



*Chapter 3*  
*Housing*

**2018**  
**COMPREHENSIVE**  
**PLAN**  
**UPDATE**

*“Where the West Still Lives”*

**CITY OF TOPPENISH**  
**2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**

**Chapter 3 HOUSING ELEMENT**

**A. INTRODUCTION**

**1. Purpose**

The housing element is intended to guide the location and type of housing that will be built in the city of Toppenish over the next twenty years. This element establishes both long-and short-term policies to meet the community's housing needs and achieve community goals. The housing element specifically considers the condition of the existing housing stock; the cause, scope and nature of any housing problems; and the provision of a variety of housing types to match the lifestyle and economic needs of the community.

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that the following be addressed by the housing element:

- Inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs;
- Adequate provisions for existing and projected housing needs for all economic segments of the community;
- Identification of sufficient land for housing, including government-assisted, low income, manufactured, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities; and
- Statement of goals, policies, and objectives for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing.

**2. Relationship to Other Elements or Land Uses**

Housing, as the major user of land in urban areas, directly affects most plan elements. Those elements in turn, especially land use, capital facilities, and transportation, directly affect housing.

**3. Urban Growth Areas**

In large part, the conversion of vacant and agricultural land to urban use will mean the subdivision of parcels for housing construction. The intensity of this development will largely determine the amount of land needed to serve future populations.

**4. Land Use**

Housing is a major consumer of land, and often the major determinant of land use patterns. The placement of schools, parks, and small commercial areas typically responds to needs generated by housing.

**5. Capital Facilities**

Availability of water, sewer and other public services makes possible a denser, less costly type of housing. Conversely, low density housing may make the provision of public services extremely expensive.

## **6. Transportation**

Housing is a major generator of traffic flow and generates traffic on local roads, arterials and highways. Housing for special needs populations may require access to public transportation or special transportation services.

## **7. Growth and Development**

Housing is a two-edged sword in the growth of a city. New housing generates new demands for infrastructure and services, but it also generates additional tax revenue.

# **B. MAJOR HOUSING CONSIDERATIONS**

## **1. Availability of Housing.**

The vacancy rate has a substantial impact on the availability, price, and quality of housing. Where there is an extremely low rate of vacancy housing is not generally available, the price is inflated, and the quality may tend to decline. An increase in the vacancy rate increases free market competition and thereby improves the situation of the housing consumer.

In Toppenish, affecting an increase in the vacancy rate must involve the development of vacant land. This situation raises two issues;

- What is the preferred role of the city in the development of land and the production of housing? and
- How can city programs best be designed to stimulate activity in the private sector?

## **2. Rural Residential Community.**

Should the city strictly adhere to its desire of being a small city surrounded by rural areas with a small city character or should policies be developed that allow for higher densities? If the preference is to maintain its small city character, how will the city house its future population at a reasonable cost?

## **3. Housing Density**

The City should consider all available alternative housing types (single-family, multifamily, manufactured homes, etc.). In considering housing types, the City should:

- Determine an appropriate mix of housing types and densities to meet the current and future needs of the community; and
- Determine the most appropriate location for these different types and densities to avoid mixing incompatible uses.

## **4. Housing Rehabilitation**

A rehabilitation program is an essential component of preserving existing housing stock, including units for occupancy by lower income persons. A rehabilitation program can also serve to strengthen neighborhoods. A shortage of available vacant units increases the need to preserve existing housing stock. The City of Toppenish is a member of the Yakima County HOME Consortium, which provides extensive housing rehabilitation for qualifying owned homes. To

date, two homes in Toppenish have received rehabilitation assistance through the HOME Consortium.

## 5. Housing Mix

An additional need beyond rehabilitation is the provision of new units to meet the needs of a growing population. New housing should be focused on the needs of a variety of income groups. Some activities that might facilitate this process are:

- Monitoring housing needs in all income groups.
- Keeping developers informed about current housing needs and encouraging them to address these needs.
- Providing information on loan programs to eligible persons seeking to improve their living situation.

