

# City of Taylorsville

## 2019 Moderate-Income Housing Plan



# SECTION I.

## Summary

In 2018, the City of Taylorsville commissioned this study to examine the housing needs of current and future residents—and to develop strategies to address those needs. In 2019 the Utah State Legislature passed SB 34 Affordable Housing Modifications which provides statutory framework for municipalities on how to address and report on moderate-income housing needs.

The primary objective of this plan is to provide information on the existing housing stock and set-forth goals, objectives, actions and policies that provide the City with the framework to address the moderate-income housing needs of Taylorsville residents. This plan addresses the need to preserve the existing character of neighborhoods, while also looking at future land use transitions and infrastructure development to reduce the housing cost burden of Taylorsville residents.

### What is a Moderate-income Housing Study?

In recent efforts to help communities better prepare for the future, the State of Utah revised its moderate-income housing element and associated reporting statutes for all cities. The statute requires cities to include a moderate-income housing element in their general plans which examines existing housing stock, an estimate for the need for moderate-income housing in the municipality for the next five years, a survey of residential land use, an evaluation of how land uses and zones affect opportunities for moderate-income housing, and a description of the municipality's program to encourage an adequate supply of moderate-income housing.

**Defining moderate-income.** The Utah Code on the Moderate-income Housing Report defines moderate-income housing as housing occupied for households with an income equal to or less than 80 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI).

For Salt Lake County, the geography used for income limits in Taylorsville, the median income is \$73,800. Figure ES-1 shows the highest possible income of households earning 80 percent of the AMI or below. Meaning that a one-person household that earns below \$41,350 falls within the 80% AMI threshold. While a three-person household earning \$53,150 or less falls within the 80% AMI threshold.

**Figure ES-1.**  
**The Moderate-income Market, Salt Lake County, 2016**

### MODERATE-INCOME MARKET

---

 **1-person households earning up to \$41,350**

 **3-person households earning up to \$53,150**

Source: HUD FY 2016 Income Limits.

## **What Happens When Moderate-income Residents Can't Afford Housing?**

Jobs, family income, transportation costs, and housing are all intricately connected. As discussed in Section II of this study, the primary jobs available in Taylorsville are in industries which pay low to moderate wages—public services, educational services, and retail trade. Together, these industries comprise 42 percent of the jobs that are occupied by people who work in Taylorsville (see Figure II-17). Providing opportunities for these workers to live in the city in which they work would have a positive effect on in-commuting and reducing transportation costs.

Lack of moderate-income and other housing types can also lead to a shift in certain household types, which can be detrimental to maintaining schools and area businesses. Families are the backbone of Taylorsville and are motivated to live in more affordable communities to help manage the costs of raising children and to ensure a quality of life they desire. Likewise, families are strong drivers of local economies. Families are key patrons of area businesses and services and are the most likely to devote their resources into improving communities (volunteering with nonprofits, serving on community boards, taking positions of leadership in churches, etc.).

New research has shown that stable families, communities and housing have positive effects on the economic vitality and mobility of children, particularly lower income children. Research has found that the Salt Lake Valley overall has been successful in offering economic stability and opportunity to families of all incomes.

## **Taylorsville's Commitment to Diverse Housing**

The City of Taylorsville desires to maintain a variety of quality housing that will serve its diverse population. A variety of housing types is also necessary to accommodate people working in the City. Young families, single persons, students, seniors, and empty-nesters have different housing needs and so different housing choices should exist to provide for those needs.

Taylorsville is an established suburban and bedroom community. As cities like Taylorsville mature, their housing needs change. One outcome of a housing study is to support natural lifecycles and housing choice changes and to help families and retain their opportunity to live in a community. For example, as families form and age, they add stability to the neighborhood if residents are able to move to different housing units but stay in the same neighborhood. Ideally, a community can offer a range of housing choices to accommodate all housing needs.

This plan builds goals, objectives and action items in the General Plan that are directly related to the changing demographics and land use transitions in the City. It offers strategic implementable responses to housing needs, land use transitions, and transportation infrastructure needs that will occur due to the changing demographics and needs in the City.

## **Primary Findings of Study**

The centrally located suburb of Taylorsville is home to over 60,000 people. Taylorsville comprises about 6 percent of Salt Lake County's population. Much of the growth and development in Salt Lake County over the three decades has occurred in the southeast suburbs of Draper and Sandy, and now for the foreseeable future, in the southwest quadrant including South Jordan, West Jordan and Riverton areas. Taylorsville's compact 10 square miles is mostly built-out which limits the City's growth potential. This lack of developable land has helped to

maintain Taylorsville size and small-town feel—yet limits the City’s opportunity to respond to housing and employment needs.

