

SECTION 4 - HOUSING NEEDS/ DEMAND ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

This component of the Housing Manhattan Study provides a **housing needs/demand analysis** for the City of Manhattan for the next five years, concluding in January, 2005. Included are (1) an overview of housing demand potential in Manhattan by 2005; (2) a listing of **Housing Goals and Strategies** to serve as the foundation to important decisions regarding housing development in Manhattan; and (3) a ***discussion of housing demand as it pertains to target populations***. Target populations include owners, renters, elderly, families, special populations and students, both traditional and non-traditional. ***These goals and strategies address housing availability, housing preservation, housing priorities and housing implementation.***

Also included is a discussion of future housing locations in the City of Manhattan. Discussed are the land barriers and opportunities to develop housing in Manhattan, as well as the identification of specific land areas, or **growth areas** for consideration. Also presented is the identification of the estimated **housing rehabilitation** demand in the community of Manhattan.

DETERMINING A HOUSING POTENTIAL

To effectively determine Manhattan's housing demand potential, the Consultant utilized three separate housing demand components. These included **(1) vacancy deficiency (demand), (2) demand for new households, replacement housing units and affordable housing units, and (3) local "pent-up" housing demand**. The following describes each of these.

(1) housing vacancy deficiency (demand)

Housing vacancy deficiency is defined as the number of vacant units lacking in a community, whereby the total percentage of vacant units is less than 5 to 6 percent. **A vacancy rate of 5 to 6 percent is the minimum rate recommended to allow a community to have sufficient housing available for both new and existing residents.** The housing vacancy deficiency figure considers 5 percent of the current year-round housing stock in a community minus vacant units.

(2) housing demand-new households, replacement, affordable demand

New households, the replacement of substandard housing and the assistance that a community provides to maintain **affordable housing** for both its present and future households with a (housing) cost burden are important considerations in the determination of a housing demand potential for any particular community.

(substandard unit)

A **substandard unit**, as defined by HUD, is a unit lacking complete plumbing, plus the number of households with more than 1.01 persons per room. Households experiencing **renter or owner cost overburden** are persons paying more than 30 percent of their income towards housing. Consideration is also given to the number of new households, demolitions and any other projects in the planning stage for the designated community.

(3) "pent-up" housing demand

The **“pent-up” housing demand for current residents in the community, desiring and having the capacity to afford alternative housing, must also be considered.** In essence, this includes estimating the housing demand potential during the planning period for those households currently residing in the community. This includes the consideration of households changing tenant status from owner to renter or vice-a-versa and households changing types of housing (ie. larger home or apartment, smaller living quarters, single family to townhouse or condominium housing, etc.). Pent-up demand is calculated utilizing data associated with development and household tenure trends and qualitative data received from local citizenry.

Pent-up demand is a highly speculative demand and one which must be locally promoted and market driven by resident desire.

MANHATTAN HOUSING DEMAND POTENTIAL 2005

Table 4.1 identifies the overall housing demand potential in Manhattan by 2005. **The community has an estimated five-year housing demand potential for 2,975 units, including an estimated 1,007 owner and 1,968 rental units.**

The **two-year housing demand** for the City of Manhattan is an estimated 58 percent of the five-year demand, or **1,725 units**. This would equal an estimated 65 percent of the total rental unit demand, or 1,279 units, and 45 percent of the five-year owner housing unit demand, or 453 units.

**TABLE 4.1
HOUSING DEMAND POTENTIAL
MANHATTAN, KANSAS
2000-2005**

1. New Households. Housing Replacements. Affordability Demand	
Owner	563 Units
Rental	1,445 Units
Total	2,008 Units
2. Housing Vacancy Deficiency/Demand (Market Standards*)	
Owner	189 Units
Rental	388 Units
Total	577 Units
3. "Pent-Up" - Housing Demand	
Owner	255 Units
Rental	135 Units
Total	390 Units
Total Estimated Demand Potential	
Owner	1,007 Units
Rental	1,968 Units
Total	2,975 Units

*Market Standards - Housing having all appropriate, modern amenities, capable of being marketed to a variety of sectors in the community.