## C. EXISTING CONDITIONS

### 1. Housing Characteristics

The population of the City of Toppenish has grown from 7,419 persons housed in 2,254 housing units in 1990 to 8,949 persons housed in 2,334 units in the year 2010. Table 5.1 shows the population and number of housing units over this period. Of note, between the years 2000 and 2010, the population remained constant while the number of housing units declined. The loss of housing units was offset by an increase in the number of persons per housing unit. The mix of housing types has changed over time. From 1980 to 2000 the percentage of single family-homes declined while the percentage of multi-family and manufactured housing increased. However, from the year 2000 to 2010 the percentage of single-family homes increased somewhat while the percentage of manufactured and other types of housing declined. Table 5.2 below shows changes in the overall housing mix.

Table 5.1 Population and Housing in the City of Toppenish

| City of Toppenish Population and Housing Units | Population |                | Housing Units |                | Persons Per Housing Unit |                |
|--|------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
|  | Number     | Percent Growth | Number        | Percent Growth | Number                   | Percent Change |
| 2010   | 8,949      | .01%           | 2,334         | -4.3%          | 3.96                     | 2.1%           |
| 2000   | 8,946      | 20.6%          | 2,440         | 8.25%          | 3.88                     | 17.9%          |
| 1990   | 7,419      | 12.2%          | 2,254         | .85%           | 3.29                     | 12.7%          |
| 1980   | 6,517      | ---            | 2,235         | ---            | 2.92                     | ---            |

2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates, Table CP04, 1980, 1990 & 2000 Census

Table 5.2: Housing Types in the City of Toppenish

| City of Toppenish Type of Housing Units | 2010   |         | 2000   |         | 1990   |         | 1980   |         |
|---|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
|   | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Single Family                           | 1,822  | 75.4%   | 1,728  | 71.2%   | 1,606  | 71.3%   | 1,818  | 81.3%   |
| Multi-Family                            | 537    | 22.2%   | 538    | 22.2%   | 420    | 18.6%   | 367    | 16.4%   |
| Manufactured and other Housing          | 58     | 2.4%    | 161    | 6.6%    | 228    | 10.1%   | 50     | 2.3%    |
| 2.3Total Housing Units                  | 2,417  | 100%    | 2,427  | 100%    | 2,254  | 100%    | 2,235  | 100%    |

Source: U.S. Census 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates, Table CP04.

### 1. Vacancy Rate

An accepted rule of thumb is that a vacancy rate near 5% is desirable to provide both free movement in the market and adequate housing maintenance practices, though the ideal rate of vacancy depends on local and regional conditions. According to the 2010 Census the homeowner vacancy rate in Toppenish was 1.6% while the rental vacancy rate was 4.0 percent. The vacancy rate for all housing types was 4.2%. By this measure the vacancy rate in Toppenish is less than ideal. These figures suggest a strong market need for owner-occupied housing.

Table 5.3 depicts the age of housing units in Toppenish. Roughly 52% of all housing units in Toppenish were built prior to 1960 meaning they are now more than 50-years old. More renters are living in housing units built in 1970 or later (46.9%) than homeowners (25.8%), and slightly more homeowners are living in housing units constructed prior to 1970 (37.1% for homeowners vs. 23.2% for renters). This difference can be attributed to the fact that most recent construction has been rental housing. The percentage of owner versus renter occupied units has remained relatively constant in the past 20-years. In 2010 was 56.6% of all units were owner-occupied compared to 56.4% in 2000 and 58.1% in 1990.

Table 5.3: Age of Housing Units in the City of Toppenish

| Year Housing Unit was Built | All Housing Units (including vacant) |         | Owner Occupied |         | Renter Occupied |         |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|----------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
|                             | Number                               | Percent | Number         | Percent | Number          | Percent |
| 2000 to 2010                | 43                                   | 1.8%    | 35             | 2.7%    | 8               | .8%     |
| 1990 to 1999                | 278                                  | 11.5%   | 113            | 8.7%    | 165             | 15.6%   |
| 1980 to 1999                | 268                                  | 11.1%   | 76             | 5.9%    | 128             | 12.1%   |
| 1970 to 1979                | 305                                  | 12.6%   | 109            | 8.4%    | 196             | 18.5%   |
| 1960 to 1969                | 258                                  | 10.7%   | 114            | 8.8%    | 144             | 13.6%   |
| 1959 and Prior              | 1,265                                | 52.3%   | 846            | 65.4%   | 419             | 53.8%   |

Source: US Census Bureau, Census of Population and Housing 2010

TABLE 5.4: Age of Housing Stock, a Comparison between the City of Toppenish, Yakima County and Washington State.