Key Findings:

- Taylorsville residents are predominately young adults and Generation Xers, which are individuals ranging in age from 40 to 60 years old. Young adults, as well as seniors, are projected to grow the fastest over the next 40 years. Almost three-quarters of households consist of families, slightly down from 2000. This is comparable to many other communities in the Salt Lake Valley.
- The local economy in Taylorsville and the larger Salt Lake Valley job market are relatively stable, with unemployment rates hovering around 3 percent for several years.
- The median household income in 2016 was \$57,826, a 23 percent increase since 1999. Taylorsville saw a loss in low income renters and owners during the same period, either because households experienced an increased income or moved away (or, as common in other markets, are “doubling up” or living at home).
- The rental market in Taylorsville is largely priced to serve renters earning between \$25,000 and \$50,000 per year. Seventy-six percent of the City’s rental units fall within this price range. However, housing supply is inadequate to meet the needs of lower income renters, earning less than \$25,000 per year. Publicly subsidized housing provides support for renters earning less than \$25,000 per year as federal and other resources for subsidized housing have declined.
- Overall, Taylorsville’s rental need is moderate—with a gap of almost 1,300 rental units at the very lowest rent ranges. The 2016 low income rental gap is slightly larger than in 2010, when it was about 1,200 households. The biggest shift in the rental gap occurred for households earning between \$15,000 and \$25,000, who find fewer affordable rentals available.
- Taylorsville’s home prices are affordable compared to many surrounding communities. Yet the City still has a homeownership gap: renters who want to buy will have trouble finding an affordable home until they earn more than \$50,000—the income at which homes to buy begin to become affordable. During 2016 and 2018, there were only 6 affordable homes to buy for every 100 renters earning less than \$50,000 and 20 homes for every 100 renters earning between \$50,000 and \$75,000.
- Within Taylorsville, housing supply is very limited, and the for-sale market does not accommodate the wages of the average worker in the City. The average Taylorsville worker—earning \$30,988 per year—can only afford 26 percent of rental units and only 4 percent of the homes for sale in Taylorsville in 2016.

Compared to surrounding communities, Taylorsville’s housing market is unique due to:

- **Relative affordability.** Taylorsville continues to offer lower rents and more affordable homes to buy. This is partially related to the age of the City’s housing stock: more than half of the City’s homes were built prior to 1980 and, as such, may not have the amenities that are common in newer housing.

- **Lack of multifamily development.** Only a small number of multifamily housing has been built since the 2009 recession. Overall, development has slowed in Taylorsville due primarily to a lack of developable land. Most of this development has been for single family homes.
- **Large unit rentals.** Compared to most nearby cities, Taylorsville has a large proportion (68 percent) of three-bedroom, four-bedroom, and five-bedroom and larger units.
- **Mobile home products.** Five percent, or 985 units, of Taylorsville housing stock is made up of mobile homes. This type of housing does not provide the same type of long-term stability or equity as other for-sale homes.

Residents in mobile homes are very vulnerable to displacement if park owners choose to sell their parks for redevelopment. These sales further reduce the supply of lots for mobile homes and create more challenges for residents who need to relocate.

## Recommended Solutions

Section IV of the Moderate-Income Housing Plan provides a thorough analysis of goals, actions and policy considerations to address moderate-income housing needs in the City. The City will likely experience significant demographic and land use transitions that will affect housing needs including:

- The City will have a larger number of seniors with the aging of its largest age cohort— residents between the age of 35 and 54 years. Taylorsville will need to plan for adequate housing stock to meet the needs of aging residents.
- New families and workers will continue to be attracted Taylorsville for its relative affordability and proximity to many work centers in the Salt Lake Valley. This will continue to put pressure on the demand for housing - particularly home ownership. The City can encourage adding units through infill and redevelopment of underutilized and vacant parcels.
- Mobile home parks will face pressure to redevelop. The City should develop policies to have Taylorsville specific relocation plans and a housing product that serves these residents.
- Increase in cost of living and transportation costs will continue to burden Taylorsville residents and will be a critical component that impacts monthly incomes. The City will need to continue to look for ways to further bridge the gap between employment and transportation as a means to offset the burden of housing costs.

## Organization of Report

This plan and report are made up of the following sections:

- Section I: Introduction.

- Section II. Community Profile. This section provides information on population growth, household characteristics, income and poverty, and employment.
- Section III. Housing Profile. This section provides information on Taylorsville's existing housing stock in terms of tenure (renter/owner), cost and affordability, and condition.
- Section IV. Moderate-Income Housing Element. This section discusses the City's current housing programs and contains goals, actions, and policy recommendations for addressing moderate-income housing needs.

## SECTION II.

# Community Profile

This section provides a general overview of the City of Taylorsville’s demographic and economic environment to set the context for the housing market analysis. It focuses on the types of households who reside in Taylorsville, now and in the future, and how demographic changes and employment growth could influence housing demand.

### Population Levels and Trends

Taylorsville is a moderately sized, centrally located city in the Salt Lake Valley and is one of Utah’s newer cities—incorporated just over 20 years ago. The city was mostly established in the early 1960’s and 1970’s as part of the unincorporated Salt Lake County. In the mid-1990s, motivated by the desire to retain a smaller, community-oriented city, within the quickly growing western part of Salt Lake County the City incorporated. This was a period of high growth for much of the Western U.S., with much of that growth occurring in newly developed suburbs. Taylorsville was established as, and continues to be, a moderate-income, family-oriented, community that is home to workers commuting primarily to other communities.

**Population.** Taylorsville is home to over 60,000 people, about 6 percent of Salt Lake County’s population. Between 2000 and 2010, the population of Taylorsville increased from 57,500 to 58,700 —a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 0.2 percent. Population growth was faster between 2010 and 2016 with a CAGR of 0.5 percent.

Figure II-1 shows population trends for Taylorsville and nearby communities.