Source: Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

Types of rental housing demand - Manhattan

Table 4.2 identifies the proposed rental housing types for the City of Manhattan during the next five years. **An estimated 1,968 rental units are needed, with up to 945 units for low- to moderate income persons and families of 80 percent of median income or less.**

Affordable rental housing is needed for persons/families of 80 percent of the County’s median income or less, including both traditional and non-traditional students. Up to 225 affordable housing rental units will be needed by elderly/ retirees, 55+ years of age needing support services. An estimated 625 rental units are needed for families of low- to moderate income, especially young families and households with a single parent. Approximately 95 affordable rental units will be needed in Manhattan by 2005 to serve persons of special needs, including persons with either a physical and/or mental disability and individuals/families needing emergency or transitional housing.

TABLE 4.2		
PROPOSED RENTAL UNIT TYPES		
MANHATTAN, KANSAS		
2005		
<u>Rental Types</u>	<u>Affordable*</u>	<u>Market Rate**</u>
0-Bedroom Units	25	0
One-Bedroom Units	260	300
Two-Bedroom Units	425	502
<u>Three- or more Bedroom Units</u>	<u>235</u>	<u>221</u>
Total Rental Units	945	1,023
Elderly Rental Units	225	235
Family Rental Units	625	775
Special Populations	95	13
*80% of County's Median Income or Less		
** Above 80% of County's Median Income		
Source: Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000		

Market rate rental units are needed in Manhattan to address the needs of both younger families and retired persons. As determined via the research of current market rate rentals in Manhattan, **during the next five years, newly developed, two-bedroom market rate rental units could secure monthly rents of \$625 to \$700.** Retirement housing for moderate- to upper income elderly persons could support monthly rents of \$900 to \$2,600, depending upon the level of services provided. These rent ranges area consistent with current rents in the community coupled with affordability levels.

Types of owner housing - Manhattan

Table 4.3 identifies proposed owner housing types needed in Manhattan by 2005. **An estimated 235 units of owner occupied housing could be developed for low- to moderate income persons and families** to both improve their living situation and provide them the opportunity of home ownership. Affordable owner housing is needed for families at or below 80 percent of the County’s median income. ***Owner occupied housing for persons and families of low- to moderate income should range between \$45,000 and \$110,000.***

New market rate owner occupied housing should be developed for the moderate - to upper income families in Manhattan, including elderly/retired citizens in search of more convenient, appropriate housing for purchase as opposed to renting. **An estimated 772 units of market rate owner occupied housing could be developed in Manhattan by 2005.** The cost and size of each new owner occupied housing unit would be a market driven concept, the choice of developers and potential buyers. Attached townhouses as well as detached single family houses could be marketed to interested families.

TABLE 4.3		
PROPOSED OWNER UNIT TYPES		
MANHATTAN, KANSAS		
2005		
<u>Owner Types</u>	<u>Affordable*</u>	<u>Market Rate**</u>
Two-Bedroom Units	40	51
<u>Three- or more Bedroom Units</u>	<u>195</u>	<u>721</u>
Total Owner Units	235	772
* 80% of County's Median Income or Less		
** Above 80% of County's Median Income		
Source: Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000		

HOUSING REHABILITATION DEMAND

An estimated 1,439 housing structures in Manhattan are in need of either moderate or substantial rehabilitation or replacement during the next five years. **Table 4.4** identifies housing rehabilitation needs in Manhattan by 2005.

Manhattan has a two-year estimated need for 500 units to receive moderate rehabilitation and ***275 housing units to be substantially rehabilitated***. An estimated 36 units need to be demolished and replaced. The estimated cost to complete this rehabilitation would range between \$9.3 and \$17 million.

The community of Manhattan should give first priority to improving the 275 units needing substantial rehabilitation. A high percentage of these units are assumed to be rental, occupied by very low- to low income families, including students.

TABLE 4.4
ESTIMATED HOUSING REHABILITATION/REPLACEMENT
DEMAND
MANHATTAN, KANSAS
2000-2002

<u>Total Structures</u> <u>Surveyed</u>	<u>Needing Moderate</u> <u>Rehabilitation</u>	<u>Needing Substantial</u> <u>Rehabilitation</u>	<u>Needing</u> <u>Replacement</u>
9,749	500	275	36

Source: Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

PRIORITY HOUSING NEEDS

The **priority housing needs of Manhattan** were derived from the results of all housing/planning research activities, both qualitative and quantitative. The following is a review of these priorities.

