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Who am I?

• Acting Director, City Planning – City of Pittsburgh

• 11 Years with the City of Pittsburgh
  • Assistant Director, Strategic & Neighborhood (Long-Range) Planning (5.5 years)
  • Long-Range Planning – Comp Planning & Zoning Code Writing

• 17 Years as a Planner
  • City of Akron (OH)
  • Mercer County – rural & small town planning
  • Suburban Pittsburgh Township
Who is taking a stand on affordable housing in Pittsburgh?

Bill O’Toole  October 10, 2018  City Design, Current Features, Features, Pittsburgh for All, Real Estate

Since the turn of the century, Pittsburgh has emerged as a story of reinvention and rebirth in the face of a changing economy. While the gains from our emergence as a hub of research and technology are real and hard-won, they don’t tell the whole story.

Since the year 2000, housing — perhaps the most basic human right — has become significantly less affordable in Pittsburgh.

According to a study commissioned by the city’s Affordable Housing Task Force, the average cost of a rental home has increased by $116 monthly, far exceeding the rate of inflation, while the median income of renters has remained stagnant at around $28,000 per year.

The same study estimates that as of 2014, the city is facing an affordable home shortage of more than 17,000 units.

How affordable is 'affordable housing'?

Pittsburgh needs more that real people can really afford, and it’s not doing so well so far

BRIAN O’NEILL  Pittsburgh Post-Gazette  boneill@post-gazette.com

Capitalism worked out for me. Like thousands of other longtime city homeowners, I benefited because I zigged for the city while so many others zagged for the suburbs more than 25 years ago.
As Affordable Housing Crisis Grows, HUD Sits on the Sidelines

Ben Carson, the housing secretary, with Terrance McCoy at a homeless youth center in Las Vegas. Mr. Carson continues to prioritize his push to reduce, rather than expand, assistance to the poor.

John Locher/Associated Press

By Glenn Thrush
July 27, 2018

WASHINGTON — The country is in the grips of an escalating housing affordability crisis. Millions of low-income Americans are

Declining Federal Housing Funding

Sharp Cuts in Federal Housing Assistance Funding

Budget cuts have led to sharp reductions in many federal affordable housing programs, particularly programs that subsidize the production of new affordable housing properties. The Federal HOME program budget, for example, fell by 62 percent between 2005 and 2015."

Milhaus Ventures proposes expansion of Arsenal 201 in Lawrenceville

By Bill O’Toole  July 15, 2019  City Design, Lawrenceville

Plans for the long-anticipated phase two of the Arsenal 201 development in Lawrenceville were unveiled by Indianapolis-based Milhaus Ventures at a community meeting on Thursday night at the Teamster Temple on Butler St.

Phase one, which opened for habitation last year, sits on 12.75 acres of land on Butler between 33rd and 40th Streets and features 243 rental apartments, a pool and 19,000 square feet of presently untitled retail space on the ground level.

According to a presentation shared by Lawrenceville United, the company is proposing a complementary five-story structure in the vacant lot behind the building, closer to the Allegheny River.

The development would include 343 apartments, a 445-space parking garage for cars, 200 parking spaces for bikes, a dog park and pedestrian access to the nearby river trail.

Per Lawrenceville’s recently enacted inclusionary zoning policy, the development will include 35 affordable units for residents making 50% of the area median income or below.

The Giant Eagle that will be redeveloped by ECHO Realty. Google Maps

The developers proposing a Giant Eagle revamp on Shady Avenue in the East End presented their plans to the Pittsburgh Planning Commission Tuesday. The Shakespeare Street development has received some pushback.

The presentation centered on changing the zoning code in the area, but developer ECHO Realty took the opportunity to present details of the project. The Giant Eagle will become smaller, and there will also be housing: more than 230 units, with 15 percent designated affordable.

Dan Yablonsky, director of communications and development for Pittsburghers for Public Transit, said the advocacy group wants as much affordable housing as possible.

"The level of displacement and gentrification in East Liberty in recent years is startling," Yablonsky said. "This Shakespeare development is an opportunity to bring those residents who were displaced back and provide the neighborhood with the housing they need."
Apartment development planned for SouthSide Works

Commercial Real Estate Industry

Indianapolis-based TWG Development, LLC has a plan and strategy in place to build a new 230-unit apartment complex at the SouthSide Works.

The company presented a plan for a project to be built at the corner of Sidney and Sarah Streets behind the McGowan Institute to the east of Hot Metal Street at the SouthSide Works master plan.

