Figure B.61: Three-Bedroom Single-Family Rentals, shows rent for three-bedroom single-family rental units. Recent comparable rents ranged from a $685 to $1,100 per month. This is a wide range that indicates units of varied condition and which may not have been market-ready or applicable to the typical renter. Area rent was listed at $1,140 by Zillow.com. Average rent was calculated to be $966 per month and can be considered a typical rent for this size home in average condition. The Census vacancy rate is listed because no sources revealed a vacancy rate for this type of unit. However, the fact that there are no listings currently available indicates a very low current market vacancy rate. No two-bedroom single-family houses were found for rent and no recent comparables were found either. This puts this type of unit at a zero percent (0%) vacancy rate for all practical purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zillow</th>
<th>Apartments.com</th>
<th>Zilpy.com</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Average Rent</th>
<th>Zilpy</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Average Rent</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Average Vacancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Ave. Area Rent</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Ave. Area Rent</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Comparables</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Average Rent</td>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>Average Vacancy Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF 3 Bed 2 Bath</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$685</td>
<td>$882</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$876</td>
<td>$966</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Zillow, Apartments.com, Zilpy, 2016 ACS
Figure B.62: Four-Bedroom Single-Family Rentals shows two units available, ranging from $1,325 to $1,200. Average area rent and census rents were similar. Comparable rents were lower, although the range of $1,000 to $1,195 was very consistent. These rent numbers averaged to an in an overall rental rate of $1,209 per month for a larger four-bedroom unit. The Census vacancy rate is shown and can be considered high; however having two (2) listings currently on the market and having a list of recent list of consistently priced comparables indicates there is some availability and vacancy is likely not as low as for the two- or three-bedroom units.

Figure B.63: Two-Bedroom Townhome Rentals shows rental rates for two-bedroom townhomes, and indicates there are no currently available units. However, a short list of comparables shows rents from $675 to $860. Average rent was calculated to be $728, almost identical to the Census rent. The overall vacancy rate for multi-family for this area is shown to be 9.1%. This combined with the Census vacancy rate results in an average vacancy rate of 7.45%. However, given short list of comparables and the lack of current availability or an average area rent, the practical vacancy rate can be considered to be near zero for the current market.

**Figure B.62: Four-Bedroom Single-Family Rentals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zillow</th>
<th>Apartments.com</th>
<th>Zilpy.com</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Zilpy</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Ave. Area Rent</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Ave. Area Rent</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Average Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF 4 Bed 2 Bath</td>
<td>$1,325</td>
<td>$1.140</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$1,263</td>
<td>$1.140</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Zillow, Apartments.com, Zilpy, 2016 ACS

**Figure B.63: Two-Bedroom Townhome Rentals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zillow</th>
<th>Apartments.com</th>
<th>Zilpy.com</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Zilpy</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Ave. Area Rent</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Ave. Area Rent</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Average Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome 2 Bed 2 Bath</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Zillow, Apartments.com, Zilpy, 2016 ACS
Figure B.64: Three-Bedroom Townhome Rentals shows rental rates for three-bedroom townhomes. No units are currently listed as available, yet a relatively short list of comparables show previous rents from $750 to $1,080. Comparables average was slightly higher at $944, compared to Census rent at $822. These figures show a wide range of rents and show how Census rents can be dragged down by lower listings. This wide range also indicates units of varying condition were likely listed previously. These figures combined with Census rent resulted in an average rent for $913 for this type of unit and can be considered a typical rent for this type in the current market, if one can be found. Vacancy can be considered to be close to zero percent (0%) for this type of unit as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zillow</th>
<th>Apartments.com</th>
<th>Zilpy.com</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Zilpy</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Average Vacancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Ave. Area Rent</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Ave. Area Rent</td>
<td>Rent Comparables</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Av. Rent</td>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>Average Vacancy Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome 3 Bed 2 Bath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$882</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$1,045</td>
<td>$1,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$944</td>
<td>$882</td>
<td>$913</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Zillow, Apartments.com, Zilpy, 2016 ACS