TABLE 4.5		
PRIORITY HOUSING NEEDS		
MANHATTAN, KANSAS		
2005		
	<u>Housing Group</u>	<u>Type of Housing Need</u>
Priority 1	1. Low Income Families	1. Home ownership opportunities, rent-to-own programs, housing rehabilitation
	2. Low Income Elderly Households	2. Independent living apartments, assisted living apartments, housing rehabilitation
	3. Married and/or Non-traditional Students	3. Rental apartments, rental housing, duplexes
Priority 2	1. Traditional Students	1. Rental apartments, dormitories, duplexes
	2. People with Disabilities	2. Housing rehabilitation, housing support services, independent living rentals
	3. Homeless	3. Shelter beds (short-term), support services, transitional housing
Priority 3	1. Middle Income Families	1. Additional median income level housing and condominiums
	2. Middle Income Elderly	2. Additional median income level housing, condominiums, rental units (both assisted and unassisted)

Source: Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

MANHATTAN HOUSING GOALS & STRATEGIES

The following housing goals and strategies are a product of both the qualitative and quantitative data presented throughout this Housing Study. ***The purpose of these goals and strategies is to stimulate local interest and provide policy direction to produce attractive, marketable and, most importantly, affordable housing programs in Manhattan, Kansas.***

Several general assumptions dictate the design of the following housing goals and strategies. **First**, the City of Manhattan population has and will continue to grow during the next five years at a minimum of 1.7 percent annually. **Second**, a growing population, combined with smaller households, will result in a need for more housing units, specifically for elderly, special populations and younger families. **Third**, the community of Manhattan lacks an ample supply of safe, decent and affordable housing. **Fourth**, a large student population, both traditional and non-traditional, associated with Kansas State University, dictates a need for improved, affordable housing, situated in appropriate locations throughout Manhattan, in close proximity to the services necessary for this group. **Last**, the presence of Fort Riley in the Manhattan area provides the population base of the City with a continuing presence of renter and owner occupied housing by military personnel. The continued presence of the military installation will impact housing demand in the community.

Housing Availability

Goal 1

Strive to establish and maintain a sufficient amount vacant, available housing in a variety of housing types and geographic locations throughout Manhattan.

Strategies

- A. Market the City of Manhattan to local and regional developers to facilitate the development of both single and multifamily housing of sufficient number to achieve a housing vacancy rate of 5 to 7 percent.
- B. Establish private/public partnerships between developers and the City of Manhattan and non-profit organizations to accelerate the production of housing in an effort to expand the number of affordable housing units and subdivisions in the community.

- C. Insure that sufficient acreages for housing are identified in the Land Use Element of the Manhattan Comprehensive Plan and permissively zoned to prepare the community for future housing development in the next five years, a minimum of 445 acres.

Goal 2

Insure that as the community of Manhattan grows, the quality and availability of services to persons/families of low- to moderate incomes and/or special needs populations is maintained and improved.

Strategies

- A. Locate housing for persons and families of low- to moderate income and/or special needs populations in areas within close proximity to existing services.
- B. If a public transit system is developed, insure transit routes provide access to affordable and special needs housing areas.
- C. Support the financial and staffing needs of public organizations in an effort to bring their services and programs to a variety of locations throughout the community and to select affordable programs.

Housing Preservation

Goal 1

Pursue all avenues which focus the efforts of property owners, financial institutions, City administration and departments and residents of Manhattan to work together to rehabilitate deteriorating housing conditions in neighborhoods throughout the City.

Strategies

- A. Expand access to housing rehabilitation programs with forgivable or low-interest loans to rehabilitate up to 775 structures in Manhattan.
- B. Expand the availability of public and private incentives, such as tax increment financing, to increase re-investment in neighborhoods located in the core of the City.

- C. Replace substantially deteriorated or dilapidated structures with new buildings of appropriate size, scale and architectural design to be compatible with the architectural styles of the early 1900's Downtown Area neighborhoods.
- D. Institute a rental housing inspection program.

Housing Priorities

Goal 1

Provide future housing development types which meet the needs of Manhattan's current and future residents.

Strategies

- A. Develop single family housing which expands home ownership opportunities for low and moderate income families with emphasis on "affordable" housing subdivisions.
- B. Housing construction for low income elderly should expand the availability of independent and assisted living apartments.
- D. Rental Apartments, duplexes and single family homes should be constructed to expand the availability of housing to married, non-traditional and traditional students.

Goal 2

Housing and services for special needs populations must be improved and expanded as the City continues to grow.

