(N - general

3/14/83 Estimate of lower income housing need Report by : William Quealer to Cotts Neck Planning Board p 5

CN 000 020 E

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 14, 1983

----- This

TO:

2-83

Colts Neck Planning Board

FROM:

Queale & Lynch, Inc./wq

P.P.#47, AICP William Oueale.

Estimate of Lower Income Housing Need SUBJECT:

memorandum is written as a follow-up to the Mt. Laurel II decision which was summarized in Memo 1-83. Part of the responsibility municipalities face under Mt. Laurel II is to identify the region in which the township is located, the indigenous (resident) need for low and moderate income housing at the present time, the prospective need for lower income housing in the region in which the township is located, and the township's fair share of the region's existing and prospective need. While there are no specific guidelines on how far into the future the prospective need should be projected, the general guideline is that the land use regulations should be set up in such a way that the development of lower income housing is reasonably achievable. We have selected projections to the year 2000 in order to provide maximum flexibility in phasing your fair share and to respond to future court decisions and/or new population information that might alter these numbers.

In defining the region, it is recommended the township use the three New Jersey counties\_lying within 30 minutes travel time from the township. This is consistent with the 31 minute travel time to work by 78 percent of the township's work force in 1980 and similar to the almost 28 minutes in the region. The region would therefore include Middlesex, Monmouth and Ocean Counties.

The income limit for low income households is 50 percent of the median income for the region. Moderate income limits fall into the 50-80 percent of median category. Based on these guidelines provided by the New Jersey Supreme Court, the maximum income for low income households would be \$10,250 based on a median household income for the region of \$20,510. Moderate income households would have incomes up to \$16,400. Approximately 23 percent of the households in the region fell into the low income category, and 16 percent in the moderate income group in the 1980 U.S. Census.

Relating these regional income characteristics to Colts Neck, the township had a total of 2,220 households of which 161, or 7 percent, were occupied by persons earning less than the region's low income, and 176, or 8 percent, were occupied by persons earning moderate incomes. These are based on a family being able to afford 25 percent of its income for housing (as determined in the Mt. Laurel II decision) and being able to afford a home with a value twice that of the family income. Using regional median family incomes, this converts to a maximum housing value of \$20,500 for low income and \$32,800 for moderate income. Rents would be under \$214/month for low income and betwen \$214 and \$342/month for

- 1 -

moderate income. The total of 337 lower income households now living in the township is about 15 percent of all households in the township.

The actual value of sales housing and actual monthly rental costs in the township show there are 46 low income units and 62 moderate income units. This means about 115 low income households plus 114 moderate income households are living in the township in housing they could no longer afford if they were to move into the township today. These 229 units were presumably purchased at lower prices in earlier years and/or are families spending more than 25 percent of their income for housing.

The prospective needs of the region are based on population projections made by the N.J. Department of Labor and Industry in February, 1982. The projections used are those developed under a formula which gives principal weight to projected levels of employment. This approach is particularly appropriate because of the relationships drawn between housing and jobs in the Mount Laurel II decision. To date, the projections are available only at the county level, not for municipalities. It is not known whether subsequent projections will be made for municipalities.

The total population for the year 2000 as developed by L&I for the three counties is 1,861,400 compared to 1,445,104 in 1980. Also in 1980, 31,386 people, or about 2 percent of the region's population lived in group quarters. Assuming this ratio will continue to the year 2000, an estimated 1,824,200 people will be living in households. Based on the average household size in the region in 1980 of 2.85 people, there will be a need for 653,100 households. With 39 percent of these households falling into the lower income category in 1980, and assuming that ratio will continue to the year 2000, about 254,700 lower income units will be needed. This compares to a 1980 count of 191,386. As a result, the difference of about 63,300 is the total number of lower income units needed in the region by the year 2000 to support these population projections. This equals almost 3,200 lower income units per year.

Distributing this household growth throughout the region should be based on the "Growth Areas" in the State Development Guide Plan, as well as employment opportunities. The three-county region has a land area of 1,427 square miles, of which 667 are in the Growth Areas. Colts Neck has about 125 acres of its land area in the Growth Area, which is about 0.2 square mile. This means the township has about 0.03 percent of the region's Growth Area.

In 1981, the township had 0.2 percent of the region's employment as reported by L&I in their covered employment data.

If these two categories of the region are applied to the prospective need for lower income housing through the year 2000, Colts Neck's fair share would be 19 units based on land area and 127 based on employment. Averaging these two numbers produces the township's fair share at 73.

In addition to its fair share of the regional need, each town has a responsibility to "...provide a realistic opportunity for decent housing for at least some part of its resident poor who now occupy dilapidated housing..." (Mt.

- 2 -

some part of its resident poor who now occupy dilapidated housing..." (Mt. Laurel II, p. 26). The U.S. Census does not provide data on "dilapidated" housing in 1980 as it did in 1970. However, looking at categories for incomplete baths or kitchens, or units with plumbing but no central heat, and units with 1.1 or more persons per room, the township had 13, 6, 7, and 13 ( 37 units, respectively.

The conclusion of this analysis is that the township has a very small portion in its southwest corner designated as part of the "growth area". Because of this small area, the township's share of the regional need is also small. The result is the township should provide opportunities for at least 136, but perhaps as many as 209, "lower income" units comprised of 60 percent low income and 40 percent moderate income units. These would be the township's fair share of the region's present and prospective lower income needs of the region.

In addition, the indigenous need appears to be between 6 and 13 units. It is suggested with this low a number that the township plan a program to identify the specific units, perhaps by inspections by the Construction Code Official, in order to verify what units have problems and to specify the problems that exist. Once this information is available, selction of appropriate methods to correct the problems can be considered.

