**Introduction**

Community conversations highlighted the need to address housing and affordability in Georgetown. Residents mentioned rising housing costs, availability of housing options and changing neighborhoods as concerns. (See Appendix C: Public Input Reports for an additional summary of public input.) Community input led to development of a housing specific goal for 2030.

The keywords of access, diverse and preserve represent three specific policy themes: affordability, diversity, and preservation. The existing housing conditions (see Appendix P: Housing Inventory, Appendix Q: Housing Subarea Profiles, and Appendix S: Housing Affordability Analysis for full study) and the public input inform the policies for each of the areas. Together, the policy themes provide a community housing strategy that preserves existing housing stock and neighborhoods and accommodates future needs by creating greater consumer choice of housing options (Figure 82).
Community Conversations: Housing Needs

Quotes from community members:

- Concerned too expensive to live here for much longer.
- Maintain existing core neighborhoods and downtown areas. Infill and expansion construction should be compatible with neighboring properties.
- Many want a better variety of housing types in the City.
- Apartments are clustered into the same areas. Spread them around.
- There is a need to have better walkability and possibly smaller, affordable grocery stores.

Respondents to the online survey that focused on housing issues said:

- The most important factors affecting housing preservation and the ability for residents to stay in their homes is property tax increases, public safety, and the inability to age in place.
- The most desired housing types are single-family homes, followed by townhomes and mixed-use development.
**Existing Conditions**

The state of housing was studied for the planning area of the 2030 Plan Update (i.e., City limits and ETJ) to establish a baseline for the development of housing policies. This analysis included a profile of housing types, densities, and cost, along with an evaluation of historic trends (see Appendix P: Housing Inventory, Appendix Q: Housing Subarea Profiles, and Appendix S: Housing Affordability Analysis for full study). The analysis was conducted by subarea – 14 smaller geographies identified for individual evaluation. This analysis identified the need for housing affordability, a diversity of options, and preservation of existing housing.

**Key Takeaways: Households Analysis**

- Over twice as many owners as renter households
- A majority of renter households earning less than $50,000/year have housing expenses exceeding 30 percent of gross income
- Prices have increased for both renters and buyers in the planning area over the past decade

Figure 83. Summary of Existing Housing and Households (City Limits, 2016)

- **26% Renters**
  - 51% make less than $50,000/year
  - 51% pay more than 30% of income for housing
  - 21% pay more than 50% of income for housing

- **69% Owners**
  - 28% make less than $50,000/year
  - 23% pay more than 30% of income for housing
  - 7% pay more than 50% of income for housing

- 5% vacant

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016 ACS
Figure 84. Comparison of Leasing Rates by Year within the Planning Area

- **2011-2013**
  - $0 to $1,249: 35%
  - $1,250 to $1,499: 34%
  - $1,500 to $1,749: 17%
  - $1,750 to $1,999: 8%
  - $2,000 and up: 7%

- **2017-2018**
  - $0 to $1,249: 13%
  - $1,250 to $1,499: 3%
  - $1,500 to $1,749: 23%
  - $1,750 to $1,999: 24%
  - $2,000 and up: 37%

Figure 85. Comparison of Sales Price by Year within the Planning Area

- **2008-2010**
  - $0 to $199,999: 56%
  - $200,000 to $274,999: 21%
  - $275,000 to $349,999: 10%
  - $350,000 to $424,999: 6%

- **2017-2018**
  - $0 to $199,999: 11%
  - $200,000 to $274,999: 24%
  - $275,000 to $349,999: 13%
  - $350,000 to $424,999: 8%
  - $425,000 to $499,999: 10%
  - $500,000: 35%

Source: Austin Board of Realtors (ABOR)/MLS July 2018
In response to the community conversations regarding housing options for low-income, workforce, and senior population segments, the distribution of existing households in each of these classifications was evaluated. Figure 86 illustrates the number of Georgetown households at each of the HUD-defined income levels using the Williamson County Area Median Income (AMI) of $77,800 for 2016. As a benchmark, civil servants in Georgetown with five years of service generally earn in the 60 to 80 percent of AMI range.