Strategies

- A. Housing availability for persons with disabilities, including frail elderly, should focus on independent living which provides access to support services.
- B. Shelters, emergency and transitional housing in Manhattan should continue to exist and be expanded in the community, to meet the needs of the homeless and near-homeless population
- C. Increase support services to special populations in conjunction with housing.

Housing Implementation

Goal 1

Expand the capacity of Manhattan's developers, financial institutions, private non-profits, University, business and industries to collectively develop needed housing in the community.

Strategies

- A. Create a *housing partnership* which brings representatives of Manhattan's housing stakeholder community together to streamline housing development.
- B. Maintain a *community housing committee* to foster the continuous development of housing and monitor Manhattan's housing needs progress.
- D. Develop a Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO). The CHDO can access HOME funds to provide resources for rehabilitation, new construction, acquisition and tenant based rental assistance.

Goal 2

Foster the continued education of housing development techniques for Manhattan's housing partners.

Strategies

- A. Create the position of “community housing coordinator” to direct housing development activities in Manhattan.
- B. Conduct housing development workshops to expand the knowledge of Manhattan's housing partners in an effort to stimulate housing development.
- C. Expand the availability of housing workshops to provide knowledge of home purchasing techniques, housing rehabilitation and financial budgeting for first-time home buyers and current homeowners.

Goal 3

Seek additional sources of funding to package needed financial resources to increase housing development throughout Manhattan.

Strategies

- A. Create an affordable ***housing trust fund*** in the City of Manhattan comprised of monies secured from local business and public entities, ie. churches, other non-profit corporations, to assist in financing housing developments.
- B. A ***community reinvestment fund*** should be established by Manhattan's financial institutions, nonprofit organizations and community benefactors to be used for affordable housing development and housing rehabilitation activities.
- D. Encourage partnership between the City of Manhattan and local organizations to seek out all sources of public monies for housing needs. Programs such as Community Development Block Grants and Low-Income Housing Tax Credits could be combined with tax increment financing and private local monies to stimulate housing construction and redevelopment of existing neighborhood areas.

AN OVERALL DEMAND STATEMENT

Community challenge

As documented and discussed throughout the Housing Manhattan Study, the City of Manhattan has a tremendous potential to add to and improve its overall housing stock. ***Data suggest a need for up to 2,975 housing units by January, 2005; an estimated 1,007 owner units and 1,978 rental units.*** The City of Manhattan is challenged to meet at least 65 percent of this demand during the next five years, or 1,935 units, an estimated 386 units per year.

Land area requirements

To meet the minimum housing demand requirement of 1,935 housing units, by 2005, ***the City of Manhattan will need to designate up to 445 acres of land for residential development.*** This amount of land equals an estimated three times the land needed, but allows for choice by those seeking areas for housing development. An estimated 60 percent of this land area would accommodate low density developments of three or less units per structure, with the remaining 40 percent for higher density multifamily programs.

Demand for target populations

Table 4.6 identifies the needed housing for the various *target populations* in Manhattan by 2005. Included is an identification of demand per group, per income category. **Households within the annual income categories 0 to 80 percent of the median income are considered low- to moderate income.**

< **Proposed Elderly Rental Units**

.....an estimated 155 units at 30 to 80 percent of median income or less.

.....70 units for elderly households at 0 to 30 percent of median income.

< **Proposed Family Rental Units**

.....an estimated 190 units for families at 31 to 80 percent of median income.

.....an estimated 590 units for families at 80 percent and above median income.

.....an estimated 60 units for families at 0 to 30 percent of median income.

< **Proposed Special Population Rental Units**

.....an estimated 50 additional units for those at 0 to 30 percent of median income.

.....a total demand of 108 units for special populations.

< **Proposed Traditional Student Rental Units**

....an estimated 370 additional rental units, or 18.8 percent of the proposed rental units needed would be necessary for the traditional student population.

< **Proposed Non-traditional Student Rental Units**

....190 of the proposed 1,968 additional rental units would be for this population, the majority for the low- to moderate income groups.

< **Proposed Elderly Owner Units**

....an estimated 90 units for elderly households greater than 51 percent of median income.

< **Proposed Family Owner Units**

....707 additional units for those greater than 80 percent of median income level.

This accounts for 70 percent of the estimated total owner demand.

....155 additional units for those at 80 percent of median income level or less.

< **Proposed Special Population Owner Units**

....an estimated 55 additional owner units for special populations is recommended.