Figure B.65: Four-Bedroom Townhome Rentals shows rental rates for four-bedroom townhomes. One current listing was found for $1,200 per month. A longer list of comparable was also found, showing rent from $825 to $1,325. Except for the $825 and $850 listing, rents were fairly similar amongst the comparables, although lower than the current listing and the Census rent. Combining all the rental rates resulted in an average rent of $1,198, which can be considered a typical market rent for this type of unit. Only the Census vacancy rate could be found; however, given the presence of an available unit as well as a good list of comparables, the Census rate of 5.8% could be close to the actual vacancy rate of this type of unit, though most likely still high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zillow</th>
<th>Apartments.com</th>
<th>Zilpy.com</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Zilpy</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Average Vacancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Ave. Area Rent</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Ave. Area Rent</td>
<td>Rent Comparables</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Av. Rent</td>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>Average Vacancy Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome 4 Bed 2 Bath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$825</td>
<td>$1,326</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,069</td>
<td>$1,326</td>
<td>$1,198</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Zillow, Apartments.com, Zilpy, 2016 ACS
Figure B.66: One-Bedroom Apartment Rentals shows rental rates for one-bedroom apartments. A significant number of available units and recent comparables are shown for this type of unit. Current available unit rents ranged from $550 to $800 per month, indicating a range in conditions. Rent comparables ranged from a low $300 to $800, indicating an even wider range of conditions per previous rentals for this apartment type.

Overall average rent was calculated to be $618 and average area rent was listed at $704. A rental unit in decent condition can be expected to be close to the $618 average area rent and $704 for good condition. Given the high level of availability and recent comparables, the Census vacancy rate of 5.8% can be expected to be close for this type of unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartment 1 Bed 1 Bath</th>
<th>Zillow Rent</th>
<th>Zillow Ave. Area Rent</th>
<th>Apartments.com Rent</th>
<th>Apartments.com Ave. Area Rent</th>
<th>Zilpy.com Rent</th>
<th>Zilpy.com Ave. Area Rent</th>
<th>Census Average Rent</th>
<th>Census Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Zillow Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Census Vacancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$575</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$704</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$591</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$675</td>
<td></td>
<td>$795</td>
<td></td>
<td>$435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$725</td>
<td></td>
<td>$725</td>
<td></td>
<td>$495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$575</td>
<td></td>
<td>$535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$575</td>
<td></td>
<td>$550</td>
<td></td>
<td>$595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$525</td>
<td></td>
<td>$675</td>
<td></td>
<td>$699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$700</td>
<td></td>
<td>$704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$575</strong></td>
<td><strong>$674</strong></td>
<td><strong>$704</strong></td>
<td><strong>$545</strong></td>
<td><strong>$591</strong></td>
<td><strong>$618</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.80%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.80%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.80%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Zillow, Apartments.com, Zilpy, 2016 ACS*
Figure B.67: Two-Bedroom Apartment Rentals shows rental rates for two-bedroom apartments. A significant number of available units and recent comparables are shown for this type of unit. Current available unit rents ranged from $575 to $1,200 per month, indicating a range in conditions for available units. Rent comparables ranged from a low $528 to $1,100, also indicating a range of conditions for previous rentals for this apartment type.

Overall average rent was calculated to be $753 and average area rent was listed at $844. A rental unit in decent condition can be expected to be close to the $753 average area rent. However, for a unit in good condition in a newer apartment building, rents probably range from $800 to $1,200. Given the high level of availability and recent comparables, the average vacancy rate of 7.45% can be expected to be close for this type of unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zillow</th>
<th>Apartments.com</th>
<th>Zilpy.com</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Zilpy</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Ave. Area Rent</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Compares</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Average Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment 2 Bed 2 Bath</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$844</td>
<td>$528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$620</td>
<td></td>
<td>$925</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$700</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$900</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$900</td>
<td></td>
<td>$725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$700</td>
<td></td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$700</td>
<td></td>
<td>$845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$575</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$610</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>$864</strong></td>
<td><strong>$844</strong></td>
<td><strong>$718</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Zillow, Apartments.com, Zilpy, 2016 ACS*
Figure B.68: Three-Bedroom Apartment Rentals shows rental rates for three-bedroom apartments. Only one (1) unit of this type was currently shown to be available at a rate of $1,375 per month. Comparables ranged widely from $600 to $1,100, indicating a wide range of conditions. Average rent was calculated to be $1,081 and is most likely indicative a rental unit of this size in decent condition. Good or new condition units are probably nearer to the current $1,375 listing. The average vacancy rate was calculated to be at 7.45%; however this seems very high given that only one listing was found and there were few comparables and a wide range of price and condition.