Figure 86. Georgetown Households by Defined Income Levels (City Limits, 2016)
Future Housing Need

By 2030, the City of Georgetown will need 14,000 more housing units. Figure 87 below provides a simple projection analysis using an estimated 55 percent rate of growth of Williamson County between 2020-2030 (Texas State Data Center, 2019). Figure 88 illustrates the number of housing units needed in 2030 if the share of incomes remains the same as 2016 (assuming housing values and income growth are both held constant).

Figure 87. Projected Housing Units Needed in Georgetown by 2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Households</th>
<th>2030 Williamson Co. Population % Change (Est.)</th>
<th>New Housing Units by 2030 for Projected Population Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>( \times 55% )</td>
<td>( \approx 14,000 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas State Data Center, U.S. Census Bureau, 2016 ACS

Figure 88. Existing Housing Units and Additional Housing Units Needed by Income Range

Approximately 25,000 Total Housing Units in 2016

Approximately 14,000 New Housing Units Needed by 2030

\( \approx \) about 1,000 housing units
Housing Affordability

Affordability refers to overall housing costs and ensuring that a range of price options exist in the City. An analysis of supply and demand for both owner and renter households was completed using factors such as income and sales and number of units available (See Appendix S: Housing Affordability Analysis.) Between 2008 and 2018, home values and rents increased almost twice as much as income (Figure 87). As illustrated in Figure 90, a majority of low income, workforce, and senior renters pay more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs, exceeding the standard guidelines for housing affordability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Median Home Value</th>
<th>Median Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$60,248</td>
<td>$177,900</td>
<td>$830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$71,410</td>
<td>$255,300</td>
<td>$1,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2008, 2018 ACS

Figure 89. Median Income, Housing Costs, 2008-2018

Figure 90. Supply and Demand for Focus Groups

Supply:
- Limited supply of for sale under $250K (homeowner units)
- Increase in average rents and leasing rates (rental units)

Demand:

**Low Income Households**
- 69% of renters are cost burdened (1,110 of 1,600 households)

**Workforce Households**
- 80% of renters are cost burdened (2,000 of 2,500 households)

**Senior Households**
- 67% of renters are cost burdened (1,000 of 1,500 households)

68% of owners are cost burdened (950 of 1,400 households)

42% of owners are cost burdened (2,300 of 5,500 households)

24% of owners are cost burdened (2,000 of 8,500 households)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016 ACS

Terminology: Cost Burden

Households paying more than 30% of their income towards housing costs are considered “cost burdened”.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines housing affordability as the ability to pay less than 30 percent of housing income on housing costs. Using this standard, the percentage of residents who pay 30 percent or less of their income toward housing costs indicates residents who are in housing that is affordable for their income level. Paying greater than 30 percent of household income on housing costs would indicate households taking on a burdensome housing cost.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Segment</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>What We Want to Achieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>• Cost of living has increased significantly.</td>
<td>• Preservation of existing rental housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building low income housing in a community like Georgetown, can be difficult, especially because central, well-connected housing tends to represent high value land.</td>
<td>• Support and education for homeowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing affordable rental housing that is well-connected to transportation options as well as goods and services.</td>
<td>• Support completion of needs assessment for vulnerable residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>• Lack of affordable rental options for low to moderate income residents and workers</td>
<td>• Assist supply expansion of workforce housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The number of low- to moderate-income jobs is increasing, while housing supply is limited relative to demand.</td>
<td>• Partner to build on the successful housing work being done locally and regionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing costs of developing and delivering new housing</td>
<td>• Review UDC requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development costs are high and rising; however, no new rental housing for moderate prices is being produced and homeownership opportunities for workforce households are limited.</td>
<td>• Provide financial assistance to housing developers and builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>• Availability of rental options for low income senior households</td>
<td>• Preservation of existing rental units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Takeaways: Affordability Need**

- Options for low-income, workforce and senior renters and workforce homeowners
- Support for community organizations providing housing for vulnerable populations.
Housing Diversity

Georgetown defines *diversity* as the housing type (e.g., single-family home, townhouse, duplex), size, and price point. While related to affordability, diversity also considers the specific preferences or needs of the household, which often varies by life stage.

