

REGIONAL HOUSING PLAN IMPLEMENTATION REPORT: 2014

A regional housing plan was adopted by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) in early 2013. The housing plan recommends that implementation of the plan be monitored and the results reported every one, five, or 10 years, in accordance with a monitoring schedule included in the plan. Following a brief summary of housing plan endorsements and presentations, monitoring results are organized according to the six general topic areas addressed by housing plan recommendations. Only those recommendations that were fully or partially implemented during the year are included. The last section summarizes consolidated plans that were updated during the year.

Housing Plan Endorsement and Presentations

Following adoption of the regional housing plan in March 2013, the final plan report was published and distributed to all county and local governments in the Region, with a request that they consider endorsing the plan as a guide to housing and community development within their community or county. By the end of 2013, four of the seven counties and 10 of the 147 cities, towns, and villages in the Region had formally endorsed the plan through adoption of a resolution. Three additional units of government acted on the plan in 2014. The Grafton Town Board endorsed the plan by resolution and the Waukesha County Board adopted an amendment to the County comprehensive plan that incorporated 40 of the 50 regional plan recommendations into its comprehensive plan. The Brookfield Common Council subsequently endorsed the action of the County Board and reaffirmed its support of the housing initiatives in the County plan, as amended.

During 2014, SEWRPC staff gave presentations about the Regional Housing Plan to a class at UW-Milwaukee, the Community Bankers Roundtable, the Mercy Lakefront Housing Advisory Board, and to the Public Policy Task Force of the Greater Milwaukee Association of Realtors. SEWRPC staff also made presentations about the plan at a Statewide Fair Housing Luncheon in Wisconsin and a Housing Opportunity and Community Development conference in Chicago intended for the greater Chicago area, including southeastern Wisconsin, northeastern Illinois, and northwestern Indiana.

Implementation of Housing Plan Recommendations

Affordable Housing

Most of the measures related to implementation of affordable housing recommendations involve the extent to which sewered communities have incorporated housing plan recommendations into local regulations and plans, particularly zoning ordinances and comprehensive plans. A comprehensive review of local and county zoning and land division regulations will be conducted every 10 years or sooner as part of an update to the regional housing plan. The Commission staff is aware of the following zoning ordinance updates made during 2014:

- Waukesha County considered the recommendations of the housing plan when updating its zoning ordinance and reviewing proposed changes to town zoning ordinances. Specifically, the regional housing plan recommendation that zoning ordinances allow single-family homes of 1,200 square feet (to accommodate more affordable housing) was included in an amendment to the Town of Waukesha zoning ordinance, and housing plan recommendations for residential densities and apartment sizes for affordable housing were included in new County zoning regulations for urban planned unit developments.
- The City of Whitewater adopted a comprehensive update of its zoning ordinance. Among other changes, the ordinance includes new regulations that would allow higher density development in multi-family zoning districts, and a new mixed-use commercial and residential zoning district.

Fair Housing/Opportunity

As described in Chapter VI of the regional housing plan report, States and entitlement jurisdictions must prepare a Consolidated Plan every five years in order to receive Community Planning and Development (CPD) block grant funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). CPD programs include the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), and Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids (HOPWA) programs. Information about Consolidated Plans updated during 2014 is included in the last section of this report.

Milwaukee County updated its Consolidated Plan in 2013. In 2014, the County developed an agreement form for communities that receive pass-through CDBG and HOME program grant funds from the County. As a condition of receiving pass-through funds, a community must agree to implement at least three of eight activities listed in the agreement intended to affirmatively further fair housing. Several of the activities were derived from the regional housing plan, including working with SEWRPC to review and revise zoning ordinances to better accommodate affordable housing.

HUD requires that a Consolidated Plan include a certification by the entitlement jurisdiction to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH). AFFH activities are to be identified based on Fair Housing Planning. An analysis of impediments (AI) is the basis for fair housing planning. There are no HUD regulations governing the preparation or content of an AI. In July 2013, HUD issued proposed regulations that would replace the AI with an Assessment of Fair Housing. HUD would provide an “Assessment Tool” and standardized data to each entitlement jurisdiction to assist in the preparation of the assessment, which entitlement jurisdictions would then use to develop fair housing goals and priorities to fulfill the AFFH requirement. The fair housing goals and priorities would, in turn, be used to prepare the consolidated plan. In September 2014, HUD released a proposed Assessment Tool template for review. Comments on the proposed tool were accepted until November 25, 2014. The final Assessment Tool and AFFH regulations had not been published as of the end of 2014.

Job/Housing Balance

Five sanitary sewer service area plan amendments were adopted by the Regional Planning Commission in 2014. Amendments were made to the plans for the Cities of Burlington, Kenosha, and Mequon and the Villages of Hartland/Pewaukee and Menomonee Falls. In accordance with a housing plan recommendation, information on the job/housing balance analysis conducted as part of the housing plan was provided as part of the review process for the sewer service area amendments. The intent of the recommendation is to remind local communities of the findings of the plan for their community as they propose expansion of their sewer service areas. Specifically, communities are encouraged to consider job/housing balance as part of the next major update of their comprehensive plans. The City of Mequon and Village of Hartland are projected to have a shortage of housing affordable to workers holding lower-wage jobs (low-cost job/housing imbalance), and a shortage of housing affordable to workers holding moderate-wage jobs (moderate-cost job/housing imbalance). The Villages of Menomonee Falls and Pewaukee are projected to have a shortage of housing affordable to workers holding moderate-wage jobs (moderate-cost job/housing imbalance). The Cities of Burlington and Kenosha are projected to have a balance between jobs and housing.