**Figure II-1.**  
**Population Trends, Taylorsville, Nearby Communities, and Salt Lake County, 2000, 2010, and 2016**

	Total Population			Total Growth 2000-2016	Annual Growth Rate	
	2000	2010	2016		2000-2010	2010-2016
Draper	25,220	42,274	46,399	21,179	5.3%	1.9%
Murray	34,024	46,746 *	48,834	14,810	3.2% *	0.9%
Salt Lake City	181,743	186,440	191,446	9,703	0.3%	0.5%
Sandy	88,418	87,461	93,141	4,723	-0.1%	1.3%
South Jordan	29,437	50,418	62,751	33,314	5.5%	4.5%
<b>Taylorsville</b>	<b>57,439</b>	<b>58,652</b>	<b>60,448</b>	<b>3,009</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>
West Jordan	68,336	103,712 *	110,928	42,592	4.3% *	1.4%
West Valley City	108,896	129,480	134,609	25,713	1.7%	0.8%
Salt Lake County	898,387	1,029,655	1,092,518	194,131	1.4%	1.2%

Note: \*In the mid-2000’s, Murray annexed a portion of unincorporated Salt Lake County, increasing the population by 17,000. In 2000, Oquirrh Shadows was annexed by West Jordan, increasing the population by 11,000+.

2016 ACS 1-year estimates are not available for smaller communities; therefore, 5-year estimates were used instead.

Source: 2000 and 2010 U.S. Census, 2016 ACS 5-year estimates, and BBC Research & Consulting.

**Population by age.** As shown in Figure II-2, Taylorsville residents are predominately between the ages of 25 and 54 years old. Compared to 2010, there are marginal differences in the age distribution of residents, with a small loss in children and college-aged adults. Overall, Taylorsville’s population is aging—21 percent of all residents are over the age of 55 (compared to only 13 percent in 2000).

**Figure II-2.**  
**Age, Taylorsville, 2000, 2010, and 2016**

	2000		2010		2016		2010-2016 Numerical Change	2010-2016 Percentage Point Change
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Under 5 years	4,806	8%	5,068	9%	5,259	9%	191	0%
5 to 17 years	12,801	22%	11,004	19%	11,002	18%	-2	-1%
18 to 24 years	8,429	15%	6,599	11%	5,682	9%	-917	-2%
25 to 34 years	8,596	15%	9,914	17%	10,881	18%	967	1%
35 to 54 years	15,289	27%	14,238	24%	14,628	24%	390	0%
55 to 64 years	3,894	7%	6,510	11%	6,770	11%	260	0%
65 years and over	3,624	6%	5,319	9%	6,226	10%	907	1%


Source: 2000 and 2010 U.S. Census, 2016 5-year ACS, and BBC Research & Consulting.

Figure II-3 shows the distribution of age cohorts for Taylorsville and peer communities.

Millcreek and Murray have a smaller proportion of school-aged children and a larger proportion of older adults and seniors. In contrast, West Jordan and West Valley have a larger share of children (one quarter of their population is between the age of 5 to 17 years old) and a smaller proportion of seniors.

**Figure II-3.**  
**Age Comparison,  
Taylorsville and Peer  
Communities, 2016**


Source:  
2016 5-year ACS, and BBC  
Research & Consulting.



**Population projections.** According to the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute, the State of Utah’s population growth is expected to outpace national rates, with the state adding almost 3 million residents by 2050. Salt Lake County will likely gain a large portion of this growth and is projected to remain the most populous county in the state. The County will add almost 600,000 new residents, representing 21 percent of the state’s growth, by 2065. Taylorsville is expected to share a relatively small proportion of this growth due to developable land.

Figure II-4 examines population projections for Salt Lake County through 2060 (growth forecasts are completed at the county level and, as such, are not available for Taylorsville alone). Most age cohorts are projected to have modest growth over the next 40 years. The largest growth will occur for young adults, aged 0 to 17, 45-64 and, aged 65 and older.

**Figure II-4.**  
**Population Forecasts, Salt Lake County, 2010 through 2060**




Source: Governor's Office of Planning and Budget and BBC Research & Consulting.

## Household Diversity

**Household composition.** Figure II-5 displays the City's 2016 household composition. Like other communities in the Salt Lake Valley, Taylorsville is largely comprised of family households (72%), particularly married-couple households. The remaining families are single head of households, with almost 2,000 single parents (predominately single mothers).

**Figure II-5.**  
Household Composition, Taylorsville, 2016



Source: 2016 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.

Figure II-6 shows household composition trends for Taylorsville since 2000. Although household composition has only changed slightly over the last 16 years, there has been an increase in nonfamily households. The largest household loss during this period was married-couple families with children, which dropped by about 1,500 households and 10 percentage points.

**Figure II-6.**  
Household Composition Trends, Taylorsville, 2000 and 2016

Source:  
2000 U.S. Census, 2016 5-year ACS, and BBC Research & Consulting.

	2000		2016	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Total households</b>	18,513	100%	19,697	100%
<b>Family households</b>	14,378	78%	14,257	72%
Married-couple family with children	6,236	34%	4,725	24%
Single head of household with children	1,808	10%	1,814	9%
<b>Nonfamily households</b>	4,135	22%	5,440	28%

Taylorsville has a smaller proportion of family households than West Jordan and West Valley, but a larger proportion than Millcreek and Murray. As shown in Figure II-7, these family households look slightly different in each community. A majority of households in West Jordan and West Valley are married couples with children, compared to Murray which only has a small share (16%) of these households.