After the company introduced its plans for the 2.6-acre site before a board meeting of the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh last year, on Tuesday, TWG briefed its proposal to the Pittsburgh Planning Commission with a smaller budget and with fewer units but retaining a plan to include more affordable units.

Instead of a 300-unit project expected to cost more than $14.4 million to build, TWG now expects its 230-unit development will cost a little more than $14.5 million, with 20% of the units to be affordable, charging rates at 30 percent area median income.

That translates to studio units that would rent for $665 per month and two-bedroom apartments expected to rent for $855 a month.

$10 Million Dispensed From Housing Opportunity Fund To Help Renters, Homeowners And Developers

By ARIEL WORTHY - JUN 4, 2019

Pittsburgh City Council members at a meeting on Tuesday, June 4, 2019.

Pittsburgh City Council unanimously approved spending $10 million from the Urban Redevelopment Authority’s Housing Opportunity Fund on Tuesday.

Celeste Scott, a housing justice organizer with Pittsburgh United, said the allocations were a win for people struggling to afford housing.

“‘There was a lot of community voice in it, we were able to talk to the advisory board and really inform the decisions... It was good for us,” Scott said.
What’s the Pittsburgh Experience?

• Figuring out the Context
  • Affordable Housing Task Force
  • Housing Needs Assessment
• Inclusionary Zoning – getting the details right
  • IZ Working Group
  • IZ Ordinance Details
  • Incentive-based vs Mandatory
• Community Advocacy
  • Data
  • Education
  • Turnout!
How can the Pittsburgh experience help?

• Where are you from?
• What’s your market like?
• Have you tried to write or administer Inclusionary Zoning?
• Do you or your community see IZ as a potential tool?
• What’s more important: the details of IZ or how the public/elected officials get behind it?
HOUSING CONTEXT IN PITTSBURGH
Housing Landscape in Pittsburgh

*Department of City Planning* – Code, Development Review, Big Picture

*Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA)* – Project $

*Housing Authority (HACP)* – Subdisized Housing, Section 8 Vouchers

*Community Development Corporations (CDC’s)* – Housing Development

*Private Market Developers* – Housing Development

*Affordable Housing Advocates* – Pushing for more
City of Pittsburgh

• 305,000 people today from high of 670,000 in 1950
• Steel collapse in 1980 – rapid decline
• Eds/Meds rebirth
• Investment in Neighborhoods, but not all
  • Neighborhoods with sales prices of $10-20K
  • Neighborhoods with sales prices of $500K-2M
How did we get here?

- Affordable Housing Task Force & report
- Community Partnership
- Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance
  - Incentive-based
  - Mandatory
- Other methods of funding & preserving affordable housing
Affordable Housing Task Force

- In May 2015, Mayor created the Affordable Housing Task Force (chaired & staffed by DCP)
- 26 members including elected officials, market-rate & affordable housing developers, community organizers, and advocates
- 5 Deliberative Democracy Forums, 450 participants
- DCP commissioned a City-wide Housing Needs Assessment & Feasibility Study
Housing Needs Assessment

May 2016

Presented to
The City of Pittsburgh
Affordable Housing Task Force
Housing Needs Assessment

Data Sources:
• ACS / Census
• RealStats
• CHAS – HUD
• City Permit Data

Consultant-led project
• Time constraints
• Could do work in-house
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Housing Needs Assessment

There are only 31 units affordable and available for every 100 extremely low-income renters

Renter households earning up to 30% of the MHI face serious challenges for finding affordable housing. There are only 31 units affordable and available for every 100 of these households. The gap is slightly smaller at 50% of MHI, and continues to shrink as income climbs. Once again, renters earning the city’s MHI still face a shortage of affordable units that are available to them.

Affordable Housing Gap for Renters, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income-Restricted Developments, 2016</th>
<th>20 units or fewer</th>
<th>21-40</th>
<th>41-80</th>
<th>81-120</th>
<th>121 units or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Median Household Income</td>
<td>Renter Households</td>
<td>Affordable &amp; Available Units</td>
<td>Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% - 30% ($12,001)</td>
<td>18,321</td>
<td>5,672</td>
<td>-12,549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% - 50% ($20,005)</td>
<td>29,062</td>
<td>11,821</td>
<td>-17,241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% - 80% ($32,007)</td>
<td>39,402</td>
<td>29,714</td>
<td>-9,687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% - 100% ($40,009)</td>
<td>45,350</td>
<td>41,033</td>
<td>-4,317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mullin & Lonergan Associates

Affordable Housing Gap for Homeowners, 2014

There are only 46 affordable units and available for every 100 extremely low-income homeowners

The affordable housing gap for homeowners follows a similar trend to the overall citywide gap. However, while there are only 41 homes for every 100 renters earning 50% or less of the MHI, there are 67 homes for every 100 homeowners. In other words, compared to renters, half as many owners earning up to 50% of MHI can purchase housing that’s affordable to them.