The regional housing plan recommends that communities with sanitary sewer service projected to have a job/housing imbalance (based on a general analysis of their comprehensive plan conducted as part of the housing plan) conduct their own detailed analysis based on specific conditions in their community when the comprehensive plan is updated. The Village of Richfield was the first community in the Region to adopt a 10-year update of its comprehensive plan,¹ on June 19, 2014. The Village did not conduct a job/housing balance analysis as part of its comprehensive plan update; however, the Village was not included in the job-housing balance analysis conducted as part of the regional housing plan because there is no public sanitary sewer service provided in the Village.

¹ The Wisconsin comprehensive planning law, in Section 66.1001(2)(i) of the Wisconsin Statutes, requires that comprehensive plans be updated at least once every 10 years.

In addition to the Richfield comprehensive plan update, SEWRPC received 59 amendments to comprehensive plans adopted by 23 communities and four counties in the Region during 2014. Most of the amendments were related to changes to land use plan designations pertaining to one parcel. Exceptions were an amendment to the Village of Mount Pleasant plan which updated planned land use designations for over 300 parcels and an update to the Village of Newburg plan which revised planned land use designations within the Village and parcels in surrounding towns within the Village's extraterritorial jurisdiction. None of the communities in the Region conducted a community-level job/housing balance analysis nor requested SEWRPC assistance for conducting such an analysis during 2014.

Accessible Housing

Information on the number of housing units that are accessible to people with disabilities is limited. At the time the regional housing plan was prepared, it was assumed that units in multi-family buildings constructed after 1991 were accessible, due to State and Federal fair housing laws that require most units² in multi-family buildings to be accessible to people with mobility disabilities. In 2011, the American Housing Survey (AHS) began collecting information on the number of households that include one or more persons with a disability and certain accessibility features in housing units. The AHS is sponsored by HUD and conducted by the Census Bureau every two years. The results of the 2011 survey were released in 2013 and were summarized in the 2013 annual housing plan implementation report. Results from the 2013 AHS have not yet been released, but will be included in the 2015 implementation report.

Although housing construction slowed considerably in the Region following the national recession and housing crisis in the late 2000s, construction of multi-family units has been fairly strong. As shown on Table 1, housing units in one- and two-family buildings comprised about 75 percent of the housing stock in the Region at the beginning of 2010, with housing units in multi-family buildings (three or more units) making up the remaining 25 percent. Between 2010 and the end of 2014, 55 percent of the new units constructed (8,578 units) were in one- or two-family buildings and 45 percent (6,900 units) were in multi-family buildings (see Table 2). Table 2 also shows the number of housing units removed from the Region's housing stock, and the net change in housing by structure type. Overall, there was a net increase of 4,690 one-family units and 5,091 multi-family units. The number of units in two-family buildings decreased by 1,126 units (563 duplexes), with 96 percent of the decrease occurring in Milwaukee County.

As shown in Table 3, the percentage of multi-family units increased slightly, by 0.3 percent, in the Region between 2010 and the end of 2014. The increase in the number and percentage of multi-family units in the Region helps increase the supply of accessible housing units, because many new multi-family units must be accessible to persons with mobility disabilities under Fair Housing Act requirements.

Subsidized and Tax Credit Housing

There was a modest increase in the number of vouchers allotted in the Region between 2011 and 2014—from 13,061 to 13,815, an increase of 754 vouchers or about 6 percent. Table 4 indicates the number of vouchers allotted to each Public Housing Agency (PHA) in 2014. The table provides both the number of housing choice (or tenant-based, meaning the voucher is attached to a household rather than a housing unit) vouchers and the number of project-based vouchers, which are attached to a housing unit. All of the PHA project-based vouchers in the Region are attached to housing units managed by PHAs in Milwaukee County. The actual number of vouchers in use by each PHA may be less than the number allotted, which fluctuates based on available funding, participating households, and the funding level needed to make up the difference between 30 percent of a household's income and the actual rent for a housing unit.

² Federal accessibility requirements apply to multi-family buildings with four or more units that were constructed or ready for occupancy after March 13, 1991. State accessibility requirements apply to multi-family buildings with three or more units that were first ready for occupancy on or after October 1, 1993. Both State and Federal accessibility requirements apply only to grade-level units in buildings without an elevator; and to all units in buildings with at least three or four units, respectively, in buildings with an elevator.

A significant change in the administration of housing vouchers in the Region in 2013 was the transfer of voucher administration in Washington County from the Cities of Hartford and West Bend to the Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA). In 2014, voucher administration responsibility for vouchers allotted to the Kenosha County Housing Authority was transferred from WHEDA to the City of Kenosha Housing Authority.