**Figure II-7.**  
**Household Composition Trends Comparison, Taylorsville and Peer Communities, 2016**

	Millcreek		Murray		Taylorsville		West Jordan		West Valley	
	Number	Percent								
<b>Total Households</b>	<b>23,716</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18,736</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>19,697</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>32,225</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>36,346</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Family households</b>	14,379	61%	12,044	64%	14,257	72%	25,719	80%	29,228	80%
Married-couple family with children	11,159	47%	3,054	16%	4,725	24%	19,840	62%	20,612	57%
Single head of household with children	3,220	14%	1,706	9%	1,814	9%	5,879	18%	8,616	24%
<b>Nonfamily households</b>	9,337	39%	6,692	36%	5,440	28%	6,506	20%	5,331	15%

Source: 2016 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.

**Disability.** In 2016, approximately 6,500 Taylorsville residents, or 11 percent, had at least one type of disability. Thirty seven percent of Taylorsville residents age 65 and older had a disability and residents between the ages of 18 to 64 years comprise more than half all of persons with disabilities. As Taylorsville’s population ages, it is likely that the City will need to serve a larger number of disabled elderly residents. Figure II-8 displays the disability characteristics by age group for Taylorsville.

**Figure II-8.  
Persons with Disabilities and  
Types, Taylorsville, 2016**

Source:  
2016 ACS 5-year estimates and BBC Research & Consulting.

	Number of Residents	Percent of Residents
<b>Total Residents with a Disability</b>	<b>6,542</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>Residents 5 years and younger</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Residents 5 to 17 years</b>	<b>684</b>	
Hearing	121	1%
Vision	99	1%
Cognitive	618	6%
Ambulatory	57	1%
Self-care	116	1%
<b>Population 18 to 64 years</b>	<b>3,574</b>	
Hearing	764	2%
Vision	741	2%
Cognitive	1,421	4%
Ambulatory	1,635	4%
Self-care	368	1%
Independent living	1,253	3%
<b>Population 65 years and over</b>	<b>2,277</b>	
Hearing	969	16%
Vision	321	5%
Cognitive	487	8%
Ambulatory	1,385	22%
Self-care	375	6%
Independent living	896	14%

Figure II-9 compares the age distribution of persons with disabilities in Taylorsville and peer communities. Millcreek and Murray have a larger proportion of residents with at least one disability than nearby communities.

**Figure II-9.  
Percent of Persons  
with Disabilities,  
Taylorsville and Peer  
Communities, 2016**

Source:  
2016 ACS 5-year estimates and BBC Research & Consulting.

	Millcreek	Murray	Taylorsville	West Jordan	West Valley
<b>Total residents with a disability</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>9%</b>
Residents 5 years and younger	4%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Residents 5 to 17 years	5%	6%	6%	5%	5%
Population 18 to 64 years	9%	9%	9%	7%	9%
Population 65 years and over	38%	37%	37%	38%	34%

**Race and ethnicity.** According to the American Community Survey, almost 80 percent of Taylorsville residents identified themselves as White in 2016. The remaining 20 percent of Taylorsville’s population is roughly split between Asian (5%), two or more races (3%), Black (2%), and Pacific Islander (2%). Figure II-10 compares the race and ethnicity of Taylorsville in 2000, 2010, and 2016.

**Figure II-10.**  
**Race and Ethnicity, Taylorsville, 2000, 2010, and 2016**

	2000		2010		2016		2000-2016
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Percent Change
<b>Total population</b>	<b>57,439</b>		<b>58,652</b>		<b>60,448</b>		<b>5%</b>
<b>Race</b>							
American Indian and Alaska Native	589	1%	564	1%	406	1%	-31%
Asian	1,745	3%	2,285	4%	2,724	5%	56%
Black or African American	508	1%	1,104	2%	1,356	2%	167%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	904	2%	1,285	2%	915	2%	1%
White	49,139	86%	45,889	78%	47,440	78%	-3%
Two or more races	1,467	3%	1,999	3%	2,067	3%	41%
<b>Ethnicity</b>							
Hispanic or Latino	7,022	12%	10,931	19%	12,756	21%	82%
Non-Hispanic White	44,099	77%	41,540	71%	41,017	68%	-7%

Note: Ethnicity in the 2000 U.S. Census was not broken out by race, therefore Non-Hispanic White totals for 2000 are estimated based on other available census data.

Source: 2000 & 2010 Census, 2016 ACS 5-year estimates, and BBC Research & Consulting.

Since 2000, the number of Hispanic and Latino residents in Taylorsville increased by 82 percent. Figure II-11 shows the racial and ethnic makeup of Taylorsville compared to peer communities. Both Millcreek and Murray are mostly comprised of residents who identify as White and have a very small proportion of Hispanic and Latino residents. Residents who are Black or African American shows a 167% increase in Figure II-11, which is an increase of 848 persons from 2000-2016, while white persons have decreased by 1,699 residents.

**Figure II-11.**  
**Race and Ethnicity, Taylorsville and Peer Communities, 2016**

Source:  
 2016 ACS 5-year estimates and BBC Research & Consulting.

	Millcreek	Murray	Taylorsville	West Jordan	West Valley
<b>Race</b>					
American Indian and Alaska Native	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Asian	4%	2%	5%	3%	5%
Black or African American	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1%	1%	2%	2%	4%
White	89%	89%	79%	86%	61%
Two or more races	2%	3%	3%	3%	4%
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Hispanic or Latino	7%	5%	21%	18%	38%
Non-Hispanic White	83%	88%	68%	74%	48%

## Economic Health

This section discusses key components of the city's economy, which affect the demand for and price of housing.