Housing unit type is an important characteristic to consider for cities to adequately understand housing challenges and issues facing their residents and workforce. Georgetown’s breakdown of housing unit types has remained virtually unchanged since 2000. This may be due to the annexation of lower density areas, which would offset the increased number of multi-family units. A greater diversity of housing includes providing options for different household types and income levels.

![Figure 91. Share of Multi-Family Units by Subarea](image)

![Figure 92. Percentage of Housing Units as Single-Family Homes](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Georgetown</th>
<th>Williamson Co.</th>
<th>Austin-Round Rock MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016 ACS

Source: CDS/Nielsen/Claritas Housing Data, 2018
**Challenges**

- Two main housing options available (traditional single-family and apartment units)
- Current regulations (i.e., special use permits for accessory dwelling units), increasing the diversity of new housing development types
- Aging in place, including transportation and support services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What We Want to Achieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Promote additional housing types to accommodate a range of ages, incomes, and lifestyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluate regulations and amend as necessary, create development incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accessibility home improvements and coordination with nonprofits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 93. Housing Unit Types

![Housing Unit Types Pie Chart]

**Key Takeaways: Diversity Need**

- Increased options and distribution of housing development types.
- Opportunities and coordination of services to support aging in place.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016 ACS

*over 100% due to rounding
Housing Preservation

Preservation refers to the retention and maintenance of the existing homes and neighborhoods in Georgetown, as well as ensuring the ability of residents to stay in their homes over time.

Figure 94 illustrates that more homes have been constructed during the 2000 to 2009 period than any other decade, which is consistent with Williamson County overall. Much of Georgetown’s newest housing is concentrated to the north and west, though new single-family home development is also occurring in the southeast portion of the City. The age of housing stock provides information for developing neighborhood programs to address housing conditions over time.

While over 45 percent of the housing stock in Georgetown has been built since 2000, older housing stock, including duplexes and fourplexes, serve an important role in providing housing to workforce renter households. Preserving this housing will assist in meeting needs for low income and workforce households as the cost of building new units is far more expensive. (See Appendix S: Housing Affordability Analysis.) As shown in Figure 96, the average cost per square foot of homes sold has gradually increased across all 14 subareas over the last decade.

Input from the public indicated a desire to maintain established neighborhoods (See Appendix C: Public Input Reports), particularly in terms of the ability of residents to stay in their homes over time and encourage reinvestment in existing neighborhoods.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016 ACS

Figure 95. Year of Structure Construction

Figure 96. Change in For-Sale Cost Per Square Foot (2008-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 13</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>$261</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 1</td>
<td>$112</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 4</td>
<td>$ 84</td>
<td>$132</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 14</td>
<td>$ 92</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 3</td>
<td>$ 82</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 9</td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$164</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 6</td>
<td>$ 99</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 5</td>
<td>$ 93</td>
<td>$132</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 7</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>$156</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 11</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 10</td>
<td>$131</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 8</td>
<td>$ 99</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 2</td>
<td>$153</td>
<td>$183</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 12</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>What We Want to Achieve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Established neighborhoods experiencing change</td>
<td>• Neighborhood plans and programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Physical preservation of existing affordable/workforce housing</td>
<td>• Housing rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Much of the existing non-subsidized moderately priced housing stock is over 40 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic preservation of existing affordable/workforce housing</td>
<td>• Rental Housing Preservation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rental rates in non-subsidized existing units have been increasing</td>
<td>o Small-scale, multi-unit rental structures (primarily duplexes and quadplexes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For-sale existing housing priced under $250,000 has been rapidly decreasing. The opportunity to preserve for-sale housing under $200,000 has nearly passed in Georgetown; keeping the existing stock at those prices would require rapid and significant action.</td>
<td>o Older, non-subsidized, income restricted apartment complexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Subsidized properties serving very low income and low-income residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preservation of housing in the $200,000 to $275,000 range, both in terms of existing older housing (especially east of I-35) and sites for new housing development (primarily east of I-35).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Takeaways: Preservation Need**

- Physical preservation of non-subsidized housing stock and economic preservation of existing affordable/workforce housing.
- Preservation of existing neighborhoods is critical to providing homes for workforce households and residents who desire to stay in their homes over time.
Comprehensive Strategy to Address Needs

The comprehensive strategy of addressing housing affordability, preservation and diversity will work to meet the current and future housing needs of Georgetown residents. The policies on the following pages address each part of the strategy as illustrated in Figure 97.