PHAs in Milwaukee County receive 62 percent of vouchers allotted in the Region. PHAs in Kenosha, Racine, and Waukesha Counties each receive about 10 percent of vouchers allotted in the Region. The Walworth County PHA receives about 3 percent of vouchers allotted to the Region. WHEDA administers housing vouchers allotted to Ozaukee and Washington Counties, which receive about 1 percent and 4 percent of vouchers allotted in the Region, respectively.

Table 5 provides information on the number of public housing units managed by PHAs in the Region. There were 5,422 public housing units in the Region in 2014, with 88 percent of the units located in and managed by the Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee. About 57 percent of PHA housing units were designated for families and the remaining 43 percent were designated for the elderly or persons with disabilities.

In addition to housing choice vouchers and public housing units, the City of Racine, the Milwaukee County HOME Consortium (which includes all cities and villages in the County except the City of Milwaukee) and the Waukesha County HOME Consortium (which includes Jefferson, Ozaukee, Washington, and Waukesha Counties) provide funds to low-income households through the Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRF) program. Through the TBRF program, households are provided funds for rent, utility costs, and/or security deposits to enable them to rent market-rate units. In some cases, households that receive TBRF assistance may also receive housing choice vouchers.

Housing developed under the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program has been a major source of new affordable housing in the Region. Table 6 provides information on the number of LIHTC units in the Region that have been completed and are available for occupancy since the program began in 1987. The total 15,828 available LIHTC units as of 2014 include 2,798 units placed in service between 2011, when data were collected for the regional housing plan, and the end of 2014. About 44 percent of LIHTC housing units were designated for families, about 46 percent were designated for the elderly, and the remaining 10 percent were designated for persons with disabilities, housing for the homeless, or for Residential Care Apartment Complexes (RCACs). RCACs provide independent apartments for persons aged 55 or older, but may provide limited nursing care and/or meals for residents.

Table 7 lists projects that were awarded LIHTC from 2012 through 2014. Six projects in the Region were awarded tax credits in 2014. Two projects are for new housing development intended for family occupancy, one each in the Cities of Kenosha and Milwaukee. A third project, located in the City of Milwaukee, was awarded for the conversion of a historic office building to apartments for families. The remaining three awards were for rehabilitation of existing housing units, one each in the Cities of Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Whitewater.

Low-income housing tax credit allocations are awarded to proposed housing developments in Wisconsin by WHEDA through an annual competitive application process. Proposed developments receive points based on the Qualified Application Plan (QAP), which is updated by WHEDA every other year, with assistance from an Advisory Committee.

The regional housing plan recommends that WHEDA consider changes to the QAP that would provide more housing to extremely-low income households (households with incomes less than 30 percent of the area median income), and not to penalize developments due to a lack of community support. The housing plan also recommends that priority be given to awarding tax credits to housing developments proposed in areas with a job/housing imbalance, in communities with a shortage of affordable housing, and in communities with an economic need for affordable housing based on the percentage of low-income households.

The QAP approved by WHEDA for the 2013-2014 LIHTC cycle incorporated all of the housing plan recommendations. QAP criteria were revised slightly for the 2015-2016 cycle with regard to LIHTC projects proposed near employment centers or in high need areas to reduce the total points from 15 to 10 points for both high need and employment center sub-criteria. In addition, projects within one half-mile of a high-need census tract are eligible to score points, in addition to projects proposed within the census tract. Table 8 summarizes the 2015-2016 QAP criteria. Category 18 helps to implement the job/housing balance recommendations of the regional housing plan. Up to 10 points may be awarded to developments that are located within one mile of a major employer or employment center (500 or more employees) which demonstrates support for the tax-credit development with a letter from a company official, or developments proposed in or within one-half mile of a census tract with job growth of 5 percent or more that have more than 999 jobs with annual wages less than \$40,000 per year, or more than 1,000 jobs per square mile. Up to 10 additional points may be awarded in or within one-half mile of census tracts with a job to housing ratio greater than 1.5:1 and a housing vacancy rate less than 7 percent, or to proposed projects that have been awarded a contract by a local government to develop an affordable housing or mixed-use project on a publicly-owned parcel.

Housing Development

The housing development recommendations are directed toward planning activities that local governments can undertake to encourage a variety of residential structure types and compact, mixed use neighborhoods. An analysis of recommendations regarding neighborhood planning and the development of design standards will be conducted every 10 years based on an inventory of land-use related plans and ordinances adopted by county and local governments.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

The regional housing plan recommends that local governments, PHAs, and developers consider Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) elements when developing and reviewing site plans for proposed housing developments. CPTED is based on the concept that the proper design of the built environment can lead to a reduction in the incidence and fear of crime and can increase quality of life. CPTED utilizes four general elements, including natural surveillance, natural access control, territorial reinforcement, and maintenance, which are described in Chapter XI (Best Practices) of the regional housing plan report.

The Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee uses CPTED principles when designing new and renovated public housing. The City of Milwaukee Police Department (MPD) also reviews proposed tavern sites based on CPTED principles. Completion of a CPTED survey is now required as part of the application process for tavern licenses. The Police Department cooperated with the Milwaukee office of the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) to develop the survey as part of a SafeGrowth initiative sponsored by LISC. A copy of the brochure describing the CPTED concept produced by the MPD and LISC is included at the end of this report.