This is a unique result for Pittsburgh, and indicates that homeowners have better affordable housing options than renters. However, a household must achieve the conditions necessary to purchase a home in the first place in order to take advantage of this situation.

Affordable Housing Gap for Homeowners, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income-Restricted Developments, 2016</th>
<th>20 units or fewer</th>
<th>21-40</th>
<th>41-80</th>
<th>81-120</th>
<th>121 units or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Median Household Income</td>
<td>Homeowner Households</td>
<td>Affordable &amp; Available Units</td>
<td>Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% - 30% ($12,001)</td>
<td>4,403</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>-2,394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% - 50% ($20,005)</td>
<td>9,732</td>
<td>6,488</td>
<td>-3,244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% - 80% ($32,007)</td>
<td>18,190</td>
<td>16,375</td>
<td>-1,815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% - 100% ($40,009)</td>
<td>24,331</td>
<td>22,954</td>
<td>-1,777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affordable Housing Task Force
Recommendations

• Housing Opportunity Fund
• Increase Utilization of 4% LIHTC
• Preservation of Existing Affordable Housing
• Protection of Existing Homeowners & Tenants

• Inclusionary Housing
  • Calls for committee to further explore the feasibility of a Pittsburgh policy

• [Link](http://pittsburghpa.gov/dcp/ahtf/index.html)
INCLUSIONARY ZONING – DETERMINING THE DETAILS
Why inclusionary zoning?

“Preserving and creating a vibrant and mixed income community will be the ultimate test of whether Pittsburgh lives up to its ‘Most Livable City’ title... As Pittsburgh looks forward to growth for the first time in over 60 years, we are working to make sure that growth is equitable and inclusive.”

(Affordable Housing Task Force Findings and Recommendations, May 2016)
Inclusionary Zoning Working Group

• Low – Moderate income residents (2)
• Housing Advocate Organizations (2)
• Community and Non-Profit Development Groups (2)
• Public and Private Finance Institutions (2)
• Market-Rate Real Estate Developers (3)
• Legal Experts (2)
IZ Exploratory Committee: Process

• Meetings
• Calculator – working through the pro-forma (THIS TAKES TIME!)
• Analysis and Recommendations
IZ Exploratory Committee: Outcome

• Found that a 10% affordability set aside is feasible for projects of 20 units or more with a LERTA tax abatement
• 50% AMI rental, 80% AMI for-sale
• Recommended a pilot IZ overlay zone to test the effectiveness

Pittsburgh should move forward with an Inclusionary Zoning Program, as part of a broader Inclusionary Housing Policy.

- The Committee is confident that a feasible, successful Inclusionary Zoning Program is achievable for Pittsburgh.
- It has set a baseline goal for the city of 10% affordable housing, at 50% of Area Median Income, for new construction or adaptive reuse housing developments that are 20 or more units.
- The Inclusionary Zoning Program approach in this memo should be understood as one element of a larger Inclusionary Housing Policy for the City of Pittsburgh, which overall will endeavor to achieve higher levels of new and preserved affordable units at a range of incomes.

Housing developed with public resources should include affordable housing, with benchmarks.

- The Committee agrees if a developer receives public resources for a residential project, they should be required to include affordable housing. The definition of public resources includes tax abatements, direct grants, and up-zoning (such as levels increased density and height).
Incentive Inclusionary Zoning in Pittsburgh

• Where?
  • Uptown Public Realm (UPR) - adopted December 2017
  • Riverfront Zoning District (RIV) - adopted July 2018

• How?
  • Incentive-based through Performance Points
  • Points earned depend on level of affordability (60% AMI vs 80% AMI) and type of housing (sale or rent)
  • Points can be used for additional height (in both districts) or build closer to the river (RIV)

• Why?
  • Incentive-based requires less legal backing since used for bonuses only
RIV District

Allegheny River I Map Area: Proposed Zoning

RIV-GI: Riverfront General Industrial
RIV-IMU: Riverfront Industrial Mixed Use
RIV-MU: Riverfront Mixed Use
RIV-NS: Riverfront North Shore
RIV-RM: Riverfront Mixed Residential
Mandatory Inclusionary Zoning - Lawrenceville