Table 4.6

Housing type by price product

Table 4.7 identifies **proposed housing types (by number of bedrooms)**, both owner and rental, for Manhattan, Kansas, **by price product**. Price products correspond to various household median income levels. These price products also reflect the current **“street costs”** for both the rental and purchase of housing in Manhattan.

The rental housing in greatest demand is the two- and three bedroom unit with a price product, or monthly rent, of \$625 and above (723 units). One bedroom units with the same price product closely follow in terms of demand (300 respectively).

A total of 495 rental units ranging from zero bedroom efficiencies to three or more bedrooms are needed in the \$385 or less per month price range.

The greatest demand in terms of owner units are the two- and three bedroom units with a purchase cost of \$186,000+ (540 units, or 52.6 percent of the total owner units, demand). A great demand also exists for owner units with a cost for purchase at \$85,000 and below (145 total units for two- and three bedroom units).

Table 4.7

FUTURE HOUSING LOCATIONS

The identification of vacant available land for housing development is a critical component in preparing the City to be proactive in attracting additional housing to the community. ***An estimated minimum of 445 acres of residential land needs to be identified to meet the housing demand in Manhattan by 2005.*** Acreage estimates for future residential development include allowances for public right-of-ways, utility easements and open space. Total acreages reflect three times the true acreage needed in order to provide development opportunities in a variety of locations and price products throughout the City.

The discussion of the growth areas includes general descriptions and location of each area, opportunities and constraints to development, as well as generalized planning recommendations. The citizen participation process utilized a variety of tools to access public opinion. Specifically, the results of the Electronic Town Hall Meetings, the Community Survey and Focus Group Meetings. Although the Electronic Town Hall Meetings prioritized needed housing types in each of the Growth Areas, location concerns and land availability were not addressed. The Consultant included general planning recommendations to provide for appropriate distribution of housing types at a variety of price products. Planning recommendations are based on modern development and planning standards which assist municipalities to make sound development decisions.

Barriers to growth

Future growth for the City of Manhattan is impacted by many natural and manmade barriers. Lakes, rivers, creeks and their associated flood plains impact the city from nearly every direction. The Big Blue River and Tuttle Creek Lake provide ample park and recreation opportunities to area residents, but also limit growth opportunities to the east and northeast. Development to the south, southeast and southwest is impacted by the Kansas River and Wildcat Creek floodplain areas, generally located south of Highway 18/24 (Fort Riley Blvd.). Wildcat Creek floodplains also impact development potentials along and south of Anderson Avenue (County Road #412).

Beyond flood prone areas, the steep slopes of rolling hills and valleys limit development options in the northwest, west, southwest and southeast portions of Manhattan's planning jurisdiction. Potential development areas to the west of Seth Child Road, as an example, will be impacted by higher development costs due to topography for underground utilities and street construction.

Manmade barriers to growth and development include the Fort Riley Military Reservation and the Manhattan Unified School District 383 boundary to the west of the community, as well as lands owned by Kansas State University. The northcentral portion of Manhattan, an area north of the City approximately between Browning Avenue and Highway 13/24/177 (Tuttle Creek Blvd.), and an area of approximately 1,200 acres northwest of the City are all owned by Kansas State University. The military reservation is generally within one and one-half miles of the western corporate limits of Manhattan.

These natural and manmade barriers in Manhattan funnel residential growth towards the southwest, northwest and to a more limited extent, the northeast and eastern portions of Manhattan. The “Land Use Element” of the City of Manhattan Comprehensive Plan, 1991, analyzed the growth potentials of the community in detail. An urban area service limit boundary for the year 2010 was established by the Land Use Plan, which was utilized in targeting residential growth areas for purposes of this Housing Study. Future residential growth areas are identified in **Illustration 3**, which includes both infill and redevelopment areas, as well as new neighborhoods.

Current development trends

Existing development patterns and the Future Land Use Plan for Manhattan have concentrated on single family residential uses. Medium to high density residential uses, outside of the Downtown area, have for the most part been identified as site specific areas or complexes. Multifamily residential uses are recommended by the Consultant to be utilized as buffering mechanisms to lessen the impact of higher density use areas upon low density residential neighborhoods.