The latest published HUD income limits had an effective date of 10/1/81. They should be updated shortly. Relating the household size income limits for Monmouth County to the approximate unit sizes needed, yields the following rent levels and sales values assuming 25 percent of income for housing. The results are based on mothly rents and sales housing at twice family income. It is noted the income limits are higher than those reported for the region in 1980. This reflects, for the most part, two years of inflation:

Persons/ Unit	Incom	e Limits		Unit Values						
			Unit	Low	Income	Moderate Income				
	Low	Moderate	Size	Rent	Sales	Rent	Sales			
1	\$10,600	\$15,250	OBR/1BR	\$221	\$21,200	\$318	\$30,500			
2	12,100	17,400	1 BR	252	24,200	363	34,800			
3	13,650	19,550	2 BR	284	27,300	407	39,100			
4	15,150	21,750	2 BR / 3 BR	316	30,300	453	43,500			
5	16,350	23,100	3 BR	341	32,700	481	46,200			
6	17,550	24,450	3BR/4BR	366	35,100	509	48,900			
7	18,800	25,850	4 BR	392	37,600	539	51,700			
8+	20,000	27,200	4BR+	417	40,000	567	54,400			

STATE GUIDE PLAN







		Middlese: Number	County	Monmout Number	់ជុំកម្លាស្ន •	Number	County 3	Total Number	Region	. €13te Nomber	ite :	Mil Postian of Region	
	Total Population In Group Otrs In Housing Units	595393 19137 57675		503173 9234 493939		346 <b>038</b> 3015 343023		144510+ 31385 1+13718	<b>.0</b> 217189	7388 792 7495		.0154584 .0114875 .0057012	
	Median Household Income: Low Income = Less than 50% Moderate Income = 50-80%	22825 11413 18261		21061 10530 12263		16224 8112 11°80		20510 10250 15400			· ·		
	<pre># Yr-Round Units Occupied = HSHLDS # w/ Low Incomes # w/ Moderate Incomes</pre>	196708 40507 32455	0.21 0.17	170130 39337 27909	0.23 0.16	128304 27781 23389	Ø.22 Ø.18	495142 107625 83753	0.22 0.17	2220 161 176		. 234-374 . 301 - 75 7 . 33213: 1	
	LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLD ESTIMATES # HSHLDS Less than 50% of the Median HSHLD Income	40507	0.21	39337	0.23	27781	0.22	107515	Ø	1±1	0.07	.001+959	•
	# Sales Units Meeting Need #/ value under \$20,500	1189		2897		2135		elzt-				.0010340	
	# Rental Units Meeting Need Mo. Rent Under \$114+No Cash Rent	17724		13985		7764		4+473		33		3.54FF 4	
1997 - 1997 1997 - 1997 1997 - 1997	Exist HSHLDS-Existing Units=NEED	21594		17455		17832		56731	(1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,	115			
	Inadequate Housing Units # w/o Bath or w/ half Bath # w/o complete Kitchen # w/plumbing but no Centrl hea # w/more than 1.1 Persons/Room	3326 2447 t 6619 5708	Ø. 09	279 <b>0</b> 1867 7102 3947	0.00	1370 1135 5855 2614	0.07	7485 5452 19577 11269	ଊ. ଅବ	13 5 7 13	9.02	8 '08E 4	
	MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLD ESTIMATES # HSHLDS with 50-80% of the Median Household Income	32465	Ø. 17	279049	Ø. 1/	. 1309	a. 13	83763	13.17	17.5	67. 1951	CO. 101	
	# Sales Units Meeting Need @ \$20,500 - \$32,800	6262		7990		10518				 -		3 3.26 - +	
	#Pental Units Meeting Need Mo. Rent \$214 - \$342	32903		24481		11002		∋8 <b>3</b> 86		53		7.752E-4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Existing HSHLDS-Exist Units=Need	-6700		-4562		1678		-9393		11+			
	RELATIONSHIP TO JOBS Mean Travel Time to Work 1980 Labor Force (Age 16+) 1981 Covered Employment*	24.5 307883 281317	Minutes 0.94	28.5 N 233867 164572	inutes 100 0.75	30.2 132992 79154	Minutes 100.00 0.45	27.73 674742 525043	Minutes 100.00	31 7 : 77 1 04 Pe	Mitutes 100.00	1.12 .0054+.0 .00 9330	
•	Age 16+ Commuting by Car Age 16+ Working in County Age 16+ Working in Mpl 1990 Unerployment (a Low Income)	244911 165927 67110	0.82 0.54 0.22 0.43	181207 133287 37943	0.83 0.61 0.17 0.07	107997 67814 32374 11592	0.89 0.55 0.27 0.09	534005 367028 137421 35212	ຍ. 94 - ຍ. 57 - ທ. 12 ມູມທູ	1857 1858 190	0.28 0.55 0.13 0.73	8.73 8.75 3.45	
	Ratio of Covered Employt to Occupied Housing Units	1.43	0.05	0.97		0.62		1.05		<b>0</b> ,49		Ø. +5	
	RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FACTORS							• "					
	Total Land Area (Sq. Miles) Portion in Growth Area (Sq. Mi.) Covered Jobs Resident Labor Force (Age 16+)	308,79 243 291317 307883		477.01 245 164572 233867		541 182 79154 131992		1425.8 570 5150+3 5747+2		31.8 .4 10:9 3:75		.0222875 5.9705-4 .0023330 .005 (447)	
	Total Population	2,589,53		502173				14+5135		- <u>6</u> 30		. BN: 459	