- Overlay District
- Based off of Committee recs
- Stricter legal test
- Paired with Incentive-based along riverfront
Mandatory Inclusionary Zoning - Details

• Scope of the Program (% of units, applicability, project threshold)
• Type and Tenure of Development
• Income Qualifications and Pricing
• Duration of Affordability Requirements
• Off-site Performance Option
• Program Monitoring & Compliance
Details

- Based off recommendations from IHIZ Exploratory Committee
- Mandatory for residential development over 20 units
  - New construction, substantial improvement, or adaptive reuse
  - For sale or for rent
  - Incentives provided in area zoned RIV
- Set-aside: 10% of units (round up)
- Duration: 35 years, renews if property is sold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milhaus Phase I</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundry</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mews on Butler</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doughboy Square Apartments</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland Homes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCleary Condos</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3719 Butler</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total to date:</strong></td>
<td><strong>627</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total to date: 627 units
Applicability

Foundry at 41st Street: 191 units

Bayard School Lofts: 11 apartments
• Rental: capped at 50% AMI
• Owner-occupied: capped at 80% AMI
• Allowable pricing: capped at 30% of monthly income for household size 1.5 times the BR count (includes all tenant-paid costs like rent, utilities, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% AMI</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$39,950</td>
<td>$43,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% AMI</td>
<td>$33,600</td>
<td>$38,400</td>
<td>$43,200</td>
<td>$47,940</td>
<td>$51,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% AMI</td>
<td>$44,750</td>
<td>$51,150</td>
<td>$57,550</td>
<td>$63,900</td>
<td>$69,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% AMI</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$79,900</td>
<td>$86,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD 2019
## What is Allowable Pricing in Pittsburgh?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Costs</th>
<th>50% AMI Rent*</th>
<th>60% AMI Rent*</th>
<th>80% AMI Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>$713</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>$922 ($105,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>$1,026</td>
<td>$1037 ($128,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>$988</td>
<td>$1,186</td>
<td>$1152 ($146,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedroom</td>
<td>$1,103</td>
<td>$1,323</td>
<td>$1245 ($155,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rent Figure Assumes Utility Costs included

$ monthly cost ($purchase price)

Source: HUD 2018
• “Must be integrated within, and distributed throughout, each building”

• “Equivalent to market-rate units...in all ways”

• “Core building amenities...must be shared”

• Must have equal or greater number of family-sized units (2+ BR)
Off-site option

- No payment in lieu, but off-site OK
- Higher affordability: 12% (round up)
- Within city limits and .25 miles
- Requires special exception at ZBA
- Must have comparable public transit service
- Certificate of Occupancy for Inclusionary Units must be obtained prior to market rate units
- Can also pay $200K per unit to developer who owns site or has site control
Questions we never anticipated answering

• Income verification – what does that mean?
  • Planners aren’t doing this, but who is?

• What happens when someone’s income rises enough to surpass the thresholds?
  • Ensuring transition out of IZ units

• How do we handle utility costs and allowances?

• How do you write Code to ensure off-site units aren’t isolated?
  • Transit access by walkshed, frequency, # of routes

• How do you handle market-rate developers who don’t have the capacity or interest to handle IZ units?
  • What other ownership or rental non-profits can assist?
INCLUSIONARY ZONING – FINDING THE RIGHT PILOT
Lawrenceville Context: Good News

- Lawrenceville now the safest neighborhood in Zone 2
- Neighborhood schools improving
- Increase in jobs and services: business district, Robotics Row, Children’s Hospital, Goodwill, Persad Center, etc.
- Increases in bus service, bike infrastructure
- Replacement of blight with green spaces, community gardens
Lawrenceville: Changes in Housing

➢ Over a 15% increase in housing units in Lawrenceville
➢ Huge increase in multi-family residential
➢ Lawrenceville among top neighborhoods for # of residential building permits issued between 2013 and 2015. (Source: Mullin & Lonergan, Pittsburgh Housing Needs Assessment)
  ➢ In Central Lawrenceville alone, 384 permits between 2013 and 2015
**Changes in Housing**

- Increase in multi-family development: complete, underway, or approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milhaus Phase I</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundry</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mews on Butler</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doughboy Square Apartments</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland Homes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCleary School Condos</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wainwright</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mintwood Warehouse</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayard School Lofts</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Street Lofts</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squareview Apts</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppes at Doughboy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3719 Butler</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 705
Test Your Knowledge

# of new affordable housing units created in last decade by private developers?
# of new affordable housing units created in last decade by private developers?