**Income.** Taylorsville has experienced modest economic growth over the last decade, but incomes have remained somewhat low compared to neighboring communities. The median

household income in Taylorsville was \$57,826 in 2016—lower than the county (\$64,601) and the state overall (\$62,518).

Figure II-12 displays median household income of both renters and owners in Taylorsville for 1999, 2007, 2010, and 2016. The median income increased by 23 percent between 1999 and 2016—from \$47,012 to \$57,826. Much of that increase occurred prior to the recession.

Owner households in Taylorsville benefitted the most from the increase in income during this period—a 28 percent increase (from \$54,174 to \$69,328) compared to just a 13 percent increase for renters (from \$33,438 to \$37,798).

**Figure II-12.**  
**Median Household Income by Tenure, Taylorsville, 1999, 2007, 2010, and 2016**

Source:  
2000 Census, ACS 3-year estimates, 2010 & 2016 ACS 5-year estimates, and BBC Research & Consulting.

	All Households	Owners	Renters
<b>Median Household Income</b>			
1999	\$47,012	\$54,174	\$33,438
2007	\$53,573	\$60,188	\$35,631
2010	\$57,337	\$64,573	\$34,556
2016	\$57,826	\$69,328	\$37,798
<b>Percent Change in Median Household Income</b>			
1999 to 2007	14%	11%	7%
2007 to 2010	7%	7%	-3%
2010 to 2016	1%	7%	9%
<b>Total change 1999-2016</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>13%</b>

As shown in Figure II-13, the change in household incomes has resulted in more high income homeowners and renters. The loss in low to moderate-income households is a factor of increased incomes or low-income households moving away.

**Figure II-13.**  
**Income Shifts by Tenure, Taylorsville, 2000 and 2016**

	2000		2016		2000-2016 Numerical Change	2000-2016 Percentage Point Change
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
<b>Total</b>	<b>18,578</b>		<b>19,697</b>		<b>1,119</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Owners</b>						
Less than \$25,000	1,563	12%	1,586	12%	23	0%
\$25,000 - \$50,000	4,308	33%	2,808	21%	-1,500	-12%
\$50,000 - \$75,000	3,830	29%	3,057	23%	-773	-6%
\$75,000 - \$100,000	1,904	14%	2,027	15%	123	1%
\$100,000+	1,600	12%	4,022	30%	2,422	18%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,205</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13,500</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Renters</b>						
Less than \$25,000	1,687	31%	1,610	26%	-77	-5%
\$25,000 - \$50,000	2,424	45%	2,364	38%	-60	-7%
\$50,000 - \$75,000	930	17%	1,295	21%	365	4%
\$75,000 - \$100,000	212	4%	588	9%	376	6%
\$100,000 +	120	2%	340	5%	220	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,373</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6,197</b>	<b>100%</b>		

Source: 2000 Census, 2016 ACS 5-year estimates, and BBC Research & Consulting.

**Poverty.** Almost 7,000 Taylorsville residents (12% of the population) live below the poverty line, earning less than \$25,000 per year for a family of four. This rate is the same as the state (12%), but lower than the United States overall (15%).

Figure II-14 displays characteristics of Taylorsville residents living in poverty. The residents most impacted by poverty include young children, Hispanic families, and families identifying as Some Other Race (commonly the race category chosen by households not identifying with other categories and residents of Hispanic descent).

**Figure II-14.**  
**Characteristics of**  
**Residents living in**  
**Poverty, Taylorsville,**  
**2016**


Source:  
2016 5-year ACS and BBC Research &  
Consulting.

	Total	Number Below Poverty	Percent Below Poverty
<b>Total Population</b>	<b>60,097</b>	<b>6,896</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>Age</b>			
Under 5 years	5,166	1,101	21%
5 to 17 years	10,875	1,564	14%
18 to 34 years	16,517	2,092	13%
35 to 64 years	21,336	1,637	8%
65 years and over	6,203	502	8%
<b>Race</b>			
White Alone	47,138	4,502	10%
Black/African American	1,356	159	12%
Asian	2,724	320	12%
Some other race	5,503	1,533	28%
Two or more races	2,059	335	16%
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
Hispanic	12,614	2,628	21%
Non-Hispanic White	40,820	3,552	9%

Residents over 35 are the least represented as living in poverty (8% of 35-64 year olds and 8% of seniors).

Figure II-15 shows the areas of Taylorsville with concentrations of poverty. Although there is some poverty concentration in the north east parts of the city, overall, poverty is not heavily concentrated.

**Figure II-15.**  
**Geographic Distribution of Poverty, Taylorsville, 2016**




Source: 2016 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.

**Jobs and unemployment.** Among Taylorsville residents aged 16 and older, 73 percent participate in the labor force. This includes residents that were currently employed (either part-time or full-time) or were actively looking for a job.

Figure II-16 presents unemployment rates for Taylorsville, Salt Lake County, the State of Utah, and the U.S. from 2000 to 2017. Taylorsville, the County, and the State have relatively low unemployment rates compared to the U.S. overall, particularly since 2014 when unemployment dropped below 4 percent. While Taylorsville was not immune to the economic downturn in 2008 and 2009, the city fared far better than the U.S. As of 2017, Taylorsville’s unemployment rate was 3.2 percent.