Growth Areas Map

Commercial and industrial land use areas, major transportation corridors and public use areas should be buffered with open space and multifamily residential uses. Corridors such as Tuttle Creek Boulevard, Seth Child Road and Kimball Avenue have portions which have multifamily development, however, single family uses are the more prominent residential land use types. Underdeveloped portions of these corridors, as well as future development corridors such as Scenic Drive (south of Anderson Avenue) should be planned for medium to high density residential uses. Well planned, permissively zoned areas are imperative to encourage continued multifamily development in Manhattan.

Planned Unit Developments (PUD) can also serve as an effective means of encouraging subdivisions which contain a variety of residential areas. Medium density apartments, townhouses and open space can effectively buffer high density areas from lowest density single family neighborhoods. Combinations of residential, commercial and open space land uses can be effectively combined in a PUD to establish innovative subdivisions where commercial and residential uses compliment one another.

The use of Planned Unit Developments in Manhattan has primarily focused upon one land use type. Existing Planned Unit Developments are comprised of just single family, or just multifamily uses. Likewise, existing areas which are zoned medium to high density residential, RM or R-3, allow single and two-family dwellings as permitted uses. However, with the exception of RM District areas in the Downtown, these districts have exclusively been used for multifamily dwellings.

The City of Manhattan has flexible planning resources available to developers, however, they have yet to utilize them to their fullest capabilities. A revised future land use plan with expanded areas identified as multifamily use areas will effectively promote continued housing development. Multifamily land uses should be priorities as buffering mechanisms to lessen the impact of transportation corridors, commercial and industrial uses, as well as areas to encourage a variety of residential use types.

Results of the Community Survey indicated that the main priority of new multifamily development should be the construction of housing for persons and families of moderate to low incomes. The City of Manhattan is scheduled to begin the process of updating the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan within the next year and, when complete, will assist continued housing development. As part of this housing study the following discussion analyzes the seven different growth areas of Manhattan and discusses housing development potentials of each area of the community.

Growth Area #1

The **Northwest Growth Area** is generally located northwest of the Anderson Avenue and Seth Child Road (Highway 113) intersection. At the time of publication of this document the proposed Grand Mere Subdivision had completed a master plan for a golf course community. This 1,076 acre subdivision will occupy **over 45 percent of the land** identified as Growth Area 1. Grand Mere is estimated to include 489 acres of residential uses ranging from single family and townhomes to apartments and an elder care facility. Commercial, office and open space uses will all be integrated with the existing golf course.

The Electronic Town Hall meetings concluded that the **Northwest Growth Area** should be the top priority for single family development and for older adult, 55+ years of age, retirement living options. Eventual development of the Grand Mere subdivision will provide a variety of housing types which meet these priorities and provide a range of amenities to complement this future neighborhood. Additional areas adjacent the southeast portion of Grand Mere, as well as areas in close proximity to the Washington Marlatt Memorial Park, provide future development opportunities as well. Vacant land for development in these areas is much smaller, 100 to 180 acres total, in comparison to Grand Mere. Nearly every other portion of the Northwest Growth Area is developed with very few undeveloped or vacant lots.

Development options for vacant property remaining in the Northwest Growth Area are limited. Topographic constraints drive up the cost of property in this region due to its impact upon infrastructure. Further development to the west is limited by the boundary line of the Unified School District 383 (Manhattan School District) following the west corporate limit line. Future development will be primarily moderate- to upper-income single family residential uses, with the exception of the Grand Mere Area.

Growth Area #2

The **Central/Northcentral Growth Area** includes the area of Manhattan, located north of Anderson Avenue, between Seth Child Road and Manhattan Avenue. Areas north of the corporate limits between Highway 113 and Highway 24/13/177 are likewise part of this Northcentral Growth Area. ***Lands occupied and owned by Kansas State University comprise a significant percentage of this area and are the most limiting factor to continued housing development in Growth Area #2.*** Areas south of Kimball Avenue are developed with few vacant parcels. Residential areas adjacent the University between Jardine Drive and Anderson Avenue, from Denison Avenue to College Avenue, have a high concentration of multifamily dwellings. Areas north of Kimball Avenue have subdivisions, some of which are still developing or have additional areas with smaller scale residential development opportunities.

Areas beyond the current corporate limits, northeast of the Seth Child Road and Marlatt Avenue intersection, between Highway 113 and approximately Browning Avenue, include undeveloped land within Manhattan's 2010 future urban limits. **An estimated 180 acres would allow for a variety of residential development types.** Priority should be given to multifamily uses along Seth Child Road, north of Marque Hill Road, as well as adjacent Browning Avenue as buffering mechanisms.