| Universe of all Housing Units | Built 1939 and Prior | Percent Built 1939 and Prior | Built 1959 and Prior | Percent Built 1959 and Prior | Built 1960 and Later | Percent Built 1960 and Later |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| City of Toppenish             | 537                  | 42.5%                        | 1265                 | 52.3%                        | 1152                 | 47.7%                        |
| Yakima County                 | 12,492               | 40.9                         | 30,544               | 36.2%                        | 53,833               | 63.8                         |
| State of Washington           | 323,392              | 45.0%                        | 718,118              | 25.4%                        | 2,111,234            | 74.6%                        |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census of Population and Housing, 2010

Approximately half of the year-round housing units in Toppenish were built before 1960 compared to 36% of the units in Yakima County and 25% of the units in Washington State. This large percentage of older homes in Toppenish is significant, as the age of the housing stock has a

direct relationship with the need for housing rehabilitation. Common problems found in older units include asbestos siding and wraps on older furnaces, unreliable knob and tube wiring, lead-based paint on walls, woodwork and saturated plaster, lead-based plumbing components, and occasionally wood and timber treatments with toxic components.

Many critical components in homes built prior to 1960, particularly the electrical, heating and plumbing systems, were installed when less stringent codes were used, and these systems were not intended to meet the requirements of modern appliances and lifestyles, or the added demands of overcrowding (see the Inventory section for more information on overcrowding). With the passage of time and the aging of these homes, many of these components have exceeded their design life resulting in potentially dangerous conditions for occupants, especially the low income and elderly who may not be able to afford maintenance or replacement of these systems.

## **2. Housing Inventory**

The City of Toppenish continues to experience serious problems with the physical integrity of its existing housing stock. Sixty-nine percent of the City's current inventory of single-family dwellings throughout Toppenish exhibit one or more signs of deterioration. This situation was verified by a windshield study of single-family housing in Toppenish on October 26th and October 27th, 2006 by Yakima Valley Conference of Governments' staff. All Toppenish single-family housing units were surveyed except for apartment units and manufactured homes. Categories of housing conditions were based on former CDBG General Purpose Handbook criteria with a summary of results being as follows:

The severity of defects varies with individual houses, but many significant defects are apparent among most of the homes surveyed (See photographic examples Attachment 4.) Common problems are dilapidated roofs, inappropriate and dangerous electrical systems, faulty heating systems, lack of weatherization, deteriorating structural components and weathered paint. The housing problems in Toppenish are not limited to an isolated neighborhood but are located throughout the community (See Housing Condition Map) and be detrimental to the safety and well-being of the entire City. The underlying factors that account for the poor condition of the housing stock include the age of the housing and limited income of the residents.

The 2010 Census reported that of the 2,417 total housing units 2,353 units occupied and 64 were vacant for an overall vacancy rate of 2.7%. Owner occupied housing totaled 1,293-units or 55-percent of the units while 1,060-units comprising 45-percent of the occupied housing stock were rental units. Additionally, the 2010 Census showed that while population remained constant between 2000 and 2010 the number of housing units decreased by 4.3-percent. Housing is currently in very short supply with demand far exceeding supply. Housing studies indicate that a vacancy rate of 4.2% to 5% is desirable to provide both free movement in the market and adequate housing maintenance practices.

## **3. Overcrowding**

Another measure of living conditions is overcrowding. The accepted standard defines overcrowding as the presence of more than one person per room. The 2010 census shows that 18.1% of the dwellings are overcrowded using the standard of more than one person per room. Overcrowding increases wear and tear on a home and is very hard on aging houses in a state of decline. Overcrowding is, in large part, due to the short supply of available affordable housing

in Toppenish. Overcrowding is a concern, as the presence of more occupants than a house is designed for places added stress on a home's systems and structural components reducing their design life. Table 5.5 compares overcrowding in Toppenish with Yakima County and Washington State. The rate of overcrowding in Toppenish is 2.6 times greater than Yakima County and over 7 times higher than Washington State.