Consolidated Plans

A consolidated plan identifies needs and priorities for housing and community development activities to principally benefit low- and moderate-income residents in the entitlement jurisdiction, and also identifies activities proposed to be funded using CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA programs to address the needs identified during the planning process. Consolidated plans are detailed through the preparation of annual action plans prepared by each entitlement jurisdiction.

Beginning in 2012, HUD developed a consolidated plan template for use by entitlement jurisdictions with the intent of providing better data and tools to assist in preparing the consolidated plan and managing CPD grants. Milwaukee County and the Cities of Wauwatosa and West Allis chose to update their plans in 2013 to take advantage of the new planning tool. These three jurisdictions together make up the Milwaukee County HOME Consortium. The new plans are effective for the years 2014 to 2018, and are summarized in the 2013 Housing Plan Implementation Report.

The City of Kenosha and Waukesha County updated their consolidated plans in 2014, which are summarized below. The State of Wisconsin and Cities of Milwaukee and Racine also updated their plans during 2014, but the

plans had not been reviewed by HUD before the end of the year. Summaries of the latter three plans will be included in the implementation report for the year the plans are approved by HUD.

Waukesha County Consolidated Plan: 2015-2019

http://www.waukeshacounty.gov/uploadedFiles/Media/PDF/Parks_and_Land_Use/Planning_and_Zoning/Community_Development/Waukesha%20County%20ConPlan%20FINAL%2011%2003%2014.pdf

- Goal 1: Homelessness and homelessness prevention
 - Assist persons who are homeless through the development and rehabilitation of transitional and permanent housing
 - Assist households at risk of homelessness with short-term rental payment and other assistance
 - Fund projects that provide supportive services and shelter to persons who are homeless
 - Provide infrastructure to meet the needs of low- and moderate-income persons
- Goal 2: Housing affordability and rehabilitation
 - Extend the useful life of existing affordable housing through weatherization, repair, and rehabilitation programs
 - Support the development of affordable rental and owner-occupied housing, including projects located near job centers that will be affordable to service employees and other low-wage members of the workforce
 - Support homeownership opportunities for households throughout the HOME Consortium through down payment assistance
- Goal 3: Provide fair housing outreach and education services
- Goal 4: Non-homeless special needs
 - Fund projects that provide supportive services to low- and moderate-income households, as well as persons with special needs, specifically including transportation assistance
 - Support efforts to develop a social service collaborative to coordinate the work of social service organizations, disseminate news and information, and eliminate duplication of effort
 - Promote commercial revitalization
- Goal 5: Public facility and infrastructure improvements
 - Fund public facility improvements that benefit low-income households and persons with special needs including senior centers, neighborhood facilities, youth centers, childcare centers, health facilities, centers for people with disabilities, homeless facilities, abused and neglected children facilities, community gardens, and parks and other recreational facilities
 - Fund non-housing community development proposals that eliminate a threat to public health and safety including water and sewer improvements, flood and drainage improvements, sidewalks and street improvements, and tree planting and other beautification projects
- Goal 6: Economic development
 - Provide assistance to businesses to create and/or retain jobs for low- and moderate-income persons
 - Support business development in mixed-use environments with access to affordable and accessible housing
- Goal 7: Provide strong program planning and administration

City of Kenosha Consolidated Plan: 2015-2019

http://www.kenosha.org/2015-2019_Consolidated_Plan.pdf

- Goal 1: Create suitable living environment through public facilities and improvements
 - Provide funding for new youth centers
 - Provide funding for neighborhood improvements
 - Provide funding for homeless facilities
 - Provide infrastructure to meet the needs of low- and moderate-income persons
- Goal 2: Provide suitable living environment through public services
 - Provide youth services

- Provide job training services for low- and moderate-income persons
 - Provide homeless services
 - Provide homelessness prevention services
 - Provide permanent supportive and transitional housing for homeless persons
 - Expand public transportation
- Goal 3: Create economic opportunities
 - Provide job training services for low- and moderate-income persons
 - Create opportunities for job creation
 - Promote commercial revitalization
- Goal 4: Provide decent affordable housing
 - Assist with property maintenance and rehabilitation for low- and moderate-income homeowners
 - Coordinate with Habitat for Humanity to provide more affordable housing
 - Continue to provide tenant-based rental assistance
 - Provide down payment, closing cost, and mortgage assistance for low- and moderate-income home buyers

Table 1

HOUSING UNITS BY STRUCTURE TYPE IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION: 2010^a

County	Single-Family ^b		Two-Family		Multi-Family		Total ^c	
	Housing Units	Percent of Total	Housing Units	Percent of Total	Housing Units	Percent of Total	Housing Units	Percent of Total
Kenosha	49,946	72.1	5,341	7.7	14,011	20.2	69,298	100.0
Milwaukee	216,047	51.7	72,032	17.2	129,934	31.1	418,013	100.0
Ozaukee	29,014	79.9	1,931	5.3	5,347	14.7	36,292	100.0
Racine	60,800	74.0	5,071	6.2	16,338	19.9	82,209	100.0
Walworth	39,467	76.5	2,140	4.2	9,949	19.3	51,556	100.0
Washington	42,172	77.1	2,669	4.9	9,897	18.1	54,738	100.0
Waukesha	124,212	77.2	3,959	2.5	32,778	20.4	160,949	100.0
Region	561,658	64.3	93,143	10.7	218,254	25.0	873,055	100.0

^a2010 data includes 2000 Census data plus the number of building permits issued for each type of housing unit from 2000 to January 1, 2010. Building permit data were provided by the Wisconsin Department of Administration.