The **Central/Northcentral Growth Area** was reported as the third highest priority area for future single family development during the Electronic Town Hall meetings. Respondents also designated this area as the ***top priority for higher density residential development***, including duplex and multifamily dwellings. Housing for persons with a disability and establishing emergency shelters were also priorities for this Growth Area.

Growth Area #3

The **Northeast Growth Area** encompasses the portion of Manhattan located east of Tuttle Creek Boulevard, including the Northview Elementary School and Eisenhower Middle School neighborhoods, areas east and north of the developed portions of this part of the community contain ample area for future development, provided that surface drainage issues are adequately addressed. Potential areas beyond the 2010 future urban area limits are associated flood plains of the Big Blue River. The largest concentrations of land with development potential are located beyond the corporate limits, east of the new middle school and along Marlatt Avenue. Infill of vacant areas within and adjacent the corporate limits is recommended to precede development beyond the corporate limits. ***This "middle" income neighborhood would be an ideal location for additional moderately priced "affordable" housing subdivisions.***

The level topography of this growth area allows a variety of single and multiple family dwelling types to be implemented. Multifamily uses should be designated along the Tuttle Creek Boulevard (U.S. Highway 24), generally north of Marlatt Avenue. Higher density residential uses are also ideally suited in close proximity to Eisenhower Middle School. Remaining areas should be utilized for affordable moderate priced single family dwellings with areas appropriate for medium density duplex and four-plex development. Neighborhood commercial centers will especially be needed in the eastern portions of the Growth Area to provide necessary services.

The priorities associated with this Growth Area during the Electronic Town Hall meetings focused on the following development interests. Priority housing types included single, duplex and multifamily dwellings and the highest priority of any growth area for development of quality manufactured/mobile home parks.

Growth Area #4

The **Southwest Growth Area** is generally located west of Seth Child Road between Anderson Avenue and Fort Riley Boulevard (Highway 18). Areas west and south of the current corporate limits, within the 2010 future urban limits are impacted by the Wildcat Creek floodplains. Designated floodplains are, however, within the northern portion of the Growth Area south of Anderson Avenue and adjacent the Anneberg Sports Complex. Outside of the proposed Grand Mere development in the Northwest Growth Area, the Southwest Growth Area represents the largest undeveloped area within Manhattan's future urban growth limits. If developed to the 2010 urban limits, the Fort Riley Military Reservation would be approximately one and one-half miles west from the community.

High density multifamily uses are most appropriate in areas adjacent to Scenic Drive, as well as the Anneberg Sports Complex. However, topographic and floodplain constraints will make locating multifamily uses challenging. For the above stated reasons, the majority of the undeveloped areas in the southwest Growth Area is more suited for single family residential uses.

Future development is recommended to occur from the current corporate limits outward to support cost effective infrastructure development. Growth Area 4, the **Southwest Growth Area**, was identified during the Electronic Town Hall Meetings as the second highest priority area for single family development, fourth highest for duplex and multifamily development and the third highest priority area for quality manufactured/mobile home parks.

Growth Area #5

Southcentral Manhattan is the location of Growth Area 5. Boundaries are identified as Anderson Avenue on the north, Westwood Drive on the east, Fort Riley Boulevard on the south and Seth Child Road along the west. Major land marks within this area are Manhattan High School, Sunset Park Zoo, Sunset Cemetery and Girl Scout Park. Wildcat Creek does impact the western portion of this Area with associated floodplains. Commercial uses are located along Seth Child Road and Fort Riley Boulevard. Residential uses primarily are composed of single family dwellings with the eastern portion of the area containing the oldest dwellings. A large mobile home park, Redbud Estates, occupies a significant portion of the west half of this Growth Area.

Growth potentials of this **Southcentral Area** are limited, as ***this area is entirely within the corporate limits of the City and nearly fully developed.*** As such, future housing needs area generally confined to housing rehabilitation and establishing emergency shelters and housing for people with mental/physical disabilities, as per the results of the Electronic Town Hall meetings.

Growth Area #6

Downtown Manhattan and the Town Center Mall, the Manhattan Country Club, Goodnow and City Parks are the major landmarks of the **Eastcentral Growth Area**. The Area is located east and south of Kansas State University, generally west of Tuttle Creek Boulevard, north of Fort Riley Boulevard and east of Westwood Road. As this area represents the original core of the City, the oldest houses in Manhattan (typically late 1880's to early 1900's) exist throughout the area. Based on the advanced age of these dwellings, the Eastcentral Growth Area also contains three of the subareas identified in the Housing Condition Survey Analysis as containing moderately to severely deteriorated structures.