**Figure II-16.**  
**Unemployment Rates in Taylorsville, Salt Lake County, Utah, and the United States, 2000 through 2017**




Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics and BBC Research & Consulting.

The US Census Bureau’s Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics reported that there were 28,614 working Taylorsville residents (either employed in the City or commuting to work outside the City) and 18,937 workers whose primary jobs are located in Taylorsville (some of these workers live in the City and some live outside the City). Figure II-17 displays employment by industry for people working in the City and for people living in the City. The figure also displays the average 2016 wage for each industry.

**Figure II-17.  
Employment and  
Earnings by Industry,  
Taylorsville, 2016**

Note:  
People who both live and work in  
Taylorsville are included in both  
distributions.

Source:  
US Census Bureau's Longitudinal  
Employer-Household Dynamics,  
2016 5-year ACS, and BBC  
Research & Consulting.



Almost two-thirds (64%) of Taylorsville jobs are concentrated in five industries: educational services (16%), administration and waste services (15%), retail trade (11%), professional services (11%), and finance and insurance (11%).

Taylorville residents, most of whom are out-commuters, have a slightly different industry distribution with retail trade accounting for the largest share of jobs (12%) followed by health and social services (10%), and manufacturing (10%).

Figure II-18 provides the top three industries of in-commuters (referred to as employees) and out-commuters (referred to as residents) for Taylorville and peer communities. Taylorville and West Valley had the largest mismatch in the top industries held by employees compared to residents.

**Figure II-18.**  
**Top Industries for Residents and Employees, Taylorville and Peer Communities**

**MILLCREEK**

<b>RESIDENTS</b>	1	Health & Social Services	<b>EMPLOYEES</b>	1	Educational Services
	2	Educational Services		2	Health & Social Services
	3	Retail Trade		3	Retail Trade

**MURRAY**

<b>RESIDENTS</b>	1	Retail Trade	<b>EMPLOYEES</b>	1	Health & Social Services
	2	Health & Social Services		2	Retail Trade
	3	Educational Services		3	Professional, Scientific, & Technical Services

**TAYLORSVILLE**

<b>RESIDENTS</b>	1	Retail Trade	<b>EMPLOYEES</b>	1	Educational Services
	2	Health & Social Services		2	Admin & Waste Services
	3	Manufacturing		3	Retail Trade

**WEST JORDAN**

<b>RESIDENTS</b>	1	Retail Trade	<b>EMPLOYEES</b>	1	Retail Trade
	2	Health & Social Services		2	Educational Services
	3	Manufacturing		3	Health & Social Services

**WEST VALLEY**

<b>RESIDENTS</b>	1	Manufacturing	<b>EMPLOYEES</b>	1	Transportation & Warehousing
	2	Retail Trade		2	Manufacturing
	3	Admin & Waste Services		3	Retail Trade

Source: US Census Bureau's Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Bureau of Labor Statistics Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages.

Taylorville has a greater number of out-commuters than in-commuters, signaling more housing opportunity and/or less job opportunity within the City. As shown in Figure II-19, over 17,000 people work in Taylorville but live elsewhere (in-commuters) and almost 27,000 people live in Taylorville but commute to jobs elsewhere (out-commuters). In other words, 90 percent of Taylorville’s jobs are held by in-commuters and 94 percent of working Taylorville residents are out-commuters. In total, only 2,000 people both live and work in Taylorville. This indicates an employment mismatch for Taylorville residents.

**Figure II-19.**  
**Inflow and Outflow of Primary Jobs, Taylorville, 2015**

Source:  
 US Census Bureau’s Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics and BBC Research & Consulting.




Figure II-20 displays the top daily destinations of in-commuters and out-commuters to/from Taylorville. The largest share of Taylorville residents work in Salt Lake City and the largest shares of Taylorville employees live in West Valley, West Jordan, and Taylorville. For these higher cost or low wage cities, Taylorville appears to provide affordable housing for their low to moderate wage workers.

**Figure II-20.**  
**In-Commuter and Out-Commuter Destinations, Taylorville, 2015**

**Where Taylorville residents work (TOP 5)**

- 1 Salt Lake City (27%)
- 2 West Valley City (11%)
- 3 Murray (7%)
- 4 Taylorville (6%)
- 5 Sandy (5%)

**Where Taylorville workers live (TOP 5)**

- 1 West Valley City (11%)
- 2 West Jordan (10%)
- 3 Taylorville (10%)
- 4 Salt Lake City (9%)
- 5 Sandy (5%)

Source: US Census Bureau’s Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics and BBC Research & Consulting.

## SECTION III.

# Housing Profile

The ability of a community's housing stock to meet current and future residents' needs is primarily dependent on two factors:

- 1) What type of housing exists and will be developed; and
- 2) How much that housing costs.

These are explored in this section of the report.

This Housing Profile section begins with an introduction to the concept of affordability and how it is measured. It then examines the characteristics of the City's housing stock, discusses the affordability analysis, and concludes with an assessment of housing needs.

### Assessing Housing Needs


The most common measure of affordability assesses the "burden" housing costs put on a household. If a household pays more than 30 percent of their gross income in rent or mortgage payment, taxes, and basic utilities, they are considered to have a housing need. The higher the cost burden, the greater the need. Cost burden is important because it also indicates how well a household can manage other expenses—e.g., child care, transportation, health care—and how much disposable income they have to contribute to the economy.