Finally, Figure B.69: Four-Bedroom Apartment Rentals shows rental rates for three-bedroom apartments. Only one (1) listing was found, with a monthly rent of $1,700. Some comparables were found, with a consistent range from $1,600 to $1,775 and an outlier of $1,150. Census rent shows a $1,326 rent which is lower than the other rents listed. Combined, all rents averaged out to be $1,537 and can be considered close to market rents for this type of unit. The average vacancy rate of 7.45% is considered high, given the low level of availability and low number of recent comparables.

### Table: Three-Bedroom Apartment Rentals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartment 3 Bed 2 Bath</th>
<th>Zillow Rent</th>
<th>Zillow Ave. Area Rent</th>
<th>Apartments.com Rent</th>
<th>Apartments.com Ave. Area Rent</th>
<th>Zilpy.com Rent Comparables</th>
<th>Census Rent</th>
<th>Average Rent</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Average Vacancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,375</td>
<td>$1,244</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$882</td>
<td>$1,081</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$648</td>
<td></td>
<td>$715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,375</td>
<td>$1,244</td>
<td>$823</td>
<td>$882</td>
<td>$1,081</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Zillow, Apartments.com, Zilpy, 2016 ACS

### Table: Four-Bedroom Apartment Rentals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartment 4 Bed 2 Bath</th>
<th>Zillow Rent</th>
<th>Zillow Ave. Area Rent</th>
<th>Apartments.com Rent</th>
<th>Apartments.com Ave. Area Rent</th>
<th>Zilpy.com Rent Comparables</th>
<th>Census Rent</th>
<th>Average Rent</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Average Vacancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$1,326</td>
<td>$1,537</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,585</td>
<td>$1,326</td>
<td>$1,537</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Zillow, Apartments.com, Zilpy, 2016 ACS
Introduction

This appendix includes figures (tables and charts) which show a range of population, household, economic, housing and financial characteristics which supplement the analysis and summary observations for each chapter of this report. The data is taken from the 2011 and 2016 US Census American Community Survey (ACS), City of Platteville, Grant County Assessor’s office, and other sources. These characteristics include total numbers, percentages of total, and growth estimates, where appropriate. Total numbers, percentages and ratios are generally provided for Grant County and Platteville, whereas only percentages and ratios are generally provided for Wisconsin. This provides the estimates for County and City needed for analysis and planning purposes, while maintaining the readability of charts. Wisconsin percentages and ratios are included in tables and charts as these numbers are generally within the same bounded scale, 1 to 100 percent, and do not alter the readability of the various charts. Providing the data in this manner allows for the ability to compare characteristics between the three geographies and develop benchmarks and narrative explanation of the data in context for Platteville. Comparisons and benchmarks also allow needs to be assessed in this Appendix and allow for identification of any related Issues and Opportunities in that section.

1. Municipal Initiatives

According to the Department of Administration, Platteville has a current, January 2018, population estimated to be 12,268 persons. This represents a 9.3% increase from the 2010 Census count of 11,225 persons, which averages to a growth rate of 1.16% per year. The median age for Platteville is 22.4 years old, much lower than for the County or State, yet an increase in age from 21.9 in 2011. Much of this is due to the presence of UWP students. This issue of student housing is a concern for the City of Platteville, not only from the concern of housing students, but the effect student housing has on neighborhoods and the housing market in general.

Looking at population growth by generation, Figure 1.1 shows the percentage of the population contained within each generation for 2011 and 2016, according to Census ACS data. Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation X and Generation Y all increased their share of the population during this time period. For purposes of this study, the Silent Generation are considered to be those 70 and older, Baby Boomers are 50 to 69, Generation X are 35 to 49, Generation Y are 20 to 34, and Generation Z are those under 20. The increase in Generation X and Y indicates both an increase in University Students as well as an increase in the number of young professionals. Young professionals relocating to Platteville will

![Figure 1.1 Population Growth by Generation](image-url)
be looking for rental units in the short term and starting families in the medium term. The Silent Generation and Generation Z both declined as a percentage of the Platteville population during this time period. This indicates less of a need for senior housing in the near term. However, a closer look at Generation Z shows there is still a need to house younger residents.