TABLE 5.5: Person per Room, City of Toppenish, Yakima County and Washington State

| Jurisdiction      | More than 1.01 Persons Per Room | Percent with more than 1.01 Persons Per Room | 1.00 or Fewer Persons Per Room | Percent with 1.00 or Fewer Persons Per Room |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|
| City of Toppenish | 432                             | 18.4%  | 1,921                          | 81.6%                                       |
| Yakima County     | 5,132                           | 6.5%   | 73,943                         | 93.5%                                       |
| Washington State  | 64,260                          | 2.5%   | 2,513,115                      | 97.5%                                       |

2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates, Table DP04.

To maintain suitable housing stock and provide for the expected expansion of the population, it will be necessary to develop a data base and municipal policies to address housing and related land use issues. Such information, plans and policies are essential to making housing decisions to suit the future needs of the city.

#### 4. Value and Cost of Housing

As indicated in Table 5.6, approximately 45% of the owner-occupied homes in Toppenish in 2010 were valued at less than \$100,000. The median value of an owner-occupied home in Toppenish is \$105,300 compared to \$149,700 throughout the county, and \$285,400 state-wide.

Table 5.6: Value of Owner Occupied Housing in 2010

| Owner Occupied Housing Units | City of Toppenish |         | Yakima County |         | Washington State |         |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---------|---------------|---------|------------------|---------|
|                              | Number            | Percent | Number        | Percent | Number           | Percent |
| Total                        | 1,293             | ---     | 50,710        | ---     | 1,669,396        | ---     |
| Less than \$50,000           | 69                | 5.3%    | 4,851         | 9.6%    | 69,806           | 4.2%    |
| 50,000 to 99,999             | 517               | 40.0%   | 8,161         | 16.1%   | 71,095           | 4.3%    |
| 100,000 to 149,999           | 426               | 32.9%   | 12,413        | 24.5%   | 130,190          | 7.8%    |
| 150,000 to 199,999           | 181               | 14.0%   | 11,132        | 22.0%   | 192,654          | 11.5%   |
| 200,000 to 299,999           | 92                | 7.1%    | 8,242         | 16.3%   | 427,516          | 25.6%   |
| 300,000 to 499,999           | 8                 | 0.6%    | 4,568         | 9.0%    | 491,251          | 29.4%   |
| 500,000 to 999,999           | 0                 | 0%      | 1,014         | 2.0%    | 242,322          | 14.5%   |
| 1,000,000 or more            | 0                 | 0%      | 329           | 0.6%    | 44,562           | 2.7%    |
| Median (dollars)             | \$105,300         | ---     | \$149,700     | ---     | \$285,400        | ---     |

2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates, Table DP04.

#### 5. Affordable Housing

“Affordable Housing” is a term which applies to the adequacy of the housing stock to fulfill the housing needs of all economic segments of the population. The underlying assumption is that the marketplace will guarantee adequate housing for those in upper income brackets, but that some combination of appropriately zoned land, regulatory incentives, financial subsidies, and/or innovative planning techniques may be necessary to make adequate provisions for the needs of lower income persons.

## 6. Income and Housing Costs

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) sets income limits that act as breaking points among low-, very low-, and moderate-income levels. For Yakima County, the income limit for a low-income family of four during fiscal year 2015 is 46,300. Because the closest American Community Survey (ACS) income data interval to this number is \$49,999, the number of families earning \$49,999 or less was used to approximate the number of low-income households in Grandview. Using this measure, approximately 18.8% of households in Grandview can be considered low-income. Due to the estimation method used, this is a slight overestimate.

Based on U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) criteria, 73% of all households in Toppenish are considered low-moderate income. Table 5.7.1 compares four income statistics for the city of Toppenish, Yakima County and Washington State as of 2010. Among the 14 cities in the county, Toppenish ranked the second lowest in terms of per capita income in 2010. Additionally, the incomes of 27.5% of the families in Toppenish are below the poverty level. This compares to 27.8% in 1990 to 29.2% in 2000 (1990 and 2000 Census). In 2010 the economy was just beginning to recover from a significant recession that depressed incomes levels. By 2016 the economy was in recovery and income levels had recovered. Table 5.7.2 depicts income levels as of 2016. The income gap between Toppenish, Yakima County and the State of Washington remained constant and despite higher incomes the percentage of families in poverty increased.

Because of these low-income levels, occupants of at least 54.2% of the owner-occupied housing units spent 30% or more of their income on housing, including utilities (2010 Census). Among those who rent, 63.9% pay more than 30% of their income for gross rent. When the percentage of income on housing costs exceeds 30%, the remaining income available to many low-income households is often inadequate to meet life's other necessities such as food and clothing.