9
Median home sale price in 2010?
Median home sale price in 2010?

$94,586
Median home sale price in 2017?
Median home sale price in 2017?

$237,000
High water marks for residential sale price

- 2014: $418,250
- 2015: $568,673
- 2016: $625,000
- 2017: $705,000
- 2019: $1,100,000
Rental prices

- Median gross rent in 15201 according to 2010 census: $913

### 2019 Rent Limits (including utility costs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 bedroom</th>
<th>2 bedroom</th>
<th>3 bedroom</th>
<th>4 bedroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% AMI max. rent</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% AMI max. rent</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACP payment standard</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% AMI max. rent</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>1391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% AMI max. rent</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentometer.com Median Rent for 15201, Last 12 Months</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for studio apartments, rent limits are estimated assuming 1.5 people per bedroom.
Displacement

➢ Lawrenceville lost over half of its HCV (Section 8) units between 2011 and 2016

➢ Total of 120 units lost

*Source: Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, “The Limits of 8”
One-parent renters with kids (left) vs. 2016 legal notice of evictions (right)

*Source: p4.earhtime.org*
## Changing demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Gain / Loss (#)</th>
<th>Gain / Loss (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7,878</td>
<td>8,030</td>
<td>+152</td>
<td>+ 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>-524</td>
<td>- 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>- 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>+ 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>+64</td>
<td>+ 48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>2,517</td>
<td>3,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74 years</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84 years</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2012-2016 and 2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, 2010 Census Summary*
## Poverty in Lawrenceville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Below Poverty</th>
<th>% Below Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34 years</td>
<td>4819</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 64 years</td>
<td>3198</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race Group</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Below Poverty</th>
<th>% Below Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>7862</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black alone</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino origin</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2012-2016 and 2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates*
Not just renters

➢ Owner-occupied houses in Lawrenceville with residents who lived there 35+ years:
  ➢ 2014: 620
  ➢ 2017: 465
  ➢ = 25% loss
### Flipping in Lawrenceville

#### Largest Price Differences Between Resold and Non-resold, 2013-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Median Sales Price</th>
<th>Price Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homewood South</td>
<td>$38,500</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Lawrenceville</td>
<td>$245,526</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Liberty</td>
<td>$197,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Lawrenceville</td>
<td>$154,950</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>$40,250</td>
<td>$19,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duquesne Heights</td>
<td>$263,050</td>
<td>$128,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lawrenceville</td>
<td>$241,950</td>
<td>$126,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel Hill South</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>$264,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Hill</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$50,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
<td>$179,500</td>
<td>$135,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Pittsburgh Housing Needs Assessment*
Rapid Resales as a Percentage of All Sales from 2013 to 2015

*Source: Pittsburgh Housing Needs Assessment*
## Potential Impact in Lawrenceville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milhaus Phase I</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundry</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mews on Butler</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doughboy Square Apartments</td>
<td>45</td>
<td><strong>4% LIHTC project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland Homes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCleary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3719 Butler</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total to date:</strong></td>
<td><strong>627</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Family</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milhaus - Future Phases</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron City Brewery</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity:</strong></td>
<td><strong>358</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Still lots of Developable Property
INCLUSIONARY ZONING – COMMUNITY MOBILIZATION
The Campaign for IZ in Lawrenceville

- Asked to pilot IZ in Lawrenceville, per alternate recommendation of IHIZ Exploratory Committee
- Asked by Mayor to design community process that could also serve as model for other neighborhoods
- Lawrenceville United, Lawrenceville Corporation, Councilwoman Gross began meeting with City Planning in summer 2018
  - Brought on RHLS to represent LU
- Early engagement with housing advocates and other community organizations
“Housing For All” community meetings

- **Meeting #1**: 9/25 – The State of Housing in Lawrenceville, Displacement, and What’s Being Done About It
- **Meeting #2**: 10/17: Inclusionary Zoning – A Tool to Preserve Affordability
- **Meeting #3**: 11/5: Community Feedback & Call to Action
Voices of residents

“We need to fight for the right of all to live in our neighborhood not just those that can afford high rents and homes prices.”

“I miss my black and brown neighbors”

“Racism is a form of hate. So is raising the prices on homes so you can't afford to eat healthy.”