Figure 1.2 shows that the percentage of children under the age of five (5) actually increased, which will result in the need for housing with enough bedrooms for larger families in the medium term.

Figure 1.2 Percentage Growth of Children Under the Age of Twenty

Figure 1.3 Average Household Size

Figure 1.4 Median Income

Overall income numbers show that Platteville does have mixed income levels, depending upon the type of income measured, when compared to the County and State. Figure 1.4 shows the median family income is $68,542, which is higher than the County at $61,965 and slightly lower than the State at $69,925 per year.
However, the median per capita income is only $17,235, while the County is considerably higher at $23,103 and the State higher still at $29,353. Median household income is also lower at $41,867 when compared to $49,077 for the County and $54,610 for the State. This shows that family income is comparatively strong, while individuals have fairly low incomes. Much of this discrepancy could be due to the presence of a high number of university students. However, this may indicate a near-term need for low-income housing for single persons and near and medium-term need for households which may not be families. Many of these households may be college students living together; however, some may be those taking care of seniors or other non-family members.

Looking at housing units, Figure 1.5 shows a total of 3,976 total housing units in Platteville in 2016, up from 3,873 in 2011, a 2.7% increase. That was more than twice the increase of 1.3% in total housing units for the County. Platteville had 3,758 occupied housing units, 3,758 are occupied housing units, a 6.2% increase since 2011, and 2018 vacant housing units in 2016, a -34.7% drop since 2011. This indicates that demand for housing is growing faster than supply. This shows that Platteville could have an issue with the number of vacant housing units in the community and an issue that could be getting worse.

In fact, as a percentage of total housing, Figure 1.6 shows Platteville’s overall vacancy rate as 5.5% in 2016, with the County at an overall vacancy rate of 11.2%. However, the 2016 vacancy rate does not take into account recent housing demand pressure. Looking at current listings in Appendix B, compared to existing housing stock, the current vacancy rate is closer to 2.5% for Single Family and Multi-Family owner-occupied housing. Vacancy rates for apartments vary depending upon type of unit.
Finally, comparing median home values to median household income gives a basic overview of housing stock relevant to local incomes. Figure 1.7 shows the median home values, median household incomes, and the ratio of home values to incomes for other communities close to Platteville. The higher the ratio of value to income the less affordable the market is. For example, Darlington has a low value to income ratio of only 1.94. Fennimore and Cuba City also have low value to income ratios.

However, Platteville has the highest ratio at 3.56. This indicates that median home prices are considerably higher in Platteville than local income levels and that the City may have an affordability issue.

These ratios reflect affordability using household incomes and it is, therefore, important to note that Platteville household incomes are depressed by the low per capita income of university students. Platteville had a median family income of $68,542, considerably higher than the $41,867 median household income. Comparing median family income to median home value reduces the value to income ratio to 2.17. However, household incomes are generally lower than family incomes in most cities. Therefore, both value to income ratios should be taken into consideration.
Population Projections

Figure 1.8 shows Platteville’s population is projected to increase to 12,514 by 2023 and 13,547 by 2033. These numbers are similar to Department of Administration projections which show Platteville having 12,800 persons in 2025, 13,180 persons in 2030 and 13,470 in 2035. The projections in Figure 1.8 represent an overall growth rate of over 10% from now to 2033.

Taking a closer look at projected population growth by generation, Figure 1.9 shows that those in the 19 or less, 35 to 49 and 65+ age groups are expected to gain in population. The growth in the 19 and under age bracket will increase the need for housing families with school-aged children. The growth in those aged 35 to 49 will create continued pressure for more workforce housing for young professionals and an increase in the number of seniors will create the need for senior housing in the medium to long-term. The flattening of growth in the 20 to 34 age bracket reflects a flattening of the University enrollment over the coming decades.
2. Housing Rehabilitation

In addition to survey data, the US Census ACS provides the percentage of housing built by timeframe and gives a good indication of housing condition and how Platteville housing stock compares to the County and the rest of the State.

Figure 2.1 shows Platteville to have a high percentage of homes built between 2010 and 2013, when compared to the County and State, indicating recent efforts to capture market demand. However, the supply of homes built in the 1950s and 1960s, as well as those built post and pre-war represent a significant stock of housing which may have rehabilitation needs.