Table 5.7.1: Comparison of Average Income in 2010 Statistics for City of Toppenish, Yakima County and Washington State

| Jurisdiction      | Per Capita Income | Medium Household Income | Medium Family Income | Percent of Families in Poverty |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| City of Toppenish | \$10,566          | \$28,896                | \$29,398             | 27.5%                          |
| Yakima County     | \$19,325          | \$42,877                | \$48,004             | 16.8%                          |
| Washington State  | \$29,733          | \$57,244                | \$69,328             | 8.2%                           |

2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates, Table DP03.

Table 5.7.2: Comparison of Average Income in 2016 Statistics for City of Toppenish, Yakima County and Washington State

| Jurisdiction      | Per Capita Income | Medium Household Income | Medium Family Income | Percent of Families in Poverty |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| City of Toppenish | \$13,162          | \$37,109                | \$38,151             | 30.5%                          |
| Yakima County     | \$20,653          | \$45,700                | \$48,004             | 15.9%                          |
| Washington State  | \$32,999          | \$62,848                | \$69,328             | 8.4%                           |

Table 5-8 presents the breakdown of expenditures of owner occupied housing costs by age. In 2010 54.2% of owner occupied householders in Toppenish spend more than 30% of their income on housing; a percentage that is substantially higher than Yakima County (28.2%), and the State of Washington (33.2%).



Table 5-8. Comparison of Percentage of Income Spent on Owned Housing of City of Toppenish, Yakima County and Washington State.

| Specified Owner-Occupied Housing Units | City of Toppenish |         | Yakima County |         | Washington State |         |
|--|-------------------|---------|---------------|---------|------------------|---------|
|  | Number            | Percent | Number        | Percent | Number           | Percent |
| All Households                         | 1,293             | ---     | 50,710        |         | 1,669,396        |         |
| Less than 30%                          | 592               | 45.8%   | 36,115        | 71.2%   | 1,106,627        | 66.3%   |
| 30% or more                            | 701               | 54.2%   | 14,322        | 28.2%   | 554,553          | 33.2%   |
| Undetermined                           |                   |         | 273           | .5%     | 8,126            | .5%     |
| Householders: 15 to 64 Years of Age    | 1036              | 80.1%   | 38,356        | 75.7%   | 1,291,929        | 77.4%   |
| Less than 30%                          | 429               | 33.2%   | 26,704        | 52.7%   | 835,802          | 50.1%   |
| 30% or more                            | 607               | 46.9%   | 11,443        | 22.6%   | 449,260          | 26.9%   |
| Undetermined                           |                   |         | 209           | .4%     | 6,867            | .4%     |
| Householders: 65 Years and Over        | 257               | 19.9%   | 12,354        | 24.4%   | 377,476          | 22.6%   |
| Less than 30%                          | 163               | 12.6%   | 9,411         | 18.6    | 270,825          | 16.2%   |
| 30% or more                            | 94                | 7.3%    | 2,879         | 5.7     | 105,293          | 6.3%    |
| Undetermined                           |                   |         | 64            | .1%     | 1,349            | .1%     |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Table B25096, 2006-2010 America Community Survey 5-year estimates.

Based on HUD guidelines, housing is considered unaffordable when housing costs exceed 30% of household income. When the percentage of income expended on housing exceeds 30%, the remaining disposable income available to low-income households is often inadequate to meet life's other necessities. Often low-income homeowners are often unable to afford basic home maintenance and repairs furthering the deterioration of the housing stock of Toppenish.

Table 5-9. Comparison of Percentage of Income Spent on Owned Housing in the City of Toppenish between 2010 and 1999.