^bIncludes mobile homes.

^cTotals are based on all housing units, including occupied and vacant units.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Wisconsin Department of Administration, and SEWRPC.

Table 2

**CHANGE IN HOUSING UNITS BY STRUCTURE TYPE IN
SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN: 2010 THROUGH 2014**

County	New Housing Units				Housing Unit Losses				Net Change in Housing Units			
	Single Family	Two Family	Multi-Family	Total	Single Family	Two Family	Multi-Family	Total	Single Family	Two Family	Multi-Family	Total
Kenosha	753	40	415	1,208	187	34	55	276	566	6	360	932
Milwaukee	1,153	382	3,991	5,526	746	1,882	1,211	3,839	407	-1,500	2,780	1,687
Ozaukee	663	46	150	859	69	6	0	75	594	40	150	784
Racine	626	88	486	1,200	170	34	447	651	456	54	39	549
Walworth	668	28	216	912	285	6	30	321	383	22	186	591
Washington	1,032	100	285	1,417	74	6	0	80	958	94	285	1,337
Waukesha	2,839	160	1,357	4,356	387	2	66	455	2,452	158	1,291	3,901
Region	7,734	844	6,900	15,478	1,918	1,970	1,809	5,697	5,816	-1,126	5,091	9,781

NOTE: The Wisconsin Department of Administration conducts an annual survey of each local government to collect data on the current housing stock. Respondents generally use building permits and demolition permits to report changes in housing units which are reported by structure type: single family (including mobile homes), two family, and multifamily buildings. This table reports changes in the Region's housing stock from January 1, 2010 to January 1, 2015.

Source: Wisconsin Department of Administration Annual Housing Survey and SEWRPC.

Table 3

HOUSING UNITS BY STRUCTURE TYPE IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION: 2014^a

County	Single-Family ^b		Two-Family		Multi-Family		Total ^c	
	Housing Units	Percent of Total	Housing Units	Percent of Total	Housing Units	Percent of Total	Housing Units	Percent of Total
Kenosha	50,512	71.9	5,347	7.6	14,371	20.5	70,230	100.0
Milwaukee	216,454	51.6	70,532	16.8	132,714	31.6	419,700	100.0
Ozaukee	29,608	79.9	1,971	5.3	5,497	14.8	37,076	100.0
Racine	61,256	74.0	5,125	6.2	16,377	19.8	82,758	100.0
Walworth	39,850	76.5	2,162	4.1	10,135	19.4	52,147	100.0
Washington	43,130	76.9	2,763	4.9	10,182	18.2	56,075	100.0
Waukesha	126,664	76.8	4,117	2.5	34,069	20.7	164,850	100.0
Region	567,474	64.3	92,017	10.4	223,345	25.3	882,836	100.0

^a2014 data includes 2010 Census data plus the number of building permits issued for each type of housing unit from 2010 to January 1, 2015. Building permit data were provided by the Wisconsin Department of Administration.

^bIncludes mobile homes.

^cTotals are based on all housing units, including occupied and vacant units.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Wisconsin Department of Administration, and SEWRPC.

Table 4

**SECTION 8 HOUSING VOUCHERS
ALLOTTED IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION: 2014**

Public Housing Agency ^a	Housing Choice Vouchers		Project-Based Vouchers		Total Vouchers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Kenosha County						
City of Kenosha Housing Authority.....	1,211 ^b	9.4	0	0.0	1,211	8.8
Kenosha County Housing Authority ^c	100	0.8	0	0.0	100	0.7
County Subtotal	1,311	10.2	0	0.0	1,311	9.5
Milwaukee County						
Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee	5,394 ^d	42.1	548	55.2	5,942	43.0
Milwaukee County Housing Division	1,726	13.4	345	34.7	2,071	15.0
West Allis Housing Authority	457 ^e	3.6	100 ^f	10.1	557	4.0
County Subtotal	7,577	59.1	993	100.0	8,570	62.0
Ozaukee County						
WHEDA.....	125	1.0	0	0.0	125	0.9
County Subtotal	125	1.0	0	0.0	125	0.9
Racine County						
The Housing Authority of Racine County	1,574 ^g	12.3	0	0.0	1,574	11.4
County Subtotal	1,574	12.3	0	0.0	1,574	11.4
Walworth County						
Walworth County Housing Authority.....	410 ^h	3.2	0	0.0	410	3.0
County Subtotal	410	3.2	0	0.0	410	3.0
Washington County						
Hartford Community Development Authority ⁱ	148	1.1	0	0.0	148	1.1
West Bend Housing Authority ⁱ	244	1.9	0	0.0	244	1.8
WHEDA.....	102	0.8	0	0.0	102	0.7
County Subtotal	494	3.8	0	0.0	494	3.6

Table 4 (continued)

Waukesha County						
New Berlin Housing Authority ^j	88	0.7	0	0.0	88	0.6
Housing Authorities of the City and County of Waukesha ^l	1,243	9.7	0	0.0	1,243	9.0
County Subtotal	1,331	10.4	0	0.0	1,331	9.6
Region Total	12,822	100.0	993	100.0	13,815	100.0

^aIncludes only public housing agencies that administer housing vouchers.