Figure 2.1 Year Structure Built by Percent

Looking at City building permit data between 2006 and 2017, Figure 2.3 shows a considerable number of apartment units were constructed in 2008, with that number tapering off after the recession. However, apartment construction has recently risen with a number of projects, totaling 117 units, permitted over the past year. This shows the supply of this property type is beginning to meet demand. However,

Figure 2.3 Recent Building Permits by Year

Platteville is shown to have the lowest percentage of 1-unit detached houses and the highest percentage of 2 unit structures, or duplexes when compared to the County and State. Platteville also has a higher percentage of 5 to 9 unit, 10 to 19 and 20 or more unit structures. This is not surprising given that Platteville is a more urban area and the County and State have rural areas included with their housing percentages. The high level of duplexes reflects a high level of both new construction and single-family conversions which have occurred over the years.

Figure 2.2 Unit Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th>Platteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS
the construction of apartments has lagged in previous years and represents an opportunity to continue to capture demand.

Another key fact to note is that one-fifth (1/5) of all duplex permits was due to single-family conversions. This is again assumed to be aimed at the rental market, especially for University students. Although most of the existing duplex conversions occurred before 2006, adding an even a small amount of single-family conversions to the number of duplexes existing and the number of duplexes being permitted each year contributes to the imbalance in housing type. Given the low percentage of single-family detached homes, conversion to duplexes is further keeping single-family detached housing from meeting demand. Finally, recent building permits did not list any permits issues for rowhouses or townhomes. Townhomes are present in Platteville; however, they are older or built as apartments. This indicates a lack of supply for this particular housing type.

3. Infill Construction and New Development

Beyond the basic demographics provided in the previous chapter, this chapter provides additional details regarding households and the types of housing which will be needed to meet their needs and income levels.

Figure 3.1 shows the Platteville average household size to have grown by 4.6% since 2011. This is a considerably higher growth rate than for the County or State. Given that population growth mostly occurred in the Generation Y, Generation X, and the Boomers, much of this growth in household size can be attributed to household consolidation. This consolidation could be a result of more young adults moving in with their parents after graduating from college, more sharing of housing within and between generations and more seniors moving in with their children. Household consolidation is further shown by Census ACS data which shows non-family households to have increased in size from 1.94 persons per household in 2011 to 2.09 in 2016. Some household size growth can also be attributed to university student as well as the growth in those under the age of 5, representing more children in households.

Figure 3.1 Average Household Size Percent Increase 2011 - 2016

Source: 2011 & 2016 ACS
Figure 3.2 shows the number of Platteville households with children to have increased by 4.6% from 2011, with both the State and County showing decreases. With the growth in the younger age groups limited to those under 5 years of age, the increase in households with children can be attributed to births, consolidation of households and children living with non-family members.

Figure 3.3 shows the impact of the increase in households with children with an overall growth in those enrolled in school and increases in the elementary and middle school populations from 2011. Total enrollment and those in elementary and middle school outpaced gains in Grant County by a significant amount, with losses in preschool and high school slightly less.

At the other end of the age spectrum, Figure 3.4 shows the percentage of households with people 60 years or older increased by 10% from 2011. This increase is slightly lower than the increases seen by Grant County and the State. However, the increase is still significant and has implications for the Platteville housing market.

Looking at Figure 3.5, Platteville shows a significant decline in those over 65-year-old living alone since 2011, while the County was flat and the State showed a significant increase. This reflects the slowing growth in the senior population for Platteville as well as the consolidation in households. More seniors are either moving in with others or leaving Platteville rather than live alone.
The housing implications are that both existing housing and new housing will need to accommodate larger families with seniors.

Other household characteristics that are reflective of the growth in Generation Y, as shown in Chapter 1, include the presence of students and the impact this population will have on housing for all residents. Figure 3.6 shows Platteville has just 47% of occupied housing units as owner-occupied. This is far lower than for the County, at 70.6%, and lower than for the State at 67%. This means those looking to rent may have more options, much of the housing stock which would normally be oriented towards owners have been configured or re-configured to suit renters.