| Specified Owner-Occupied Housing Units in Toppenish | 2010   |         | 1999   |         |
|---|--------|---------|--------|---------|
|   | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| All Households                                      | 1,293  | ---     | 1,239  |         |
| Less than 30%                                       | 592    | 45.8%   | 916    | 73.9%   |
| 30% or more   | 701    | 54.2%   | 314    | 25.4%   |
| Undetermined  |        |         | 9      | .7%     |
| Householders: 15 to 64 Years of Age                 | 1036   | 80.1%   | 940    | 75.9%   |
| Less than 30%                                       | 429    | 33.2%   | 684    | 55.2%   |
| 30% or more   | 607    | 46.9%   | 256    | 20.7%   |
| Undetermined  |        |         | 0      | 0%      |
| Householders: 65 Years and Over                     | 257    | 19.9%   | 299    | 24.1%   |
| Less than 30%                                       | 163    | 12.6%   | 232    | 18.7    |
| 30% or more   | 94     | 7.3%    | 58     | 4.7     |
| Undetermined  |        |         | 9      | .7%     |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Table HCT081, 2000 Census Summary File 4

The percentage of low-income homeowners more than doubled in the decade between 1999 and 2010. Table 5-9 depicts a comparison during this time. In 1999 25.4% of owner occupied

householders in Toppenish spent 30% or more of their household income on housing compared with 54.2% in 2010.

City of Toppenish will continue its participation in the Yakima County HOME Consortium. The HOME Consortium expands affordable housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income households in member jurisdictions throughout the region. The HOME Consortium has participated with Yakima Valley Partners Habitat for Humanities to fund affordable single-family housing units and to provided home-owner occupied rehabilitation. The HOME Consortium is currently focused on housing rehabilitation as a pressing regional need, but is still able to assist with new construction for multi- or single-family rental units and affordable housing for a homebuyer program.

## **B. HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

### **1. Existing Densities**

Overall, housing densities in the city limits of Toppenish are relatively low. City wide the housing density is 1.82 units per acre which equates to 1,165 units per square mile. The population density is 6.98 persons per acre equating to 4,467 persons per square mile. This overall density includes non-residential lands. The area of the city with the greatest density can be found in a five-block area bisected by Guyette and Rentschiller Lanes, south of Madison Avenue. This area is approximately 12-acres in size and supports 108 apartment units and several single-family homes. The housing density of this area is 8.93 dwellings per acre or 5,712 dwellings per square mile. The population density of this area is approximately 42.3 persons per acre, just over 27,000 persons per square mile. By comparison the residential subdivision of Berger Addition is at the low end of the density spectrum. This 40-acre subdivision of single family homes is situated near the western city limits. The neighborhood has a housing density of roughly 2.4 dwelling units per acre, or approximately 1,550 dwellings per square mile. The estimated population density is 9.4 persons per acre or 6,080 persons per square mile. A typical 3-block area bounded by Washington and Madison Avenues, Juniper and Ivy Streets represents lands developed in the 1930's. This area is 11.8 acres in size with a housing density of 3.98 units per acre or 2,550 dwellings per square mile. The population density of the area is 15.75 persons per acre equating to approximately 10,080 persons per square mile.

Based on net acreage (parcel acreage minus streets) approximately 370 acres or 35% of the land area is devoted to housing.

### **2. Inventory of Vacant Buildable Land**

In Toppenish, approximately 274 acres or 26% of the parcel acreage is classified as vacant or agricultural. Of this vacant acreage, about 50-acres are residentially zoned. Most of this acreage is designated as R-2 Residential.

### **3. Population and Housing Growth**

Between 2000 and 2010 the city experienced little population growth. During this period, the number of housing units decreased by 4.3%. The modest growth in population was absorbed by an increase in the number of persons per household. In 2000 there was an average of 3.88

persons per household compared to 3.98 in 2010. During this period there was little change in the housing vacancy rate

From 2010 to 2017 a total of 45 new housing units were added to the City’s housing stock. Of these two-thirds (66.6%) of the units were multi-family dwellings, and one-third (33.3%) were single family dwellings. The multi-family units consisted of an apartment complex constructed by the Yakima Housing Authority for low and moderate-income families. Half of the single-family dwellings were constructed through a program with Yakima Valley Partners Habitat for Humanity [YVPHH]. YVPHH used subsidies that enabled low income families the opportunity to afford the homes. This trend is a continuation of the past decade and is expected to continue based on the economic profile of the population and availability of suitable lands. In 2006 Catholic Charities Family Housing constructed a 26-unit apartment complex. The apartment complexes by both the Yakima Housing Authority and Catholic Charities were constructed as family housing consisting of three-bedroom units. Accordingly, the typical number of persons per household of these units is somewhat higher than typical apartment units.