^bIncludes 41 family-unification vouchers, 89 vouchers for persons with disabilities, and two vouchers for Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH).

^cKenosha County Housing Authority vouchers are administered by the City of Kenosha Housing Authority.

^dIncludes 100 vouchers for persons with disabilities and 138 vouchers for VASH.

^eIncludes 100 vouchers for VASH.

^fAll 100 vouchers are for the Beloit Road Senior Housing Complex. The West Allis Housing Authority does not receive any direct Federal rent-assistance funding for the Beloit Road complex.

^gIncludes 14 vouchers for VASH.

^hNumber of vouchers in 2013. Updated information was not provided by the Walworth County Housing Authority.

ⁱAll PHA voucher programs in Washington County are now administered by WHEDA.

^jThe voucher programs for all PHAs in Waukesha County are administered by the Housing Authorities of the City and County of Waukesha.

Source: Public Housing Agencies and SEWRPC.

Table 5

**PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS MANAGED BY PUBLIC HOUSING
AGENCIES (PHA) IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION: 2014**

Public Housing Agency ^a	Family Units		Elderly/Special Needs Units		Total Units	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Milwaukee County						
Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee ^b	2,881	93.1	1,906	81.8	4,787	88.3
South Milwaukee Housing Authority	52	1.7	8	0.3	60	1.1
West Allis Housing Authority	0	0.0	104 ^c	4.5	104 ^c	1.9
County total	2,933	94.8	2,018	86.6	4,951	91.3
Racine County						
Housing Authority of Racine County	0	0.0	24	0.4	24	0.2
County total	0	0.0	24	0.4	24	0.2
Washington County						
Slinger Housing Authority.....	8	0.3	41	1.8	49	0.9
West Bend Housing Authority	0	0.0	146	6.3	146	2.7
County total	8	0.3	187	8.1	195	3.6
Waukesha County						
Housing Authorities of the City and County of Waukesha	152	4.9	114	4.9	266	4.9
County total	152	4.9	114	4.9	266	4.9
Region	3,093	100.0 ^d	2,329	100.0 ^d	5,422	100.0

^aIncludes only public housing agencies that manage low-rent public housing units. Some of the units managed by PHAs may have project-based housing vouchers attached to them or may be occupied by a household with a housing choice voucher.

^bInformation for the Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee (HACM) was current as of 2011. Updated information was not provided by HACM.

^cThe West Allis Housing Authority does not receive any Federal rent-assistance funding for the Beloit Road Senior Housing complex, but does receive 100 project-based vouchers for the complex.

^dAbout 57 percent of public housing units are designated to be occupied by families, and the remaining 43 percent are designated for occupancy of the elderly or persons with disabilities.

Source: Public Housing Agencies and SEWRPC.

Table 6

**LOW INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT (LIHTC) UNITS
IN THE REGION BY COUNTY: 2014^a**

County	Family		Elderly		Other ^b		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Kenosha County	294	4.2	506	6.9	193	12.7	993	6.3
Milwaukee County	5,399	77.6	4,021	54.7	1,022	67.0	10,442	66.0
Ozaukee County	32	0.5	322	4.4	48	3.1	402	2.5
Racine County	569	8.2	563	7.7	137	9.0	1,269	8.0
Walworth County	190	2.7	295	4.0	73	4.8	558	3.5
Washington County	195	2.8	348	4.7	32	2.1	575	3.6
Waukesha County	274	3.9	1,295	17.6	20	1.3	1,589	10.0
Region Total	6,953	100.0 ^c	7,350	100.0 ^c	1,525	100.0 ^c	15,828	100.0

^aIncludes only units in which allocated credits have been placed-in-service. Does not include units with allocated credits that have not been completed or fully occupied.

^bIncludes units in complexes for persons with disabilities/majority persons with disabilities, homeless/majority homeless, and residential care apartment complexes (RCAC).

^cOf the 15,828 LIHTC units in service, 44 percent are designated for families, 46 percent for the elderly, and 10 percent for persons with disabilities, housing for the homeless, or RCACs.

Source: Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA) and SEWRPC.