Figure 3.7 shows vacancy rates from 2011 to 2016 by tenure. During this time period, Platteville went from a low rental vacancy rate of 4.0% for owner-occupied homes to a healthier vacancy rate of 5.8%. However, Census data shows the homeowner vacancy rate plunged to 0% during the same time period. However, looking at the current for-sale market data in Appendix B, actual homeowner vacancy rates are now closer to 2.5%. Regarding the rental market, Appendix B shows that, using commercial for-profit rental search sites, there are currently fewer renter units available as indicated by the 5.8% vacancy rate, with rates ranging from 0% to 7.5%, depending upon number of bedrooms. In particular, there are limited numbers of newer three (3) bedroom units in good condition and few two (2) bedroom units in good condition as well.

In addition, the UW-P rental listing service provides a number of rentals not necessarily captured by commercial rental search websites. Looking at the UW-P service, there are 63 sing-family houses for rent. Platteville total housing units are 3,976. The vacancy rates for houses would therefore be 1.58%.
There are 43 apartments listed, which equal a 1.08% vacancy rate and there are a total of 185 units of all types for rent, which would equal a 4.65% vacancy rate.

This data indicates that the local housing stock builders, owners, and landlords have responded to the high number of renters and have outpaced the growth in Generation Y and the demand from university students. Some of the rental supply has included student apartments and single-family conversions. However, demand from university students is likely to increase as the growth in those aged 20 to 34 flattens over the coming decade and renter characteristics change. Renters from different age groups and from different types of the household will likely seek different types of rentals, including newer larger units in areas throughout the City, and many of the conversions may no longer be relevant to the rental market.
Housing Affordability
Looking at the supply of the housing relative to affordability, Figure 3.8 shows the number of owner-occupied households by median annual income range. This figure also shows the range of home values which correspond to the annual income ranges and can be considered affordable. The number of households in each income range is listed and the number of owner-occupied housing units within each value range is also shown. Finally, the balance of owner-occupied households compared to the number of housing units in each range is provided. A positive balance indicates that there are more houses in a particular affordability range than there are households in the comparable income range. For instance, there are 165 more existing housing units in the $125,000 to $187,499 range than there are households in the $50,000 to $74,999 income range. This figure also shows an oversupply of homes in the $62,500 to $124,999 range and a slight oversupply in the $187,500 to $249,000 range. However, given the low vacancy rate for owner-occupied homes, there may be an oversupply of homes, but they may not be available or for sale. This figure also shows an imbalance, or lack of housing, in the less expensive $0 to $62,499 range and the more expensive $250,000 to $374,999 range for those homes greater than $375,000 in value.

Figure 3.9 shows a similar comparison for renter-occupied units. The number of households by income range is compared to the number of houses existing in comparable affordability rent ranges. These ranges are also derived by taking 30% of the lower and upper level of the monthly incomes. The balance represents the number of affordable rental units per rent range, compared to the number of renter-occupied households which can afford units in this range. This figure shows there to be a significant shortfall in the lower rent range of $0 to $374 per month. However, there is an oversupply of rental units in the $625 to $1,249 per month range. The supply levels off at the $1,250 to $1,874 monthly rent range, with just 35 more rental units existing than household which can afford those units. There are even fewer units available in the $1,875 to $2,499 range.

Figure 3.8 Owner-Occupied Housing Affordability Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Affordable House Value Range</th>
<th>Owner Occupied HH in Income Range</th>
<th>Owner Occupied Units in Affordable Value Range</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $24,999</td>
<td>$0 - $62,499</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td>-187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>$62,500 - $124,999</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>$125,000 - $187,499</td>
<td>553</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>$187,500 - $249,000</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>$250,000 - $374,999</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td>-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000+</td>
<td>$375,000 +</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>-49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS; Vierbicher

Figure 3.9 Renter Housing Affordability Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Renter Occupied HH in Income Range</th>
<th>Affordable Monthly Rent Range</th>
<th>Renter Occupied Units in Affordable Range</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $14,999</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>$0 - $374</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>$375 - $624</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>$625 - $1,249</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>-480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>$1,250 - $1,874</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>$1,875 - $2,499</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$2,500 - $3,749</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3,750 +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ACS; Vierbicher
Population and Housing Projections

Combining the population projections from Chapter 1 with the household sizes, ownership percentages and housing type preferences of each age group, basic projections of the housing type needed through the next 15 years can be created. Figure 3.10 shows population growth for those under age 20 and for those 20 years and older along with their associated current and future housing needs. First, this figure shows an immediate need for an additional 6 multi-family homes, including duplexes, triplexes and rowhomes, in order to bring the current vacant rate to a healthy 3.5% rate. This figure also shows an additional 23 single-family homes need to be built now in order to achieve the same 3.5% rate.