The 2017 population estimate for Toppenish was 9,085 persons (Office of Financial Management [OFM]). The 2040 population projections used in this Comprehensive Plan are discussed in the Land Use Element. The medium projection, identified as the likeliest 2040 population projection given current trends, is 9,955 for an increase of 870 persons. The increase in 5-year increments is depicted in Table 5-10 and includes persons per housing type based on the assumption that one-third (33.3%) of the new dwellings in Toppenish will be single family dwellings and two-thirds or 66.6% will be multi-family dwellings. The analysis also assumes that the number of persons per household in 2010 will remain similar during the 20-year planning period. Table 5-10 depicts the population increase in single family and multi-family units.

*Table 5-10 City of Toppenish Population Projections*

| Year  | Total Population | Population Increase | Population Increase by Unit Type |              |
|-------|------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|
|       |                  |                     | Single Family                    | Multi-Family |
| 2017  | 9,085            | -----               | ----                             | -----        |
| 2020  | 9,241            | 156                 | 52                               | 104          |
| 2025  | 9,454            | 213                 | 142                              | 213          |
| 2030  | 9,642            | 188                 | 125                              | 188          |
| 2035  | 9,810            | 168                 | 112                              | 168          |
| 2040  | 9,955            | 145                 | 98                               | 146          |
| Total | -----            | 870                 | 290                              | 580          |

Table 5-11 depicts the number of dwelling units required to absorb the population based on an average occupancy of 4.0 persons per single family dwelling and 3.8 persons per multi-family dwelling. In addition to those needs displayed by the current housing stock, new construction will be needed to increase the vacancy rate and to provide for population growth.

*Table 5-11 Number of Dwelling Units Required*

| Year | Single Family | Multi-Family | Total |
|------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| 2020 | 13            | 27           | 40    |
| 2025 | 18            | 37           | 55    |

|        |    |     |     |
|--------|----|-----|-----|
| 2030   | 16 | 33  | 49  |
| 2035   | 14 | 29  | 43  |
| 2040   | 12 | 25  | 37  |
| Total: | 72 | 152 | 224 |

Table 5-12 depicts the acreage required to accommodate the projected dwelling unit increase based on an average single-family density of 3.0 dwellings per acre and an average multi-family density of 8.5 dwellings units per acre.

*Table 5-12 Additional Acreage Required for Housing*

| Year   | Single Family | Multi-Family | Total |
|--------|---------------|--------------|-------|
| 2020   | 4.3           | 3.2          | 7.5   |
| 2025   | 5.9           | 4.4          | 10.3  |
| 2030   | 5.2           | 3.9          | 9.1   |
| 2035   | 4.6           | 3.5          | 8.1   |
| 2040   | 4.0           | 3.0          | 7.0   |
| Total: | 24.0          | 18.0         | 42.0  |

The potential exists within the city for mixed use building (residential units above existing commercial in the downtown core), duplexes, triplexes, four-plex's, and small-scale apartment buildings. The current inventory of vacant lands will accommodate this projected growth. However, to provide for market choice, it is likely that some lands for new housing will be accommodated through annexation.

### **C. A COORDINATED HOUSING STRATEGY FOR TOPPENISH**

As is the case with most communities, Toppenish's housing problems are a result of complex physical, social, and economic realities. Because of the complexity of these problems, a coordinated approach is necessary to address them. A coordinated housing strategy for Toppenish should include:

- Consideration and implementation of the housing goals, policies and objectives. Land use decisions, new municipal ordinances and the allocation of available resources should be made in consideration the goals, policies and objectives contained in this comprehensive plan;
- 2) A target area or areas for housing rehabilitation should be indicated with the plan and used to guide future activities aimed at improvement of the existing housing stock: and
- 3. Implementation of needed improvements in the Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements could result in greater opportunity for growth in Toppenish. The addition of more people in Toppenish, particularly those active in the community work force will add to the viability of the community.

## **D. GOALS AND POLICIES**

This section presents the goals and policies for housing in the City of Toppenish. In addition, the Growth Management Act has designated cities, town and their associated urban growth areas as the primary areas for urban growth. To achieve inter-jurisdictional consistency countywide planning policies have been adopted by each jurisdiction in Yakima County. An analysis of County Planning Policies applicable to this element is presented in Appendix A.