“I no longer want to live in this neighborhood because of housing displacement currently happening.”
"I came home from school one day, my parents said start packing because we can’t afford to stay. I remember paying $400 for 4 bedrooms but all that has changed, I can’t even get a room for that price now."

"After decades enduring segregations because of our physical appearances, color, and ethnicity in our native country, our hope in the United States was not to feel the same treatment or to face discrimination due to our incomes. For many of our families, we were so excited and felt settled in Pittsburgh’s Lawrenceville until the income based displacements of our families. Despite the income forced displacement of our families, the community’s continued love for Lawrenceville has never faded."
What We Heard From Meetings

- Concern for displacement, desire to see IZ for Lawrenceville
- Want to see IZ units go to most displaced/vulnerable residents
- Want to see inclusionary units stay in Lawrenceville, not be segregated or different
- Agreement that need other strategies too
Mobilizing

➢ Collecting petition signatures to demonstrate widespread support (over 1,100)
➢ Speaking at City Council
➢ Letters of support (over 40)
Turning out for Planning Commission hearing

• Text-banking
• Support for residents to write testimony
• 40 speakers + many more attendees in support at Planning Commission
• VICTORY: unanimous recommendation!
Status of Legislation

➢ Passed by City Council June 2019
➢ Developments
Not a silver bullet...

➢ Inclusionary zoning alone will **not** solve the shortage of affordable housing in Pittsburgh, but it’s an important piece of the puzzle with other strategies:

✓ Community Land Trust: affordable homeownership
✓ Doughboy Flats: affordable rentals
✓ Housing Opportunity Fund: $ for home repairs, rental assistance, etc.
✓ Longtime Owner Occupied Protection: from increased taxes
...but nothing to sneeze at

- 100 Units have been approved by the City since the passage of IZ
Milhaus Ventures proposes expansion of Arsenal 201 in Lawrenceville

According to a presentation shared by Lawrenceville United, the company is proposing a complementary five-story structure in the vacant lot behind the building, closer to the Allegheny River.

The development would include 343 apartments, a 445-space parking garage for cars, 200 parking spaces for bikes, a dog park and pedestrian access to the nearby river trail.

The Giant Eagle that will be redeveloped by ECHO Realty.

The developers proposing a Giant Eagle revamp on Shady Avenue in the East End presented their plans to the Pittsburgh Planning Commission Tuesday. The Shakespeare Street development has received some pushback.

The presentation centered on changing the zoning code in the area, but developer ECHO Realty took the opportunity to present details of the project. The Giant Eagle will become smaller, and there will also be housing: more than 230 units, with 15 percent designated affordable.

Dan Yablonsky, director of communications and development for Pittsburghers for Public Transit, said the advocacy group wants as much affordable housing as possible.

"The level of displacement and gentrification in East Liberty in recent years is startling," Yablonsky said. "This Shakespeare development is an opportunity to bring those residents who were displaced back and provide the neighborhood with the amenities they deserve."
Apartment development planned for SouthSide Works

Indianapolis-based TWG Development, LLC has a plan and strategy in place to build a new 280-unit apartment complex at the Southside Works.

The company presented a plan for a project to be built at the corner of Sidney and Sarah Streets behind the McGowan Institute to the east of Hot Metal Street at the Southside Works master plan.

After the company introduced its plans for the 26-acre site before a board meeting of the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh last year, on Tuesday, TWG briefed its proposal to the Pittsburgh Planning Commission with a smaller budget and with fewer units but retaining a plan to include more affordable units.

Instead of a 300-unit project expected to cost more than $64 million to build, TWG now expects its 280-unit development will cost a little more than $50 million, with 20% of the units to be affordable, charging rents at 30 percent and median incomes.

That translates to studio units that would rent for $655 per month and two-bedroom apartments expected to rent for $935 a month.
What are the lessons from Pittsburgh?

• Understand your market
• Different tools for different markets
• Find your champions
• It takes a (village, big tent, insert metaphor here)
• This takes time or money (or in Pittsburgh, both)
Resources

• IZ Ordinance & IH-IZ report
  • https://pittsburghpa.gov/dcp/ipod6

• AFTF report + Housing Needs Assessment
  • https://pittsburghpa.gov/dcp/ahtf/index.html

• Grounded Solutions
  • https://inclusionaryhousing.org/

• Inclusionary Calculator
  • http://inclusionaryhousing.org/calculator/
Questions?

Andrew Dash, AICP
Acting Director, City Planning
City of Pittsburgh
412-255-0760
andrew.dash@pittsburghpa.gov
https://pittsburghpa.gov/dcp