#### Federal definition of affordability

- 1) Housing costs are "affordable" if they do not exceed 30% of household's gross monthly income
- 2) "Costs" include basic utilities, mortgage insurance, HOA fees, and property taxes



Households paying >30% for housing are **"cost burdened"**




Households paying >50% for housing are **"severely cost burdened"**

It is important to note that cost burden exists in nearly every community because demand exceeds the supply of housing at various price points. Some residents—e.g., persons with disabilities living on fixed incomes—cannot avoid cost burden unless they occupy publicly

subsidized housing or receive Housing Choice Vouchers. Unless an adequate supply of affordable housing is available, being cost burdened may be the only option for certain residents.

Eligibility for housing programs is generally based on how a resident’s income falls within HUD-determined income categories, called Area Median Income or AMI. The income thresholds and target housing are outlined in Figure III-1. The figure also shows what a household at each AMI level can afford, and the housing products that typically accommodate needs. For example, a household earning between 30 and 50 percent of the AMI—a very low-income household—is most likely to find affordable housing in publicly supported housing or through innovative ownership solutions such as land trusts.

**Figure III-1.**  
**HUD Income Thresholds and Target Housing, Salt Lake County, 2018**



Note: AMI levels are for a household size of four, which is HUD convention.

Source: HUD and BBC Research & Consulting.


## Taylorville’s Existing Housing Stock

According to the 2016 ACS there are 20,415 housing units (occupied and vacant) in Taylorville. Housing development has increased very little from 2010—a 1 percent increase, or about 250 units. This compares to 5 percent and 1,000 units between 2000 and 2010.

Like many areas across the country, residential development in Taylorville slowed in the wake of the recession. Since then, except for 2017, resident development has lagged behind recessionary levels.

Figure III-2 displays residential permitting over the past 20 years, broken out by housing type. Data for 2018 reflects only January through April.

**Figure III-2.  
Building Permits Issued, Taylorsville, 1998 through April 2018**




Source: HUD State of the Cities Data Systems Building Permit Database and BBC Research & Consulting.

**Housing type.** Nearly two thirds of Taylorsville housing stock is single family detached and 31 percent is attached housing (paired homes, townhomes, apartments, condos, etc.). In addition, 5 percent of the housing stock is mobile homes.

As shown below, the vast majority of Taylorsville owners (83%) live in single family detached houses and the majority of renters (76%) live in attached units. “Tenure,” in this case, refers to ownership or rentership.

**Figure III-3.**  
**Occupied Housing by Tenure, Taylorsville, 2016**



Source: 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates and BBC Research & Consulting.

**Household size and bedrooms.** The average household size in Taylorsville is 3.06—similar to Salt Lake County (3.03), but smaller than the state as a whole (3.16).

Figure III-4 breaks down the distribution of household size by homeownership. Overall, two-person households are the largest group in Taylorsville, comprising nearly one third of all households.

Homeowners are mostly likely to be two-person households, while renters are usually one-person or two-person households. Considering the age trends in Taylorsville, the large proportion of young professionals and older adults heavily impact the distribution of household size in the city. Five-person or larger households account for 16 percent of households.

**Figure III-4.**  
**Household Size by Homeownership, Taylorsville, 2016**


Household Size	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		All Households	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-person household	2,605	19%	1,763	28%	4,368	22%
2-person household	4,275	32%	1,697	27%	5,972	30%
3-person household	2,243	17%	779	13%	3,022	15%
4-person household	2,159	16%	929	15%	3,088	16%
5-person household	1,131	8%	549	9%	1,680	9%
6-person household	611	5%	368	6%	979	5%
7-or-more person household	476	4%	112	2%	588	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,500</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6,197</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>19,697</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates and BBC Research & Consulting.

As shown in Figure III-5, Taylorsville has a higher proportion of large units compared to Millcreek and Murray. The only other peer community with more large units is West Jordan.

**Figure III-5.**  
**Number of Bedrooms,**  
**Taylorsville and Peer**  
**Communities, 2016**

Source:  
 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-  
 Year Estimates and BBC Research &  
 Consulting.




Taylorsville has an almost equal distribution of two bedroom (23%), three bedroom (25%), and four bedroom units (26%).

**Age of housing stock.** About 10 percent of Taylorsville’s housing stock was built in the past 15 years (since 2000). Over one third (41%) was built between 1980 and 2000. Almost half (48%) was built between 1940 and 1980 and just 1 percent was built before 1940. Figure III-6 displays the city’s housing stock by age; data for peer communities are included for comparison.

**Figure III-6.  
Age of Housing Stock,  
Taylorsville and Peer  
Communities, 2016**

Source:  
2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-  
Year Estimates and BBC Research &  
Consulting.



Most of Taylorsville's housing stock was built after 1940, therefore reducing the risk of lead-based paint.<sup>1</sup> Age of homes can be an important indicator of housing condition: older houses tend to have more condition problems and are more likely to contain materials such as lead based paint.

**Overcrowding and substandard condition.** Other key factors to examine in evaluating housing condition are overcrowding and substandard units. Overcrowding in housing can threaten public health, strain public infrastructure, and points to an increasing need of affordable housing. This study uses HUD's definition of having more than one person per room to identify overcrowded units.<sup>2</sup> Approximately 4 percent of the city's households—or about 830 households—are overcrowded.