### **GOAL 1: Encourage a variety of affordable, well-designed and attractive housing for all Toppenish residents.**

Policy 1.1 Support the development of a housing stock that meets the varied needs of the present community while attracting high income residents.

Objective: Encourage the construction of new units to increase the housing supply. New construction should provide for moderate to low income households, and elderly market demand as well as upscale residences. It should also provide for an appropriate mix of housing types and intensities (single family, and multifamily)

Objective: Encourage the construction of new housing units based on local need in consideration of:

- 1) Existing vacancy rates of owner and renter occupied households;
- 2) The number of households expected to reside in Toppenish in the next twenty years;
- and
- 3) The number of dwelling units that are dilapidated and not suitable for rehabilitation.

Objective: Allow, on individual lots in all residentially zoned areas, manufactured housing that meet accepted standards for site built homes.

Policy 1.2 Evaluate local development standards and regulations for effects on housing costs. Modify development regulations which unnecessarily add to housing costs.

Policy 1.3 The city should consider allowing accessory apartments as conditional uses in single family residential zoning classifications.

Policy 1.4 Monitor housing availability.

Objective: Develop a record keeping and evaluation system that accurately measures the impact of programs on local housing problems.

Objective: Make current housing information available to potential developers and encourage its use in the consideration of development alternatives.

Objective: Provide for the periodic updating of existing plans and the ongoing analysis of housing problems.

Policy 1.5 Work cooperatively with public agencies, private institutions, and private enterprise to involve the private sector in new housing construction.

Objective: Provide information regarding housing needs to local finance institutions and developers.

Objective: Support the construction of new housing funded by federal and state programs, by private enterprise, public agencies, nonprofit corporations, and other eligible parties.

Objective: Support the management and administration of public housing programs by a local public housing authority.

Objective: Endorse private sector efforts to secure federal and/or state funds to provide housing for elderly and disabled citizens.

Policy 1.6 Work cooperatively with public agencies and private institutions to implement programs that expand the housing opportunities of lower income households, particularly those on fixed incomes.

Objective: Support the provision of rental assistance to those lower income households that pay an excessive proportion of their income on housing.

Policy 1.7 Support the future development of regional plans and strategies to address the housing needs of the unincorporated areas of the County.

**GOAL 2: Encourage a mixture of housing types and densities throughout the sub-area that are compatible with public service availability.**

Policy 2.1 Support the development of regional strategies to address the housing needs of Toppenish and its urban growth area.

Objective: Land use controls shall govern the distribution of housing types by establishing overall density.

Objective: The density of new residential development shall be based on the existing land use pattern, the availability of public services, municipal service plans, and the provision of services by the developer.

Objective: New multifamily residential construction will be encouraged to address the need for additional rental housing.

Objective: Criteria shall be developed for establishing levels of service required for different densities of development.

**GOAL 3: Establish and maintain neighborhoods in Toppenish that are safe, sanitary and well-maintained.**

Policy 3.1 The City will ensure and facilitate the provision of municipal services appropriate to the density of residential development.

Objective: The cost of extending municipal services to serve new residential developments will be borne by the developer

Objective: The City will actively seek outside sources of assistance to upgrade municipal service facilities in existing residential areas that may require improvement when local resources are not available.

Policy 3.2 Conserve the city's existing housing stock through code enforcement, rental licensing, appropriate zoning, participation rehabilitation programs, and discouraging conversion to nonresidential use.

Policy 3.3 The city of Toppenish will work cooperatively with other public agencies, private institutions and organizations to foster housing rehabilitation and neighborhood reinvestment in areas suitable for rehabilitation.

Objective: The housing target area map will serve as a guideline for the commitment of public and private financial resources for housing rehabilitation.

Objective: The City may seek outside sources of assistance to finance the rehabilitation of homes eligible for assistance.

Objective: The City will promote the involvement of local finance institutions and others to direct private capital to areas identified as needing rehabilitation and neighborhood reinvestment.

Policy 3.4 The city of Toppenish will encourage property maintenance and pride in the community.

Objective: The City may establish a voluntary residential inspection program to inform home occupants of the condition of structural, electrical, plumbing and other components of the home.

Objective: Work cooperatively with Pacific Power and Light Company to increase the number of energy audits performed for Toppenish households.

Objective: Encourage the presentation of workshops on low or no cost weatherization and energy conservation skills by qualified organization.