The Housing Toolkit is intended to be a reference guide for programs, policies, and regulations that could be implemented, as needed, to address identified housing needs. As annual reporting takes place, the Toolkit will provide a reference for additional tools that may be utilized to support housing goals and policies. The complete Toolkit is available in Appendix R: Housing Toolkit.

Figure 97. Addressing Community Housing Needs

[Diagram showing the following categories: Preservation of units [H1-H.3], Preservation of neighborhoods [H.4], Affordability of new units [H.5-H.8], Diversity of options [H.9-H.11]]
Housing Policies

Policy H.1  Preserve existing housing stock that contributes to diversity and affordability.

- Protect existing housing stock that provides a range of housing types, price points and sizes to overall inventory.

Policy H.2  Preserve existing neighborhoods in targeted areas.

- Certain neighborhoods require special consideration of development impacts to ensure character and compatibility are protected.
- Preservation efforts may be defined through small area planning.

Policy H.3  Support owners’ ability to stay in homes in neighborhoods with rapid value increases without limiting the sale of the home.

- Homeowners may be priced out of their existing homes and neighborhoods due to drastic increases in property values, as shown in the housing subarea profile analysis (Appendix Q: Housing Subarea Profiles), that result in property tax increases.

Policy H.4  Maintain and promote neighborhood character and quality.

- Neighborhood vitality is maintained and promoted through neighborhood association support, enhancements and beautification efforts.
- Character and quality may be defined and promoted through small area planning or creation of neighborhood conservation districts.
Policy H.5  Support and increase rental choices for low-income and workforce households unless the housing is substandard.

- Support existing rental choices for low-income households and workforce households as identified in the housing inventory (Appendix P: Housing Inventory).
- Increase rental choices for workforce households through support of LIHTC development and providing incentives in development regulations, agreements and negotiated standards.
- Substandard housing is defined through coordination with Code Enforcement and Chief Building Official.

Policy H.6  Support rental choices for senior households.

- Maintain age-restricted units to provide rental choices for cost-burdened senior renters.

Policy H.7  Increase homeownership choices for workforce households.

- Homeownership opportunities are targeted for workforce households earning between 60 to 80 of the Area Median Income (AMI).

Policy H.8  Support the nonprofit community in creating housing opportunities for the most vulnerable residents (including but not limited to homeless, seniors, youth aging out of the foster care system, and people with disabilities).

- Maintain and continue to develop community partnerships to assess community need.
- Assist non-profits through Strategic Partnership grants.
HOUSING

Policy H.9  Encourage and incentivize new housing and reinventions or additions to existing housing to provide a mixture of housing types, sizes, and price points.

» Ensure development regulations support and include incentives for diverse housing options.

» Negotiation during Municipal Utility District (MUD), Planned Unit Development (PUD), and other similar initiatives can provide opportunities to include various housing options.

Policy H.10  Ensure land use designations and other policies allow for and encourage a mixture of housing types and densities across the community.

» Land use and special district policies are regularly reviewed to support housing diversity.

» Application of land use ratios and care taken to ensure developments include supporting uses.

Policy H.11  Promote aging in place opportunities by aligning land use policies and transportation policies that promote a housing market capable of accommodating residents throughout all stages of life.

» Aging in place means that a person can comfortably spend their entire life within the community if desired – and possibly within the same home.

» Coordinated services and land use decisions support aging in place.

Policy H.12  Actively seek and build public and private partnerships to leverage resources and promote innovation.

» Coordinate the City’s housing goal and policy through engagement with entities such as Williamson County, local financial institutions and non-profits.
Policy H.13  Align housing goals with other city policies and strategic plans.

- Aligning all plans supports effective and efficient governance.
- This policy acknowledges that housing is an integral land use and the decisions related to the services the City provides include the consideration of housing policies.

Policy H.14  Provide opportunity for community engagement through outreach and communication.

- Ensure the community has the opportunity to understand and participate in housing plans and decisions.
- Provide opportunities for engagement in the community where residents are already gathered.