Table 7

**LOW INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT (LIHTC) AWARDS IN THE
SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION BY COUNTY AND COMMUNITY: 2012 THROUGH 2014^a**

County/Community	Name	Year of Award	Household Type	Low-Income Units	Total Units
Kenosha County					
Town of Salem.....	Meadows of Mill Creek ^b	2012	Family	20	24
Village of Twin Lakes.....	Residences on Main ^{b,c}	2012	Elderly	21	24
City of Kenosha	Residences at Library Park ^d	2013	Family	38	46
City of Kenosha	5 th Avenue Lofts ^b	2014	Majority Family	40	60
City of Kenosha	Saxony Manor ^e	2014	Elderly	224	224
County Total	- -	- -	- -	343	378
Milwaukee County					
City of Milwaukee	Florist Garden Apartments ^{c,e}	2011 ^f	Family	77	80
City of Milwaukee	Family Supportive Housing at Center and Buffum ^b	2012	Supportive	37	37
City of Milwaukee	Farwell Studio Apartments ^{c,d}	2012	Mixed	34	34
City of Milwaukee	Impact Milwaukee I ^e	2012	Family	24	24
City of Milwaukee	LBWN – Rent to Own Homes ^e	2012	Family	24	24
City of Milwaukee	Northside Homeowners' Initiative II ^e	2012	Family	30	30
City of Milwaukee	Northside Neighborhood Initiative II ^e	2012	Family	60	60
City of Milwaukee	UMCS Phase III ^b	2012	Family	24	24
City of Milwaukee	700 Lofts ^d	2013	Family	41	49
City of Milwaukee	Appleton Heights Townhomes ^b	2013	Family	15	18
City of Milwaukee	Glendale Heights Townhomes ^b	2013	Family	15	18
City of Milwaukee	Ingram Place Apartments ^b	2013	Family	45	53
City of Milwaukee	Paper Box Lofts ^d	2013	Family	61	72
City of Milwaukee	Washington Park Homeowners' Initiative ^e	2013	Family	42	42
City of Milwaukee	Community for Returning Women Soldiers ^b	2013 ^g	Mixed	23	26
City of Milwaukee	Milwaukee Prosperity Harambee ^e	2013 ^g	Family	32	35
City of Milwaukee	Greenwich Park Apartments ^b	2014	Majority Family	45	53
City of Milwaukee	Milwaukee Prosperity ^e	2014	Family	34	35
City of Milwaukee	The Germania ^{d,h}	2014	Family	78	72
Village of Brown Deer.....	Beaver Creek Apartments ^b	2013	Majority Family	37	44
Village of Brown Deer.....	Bradley Crossing II ^b	2013	Majority Supportive	54	54
County Total	- -	- -	- -	1,057	1,132
Ozaukee County					
None.....	- -	- -	- -	0	0
County Total	- -	- -	- -	0	0
Racine County					
Village of Caledonia.....	Parkview III ^{b,c}	2012	Elderly	73	73
City of Burlington	Fox Crossing Apartments ^b	2013	Family	21	24
County Total	- -	- -	- -	188	203

Table 7 (continued)

County/Community	Name	Year of Award	Household Type	Low-Income Units	Total Units
Walworth County					
Cities of Elkhorn and Lake Geneva.....	Walworth Apartments ^{c,e}	2012	Majority Elderly	134	139
City of Whitewater	Whitewater Woods Apartments ^e	2014	Majority Family	40	40
County Total	- -	- -	- -	174	179
Washington County					
None.....	- -	- -	- -	0	0
County Total	- -	- -	- -	0	0
Waukesha County					
City of Waukesha	Hillcrest Apartments ^e	2012	Family	60	60
City of Waukesha	Meadow Ridge Apartments ^b	2013	Family	61	70
City of Oconomowoc	Oconomowoc School Apartments ^d	2012	Family	50	55
County Total	- -	- -	- -	171	185
Region	- -	- -	- -	1,654	1,763

^aCredits awarded as of October 2014.

^bNew construction.

^cCredits in service as of July 2014.

^dAdaptive reuse of existing non-residential building for multi-family housing.

^eAwarded credits to rehabilitate existing units.

^fProject not included on Table 173 in the Regional Housing Plan, which lists projects that received low-income housing tax credits between 2006 and 2011.

^gProject awarded credits in October 2013 under the LIHTC set-aside for Veteran and High-Impact Projects (VHIP).

^hProject awarded credits from the High Impact Project Reserve (HIPR) in October 2014.

Source: Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA) and SEWRPC.

Table 8

**WHEDA LOW INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT (LIHTC)
QUALIFIED ALLOCATION PLAN (QAP) SCORING CATEGORIES: 2015-2016**

Category 1 – Lower-Income Areas: Development is located within a qualified census tract and contributes to a community revitalization or redevelopment plan and/or is located on Federally designated tribal land. (Up to 5 points)

Category 2 – Energy Efficiency and Sustainability: Development is designed to promote long term energy efficiency and sustainability through project design and site location, has a high Walkscore, and/or is near a transit stop. (Up to 43 points)

Category 3 – Community Notification and Support: Local notice form signed by elected official or planning director submitted (2 points; local approval not required). Up to six points awarded for letters of support from elected and non-elected local officials, housing authorities, neighborhood groups, or major employers. (Up to 8 points)

Category 4 – Mixed-Income Incentive: Development offers both affordable and market rate units. (Up to 15 points)

Category 5 – Serves Larger Families (3-bedroom or larger units): Development offers at least 5 percent of total units with three or more bedrooms. (Up to 8 points if 16 percent or more of units are three or more bedrooms.)