The proximity of the University and Downtown commercial areas has also impacted the area with in-fill apartments, houses converted to apartments and several apartment buildings or complexes. Rehabilitation and replacement of substantially deteriorated dwellings should be a primary housing activity in the **Eastcentral Growth Area**.

Housing rehabilitation efforts should be coupled with strict enforcement of the City's building codes and an occupancy inspection process when owners or tenants change. The condition of dwellings, by these processes, will be maintained and ultimately, the property tax base of Manhattan will be better protected . Access to grant and low interest loan funds for low- to moderate income property owners in order to meet the required code improvements is vitally important to the success of neighborhood revitalization. Design standards should be implemented which require new construction to be compatible with the architectural characteristics of the early twentieth century residential dwellings. New construction should also be of an appropriate scale to be compatible with the building heights, roof pitch, and the width and depth of the early twentieth century single family dwellings and small scale (six unit) apartment buildings. Lastly, incentives should be established to encourage more owner occupied households in this growth area and throughout the community.

The future of **Eastcentral Manhattan** has been an area of focus since the early 1980's. Redevelopment of the Downtown and development of the Manhattan Town Center has reinvigorated the commercial center of the community. However, ***the private sector has been unable to refocus redevelopment efforts into the adjacent residential neighborhoods.***

The Electronic Town Hall meetings asked participants the following: *“Should there be an effort to develop housing in the Downtown?”* Overwhelmingly, 81 percent of the respondents said “Yes.” Barriers to developing housing Downtown were identified as the lack of suitable sites or vacant parcels for development, the cost feasibility of redevelopment, the limitations of zoning/building codes and the lack of parking. Design standards and architectural control of new development was strongly encouraged by respondents of the Town Hall meetings, focus group meeting attendees and Housing Steering Committee members.

Town Hall meetings also listed the Eastcentral Area as a priority area for duplex and multifamily development, additional housing for older adults and persons with disabilities, the area of focus for new emergency shelters and the location of associated services for current and future residents.

Growth Area #7

The **Southern Growth Area**, south of Fort Riley Boulevard and west of Rosencutter Road is primarily a post 1970's residential neighborhood. Single and multifamily dwellings dominate the Growth Area with the Davis Drive and Woodland Hills areas being the focus of recent residential development. Vacant areas south and somewhat southwest and southeast are within the 2010 Growth Area and provide future housing potential. Beyond the growth limit area, steep slopes and the floodplains of the Kansas River and Wildcat Creek prevent further growth. Future developments are encouraged to include a mixture of single and multifamily dwelling types, as well as affordable and moderately priced neighborhoods.

Multifamily Development Conclusions

LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR HOUSING

The following criteria are provided as general guidelines for helping determine preferred locations for various types of housing, to serve the needs of the broader community. While it is hoped that ideal sites would conform to most of the criteria applicable to a particular housing type, it is recognized that the ideal site may be difficult to find and that compromises may need to be made if the community is to address the pressing housing needs identified in this study.

- < Multifamily residential development should be located in close proximity to, or within easy walking distance of, major activity centers for education, shopping and services, employment, or parks and open space.
- < Higher density residential development should be located along major transportation corridors and at major street intersections.
- < Properly arranged combinations of single-family homes, duplexes, town homes and multifamily dwellings may be placed in planned mixed-density neighborhoods, with higher densities being located closer to the major transportation corridor or activity centers, and transitioning to lower densities farther away from major streets and activity centers.
- < Residential density can be used as a buffering or transitioning tool, to lessen the impact of higher density or intensity use (such as industrial, commercial or large activity centers) upon lower density residential neighborhoods.
- < Residential density should be compatible with the level of infrastructure available to serve the area in question.
- < Multifamily residential developments should incorporate design and site planning features to insure compatibility with adjacent development.

- < Multifamily residential uses should be utilized to replace substantially deteriorated and dilapidated housing in the neighborhoods adjacent to the downtown and the university.
- < Multifamily housing for students (*married, non-traditional and traditional*) should ideally be located within walking distance of educational centers, or along planned transit routes and transportation corridors.