For future needs, population growth is shown to be modest up to 2023 and then accelerate into 2028 and 2033. By 2023, there will be a modest need for 17 multi-family owner-occupied homes and 42 single-family homes. Rental home demand will be flat. From 2023 to 2028, the need for additional apartments will increase to 26 and the need for multi-family owner-occupied homes will increase to 30 and 54 additional units, respectively. Finally, from 2038 to 2033 the number of additional apartments needed will increase to 55 for those five years. These housing projections should be considered the minimum number of units which need to be built for new residents Additional housing units will be needed to accommodate those with a range of needs which may not be met by future market-rate housing, such as those buyers needing income-assistance, assisted living or senior care, and college students.

These preferences rely upon national data and should be taken in context with the Public Engagement Results in Appendix A as well as all the data and analysis provided in this Study. For instance, due to the high cost of housing, many of those who prefer to buy multi-family or single-family homes will have to rent as they save money and, therefore, more apartments should be considered for 2023 than the current projection of zero. Although, the 72-unit Ruxton apartments will likely satisfy demand for some unaccounted for demand. Stakeholder interviews also revealed a need for new apartments, particularly three (3) bedroom apartments, appropriate for workforce families moving to Platteville for employment and looking to buy a home in the future. Also, school teachers and University staff indicated a need for affordable apartments as well.

In addition, much of the single-family housing demand came from those in the senior age brackets who may prefer single-family homes, but are unlikely to purchase one should they sell their current house or move to Platteville to be close to family. The stakeholder interviews included input from realtors saying older home buyers are looking for single-story homes with less maintenance and lower cost than single-family homes. Also, the percentage of multi-family owner-occupied housing needed versus single-family homes becomes greater through 2028 and 2033, showing strong medium-term and long-term need. Therefore, more emphasis should be placed on multi-family attached housing, townhomes and condominiums, and less on single-family construction than indicated by the projections.
4. Funding Initiatives

An analysis of household financial characteristics shows a higher level of financial need than indicated by the survey results. Figure 4.1 shows a full 33% of Platteville residents live below the poverty level, as measured by the US Census ACS. This is far higher than for the County or State. Much of this can be attributed to the University population, where students are generally not fully employed and have lower incomes than those solely in the workforce. However, other residents are also included in the poverty figures. For instance, almost 24% of children below the age of 18 are below the poverty level, also far higher than for the County or State. Senior poverty is also high at 9.9%, which is higher than the State at 7.7%, yet lower than for the County at 10.3%.

Looking at the impact of the poverty level on housing costs, Figure 4.2 shows the monthly costs paid by homeowners, with a mortgage, as a percentage of their income. Fewer homeowners paid less than 20% of their income on housing costs than the County or State at 39.8%. In addition, more homeowners 31.1% paid more than 30% of their income on housing costs, which is a reflection of income levels as well as high housing prices.

The impact of poverty, and other financial factors, on renters is even more pronounced. Figure 4.3 shows only 21.6% of renters paid less than 20 percent of their income on rent, while 55.6% paid more than 30 percent of their monthly income on rent. These figures are also a result of lower incomes, higher levels of poverty and a reduced rental stock at lower price levels. The low vacancy rate of for-sale homes at lower income budgets is also imbalanced, forcing many renters to continue to rent and compete with others renters unable to buy a home.
Figure 4.4 shows the average rent paid by a percentage of the population. Fewer Platteville residents are paying between $500 and $999 per month than the County or State. More residents, 24.1%, are paying $1,000 to $1,499 in rent, considerably higher than the County or State. Median rents are high, at $738; however, this figure still does not represent the rents many residents are facing when choosing a rental. Rents have stabilized some though, with rents only increasing 5.9% since 2011, less than the 9% increase in the County.

Figure 4.4 Average Rent by Percent of Population

Source: 2016 ACS