Category 6 – Serves Lowest Income Residents: Development reserves units for households with incomes of 50 percent or less than county median income (CMI). (Up to 70 points; 10 point bonus if an application includes six or more units for households at 30 percent CMI.)

Category 7 – Integrated Supportive Housing: Development will provide supportive services in an integrated setting (less than 25 percent of residents require services). (Up to 15 points; 5 point bonus if some or all of the services are designed to address the needs of Veterans.)

Category 8 – Elderly Assisted Living - RCACs: Development will provide supportive services to elderly persons in a certified Residential Care Apartment Complex (RCAC). (Up to 18 points)

Category 9 – Rehab/Neighborhood Stabilization: Development proposes rehabilitation, or acquisition and rehabilitation, of existing single-family, two-family, or four-family housing as part of a targeted, city-supported plan to stabilize neighborhoods due to vacant properties and/or foreclosure. (Up to 30 points)

Category 10 – Universal Design: Development offers architectural features that increase accessibility. (Up to 23 points)

Category 11 – Financial Participation: Development has financial participation secured by the applicant for permanent (not construction) financing (up to 25 points; one or both options can be used).

Option A: One point for each percentage point of financial participation, including loans, grants, or cash donations from local governments, Federal agencies, the Federal Home Loan Bank, TIF financing, or area employers.

Option B: Points determined by dividing the dollar amount of qualified cost reductions by the total development costs plus the cost reductions.

Category 12 – Ownership Characteristics: Development where the controlling entity (managing member or general partner) is partially owned and controlled by a member of a minority group or a tax-exempt organization. (Up to 6 points)

Category 13 – Eventual Tenant Ownership: All units are intended for eventual low-income resident ownership. (3 points)

Category 14 – Project Development Team: Development team (developer, management agent, and consultant) will be evaluated based on past performance and previous tax credit program experience. (Up to 50 points)

Category 15 – Readiness to Proceed: Development has permissive zoning in place for multi-family housing. (15 points)

Category 16 – Credit Usage: Development uses relatively fewer credits per low income unit produced. (Up to 40 points)

Category 17 – Employment Centers and High Need Areas: Developments which are near employment centers (up to 10 points) and/or located in areas with high occupancy rates where data suggests a severe housing need or an imbalance between housing and employment opportunities, or a local government has issued an RFP/RFQ to develop a project on publicly-owned land (up to 10 points; up to 20 points total).

Maximum Score: 409 points.

Source: Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA) and SEWRPC.

CPTED

Crime Prevention
Through
Environmental Design

CPTED

Crime Prevention
Through
Environmental Design

In this brochure, please find descriptions
of CPTED principles.

When meeting with the local CLO (Community
Liaison Officer) or CPU (Community
Prosecution Unit) Officer, s/he will be looking
for positive examples of each principle in
practice at your proposed license premise.



For more information, please contact:
Milwaukee Police Department,
License Investigation Unit
414.935.7430

For a listing of police districts
to locate your local CLO, see:
<http://city.milwaukee.gov/PoliceDistricts>



LISC
Milwaukee

9/13



LISC
Milwaukee

Crime Prevention Through Environmental
Design (CPTED, pronounced sep-ted) helps us
to create healthy, safe communities through
well planned environmental design.

POSITIVE CPTED

NEGATIVE CPTED



The fencing defines the site, thereby controlling access to the property. It also allows for strong natural surveillance.



In an effort to display territoriality, this homeowner has gone too far, making this an unpleasant place to be, even for responsible users.



The managers of this convenience store maintain natural surveillance by keeping the windows clear of posters and ads.



A would-be criminal may see this store as an easy one to rob because ads in the windows almost completely obscure the view inside.



A good example of Territorial Reinforcement through the use of lighting.



Little or no maintenance is taking place on this property, creating an image or sense that a person can do anything here and get away with it.

NATURAL SURVEILLANCE

Any architectural design that enhances the chance that a potential offender will be, or might be seen, is a form of natural surveillance. A potential criminal is less likely to attempt a crime if he or she is at risk of being observed. At the same time, we are likely to feel safer when we can see and be seen.

NATURAL ACCESS CONTROL

Access controls are part of territoriality. Access controls include creating a sense of turf, but it focuses on entry and exit points into buildings, parks, parking lots and neighborhoods.

CPTED

Crime Prevention
Through
Environmental Design

IMAGE

How a property is maintained is instrumental in creating a sense of place, or territory for legitimate users of that space. If a property is well maintained, it shows that management, or the owner cares for and will defend the property against crime.

TERRITORIAL REINFORCEMENT

Territorial Reinforcement is the use of physical attributes that express ownership, such as fences, signage, landscaping, lighting, etc. Defined property lines and public spaces are examples of territorial reinforcement.

ADDITIONAL IDEAS TO SUPPORT COMMUNITY CPTED EFFORTS:

Activity Support fosters community interaction. Criminal acts can be discouraged in public spaces when we encourage activities in those spaces by residents, visitors and other legitimate users.