<sup>1</sup> Lead-based paint was banned from residential use in 1978. Housing built before 1978 is considered to have some risk, but housing built prior to 1940 is considered to have the highest risk. After 1940, paint manufacturers voluntarily began to reduce the amount of lead they added to their paint. As a result, painted surfaces in homes built before 1940 are likely to have higher levels of lead than homes built between 1940 and 1978.

<sup>2</sup> The HUD American Housing Survey defines a room as an enclosed space used for living purposes, such as a bedroom, living or dining room, kitchen, recreation room, or another finished room suitable for year-round use. Excluded are bathrooms, laundry rooms, utility rooms, pantries, and unfinished areas.

The 2016 ACS reported that 36 units (vacant and occupied) in the city lacked complete plumbing facilities and 84 housing units (vacant and occupied) lacked complete kitchens. These 120 severely substandard units represent less than 1 percent of the city's total housing units.

**Homeownership.** Many cities in Utah have a large proportion of homeowners and Taylorsville is no different. While renters are not as common, rentership has increased dramatically since 2010. The number of renters in Taylorsville increased by 14 percent, like Millcreek and West Jordan. South Jordan has seen the largest increase in their renter population with a 50 percent change in just the last six years.

**Figure III-7.**  
**Homeownership Trends, Taylorsville and Surrounding Communities, 2010 and 2016**

	2010		2016		Percent Change	
	Owner	Renter	Owner	Renter	Owner	Renter
Draper	81%	19%	80%	20%	-1.2%	5.3%
Millcreek	65%	35%	60%	40%	-7.7%	14.3%
Murray	69%	31%	64%	36%	-7.2%	16.1%
Salt Lake City	50%	50%	48%	52%	-4.0%	4.0%
Sandy	82%	18%	77%	23%	-6.1%	27.8%
South Jordan	86%	14%	79%	21%	-8.1%	50.0%
<b>Taylorsville</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>-4.2%</b>	<b>14.3%</b>
West Jordan	78%	22%	75%	25%	-3.8%	13.6%
West Valley City	70%	30%	69%	31%	-1.4%	3.3%
Salt Lake County	69%	32%	66%	34%	-4.3%	6.3%

Source: 2006-2010 and 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates and BBC Research & Consulting.

Taylorsville renter households earn significantly less than owner households and are more likely to have an income of 80 percent of AMI or below. Figure III-8 compares Taylorsville AMI levels by tenure.

One third of owner households are moderate to low-income, compared to two thirds of renter households.

**Figure III-8.**  
**AMI Income Distribution by Tenure, Taylorsville, 2016**

Note:  
2016 HUD Income limits for Salt Lake County were used to match available ACS data.

Source:  
2016 5-year ACS, HUD, and BBC Research & Consulting.


Area Median Income (AMI)	Income Limit	Owner Households		Renter Households	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
	<b>\$73,800</b>				
0-30% of AMI	\$22,140	1,355	10%	1,301	21%
31-50% of AMI	\$36,900	1,447	11%	1,471	24%
51-80% of AMI	\$59,040	1,592	12%	1,203	19%
81-95% of AMI	\$70,110	2,459	18%	1,042	17%
96-120% of AMI	\$88,560	1,697	13%	572	9%
121-150% of AMI	\$110,700	1,504	11%	320	5%
151% and above of AMI	\$110,700	3,445	26%	289	5%

## Ownership Market Trends

This section introduces the homeownership market in Taylorsville by price trends, home values, and home sales.

In 2016, the Census' ACS estimated the median value of owner-occupied housing units in Taylorsville at \$192,800. Over 75 percent of all Taylorsville owner-occupied units (10,453) are valued between \$100,000 and \$300,000. About 11 percent (1,496) are valued below \$100,000. Figure III-9 displays the value of Taylorsville's owner-occupied housing units since 2000.

**Figure III-9.**  
**Home Value Distribution, Taylorsville, 2000, 2010, and 2016**




Source: 2016 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.

In 2000, the median value of owner-occupied housing in Taylorsville was \$138,100. Since 2000, the median value increased \$54,700 (40%)—or by about \$3,420 per year.

Figure III-10 compares the median value of owner-occupied housing in Taylorsville with peer communities. As shown in the figure, Taylorsville has one of the more affordable median values in the Salt Lake Valley. Southern suburbs, Draper, Sandy, and South Jordan, have the highest median home values among peer communities. Unlike Taylorsville, these suburbs have newer built and larger homes.

**Figure III-10.**  
**Median Value, Taylorsville and Peer Communities, 2016**


Source:  
2016 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.



Examining median home value is an important measurement to understanding local housing markets, but value does not always represent what a household can purchase. Both current listings and historical sales can provide additional insight into the price of housing.

Figure III-11 shows median sale price trends of Taylorsville and peer communities.

**Figure III-11.**  
**Median Sale Price, Taylorsville and Peer Communities, 1997 to 2018**



Source: Zillow median sale price and BBC Research & Consulting.

According to Zillow, Taylorsville has one of the lowest median sale prices of its peer communities, but higher than the U.S. overall.


In the late 1990’s and early 2000’s, price differentiation among some peer communities, the county, and the state was negligible. Taylorsville experienced a similar trend of price growth and decline as other communities but had a slower period of growth prior to 2006.

Draper, Sandy, and South Jordan have always had higher housing prices than surrounding communities but experienced a sharper increase and decrease in sale prices before and during the recession.

Figure III-11 also shows that the current median sale price across all geographies has exceeded pre-recession price peaks.

Recently sold homes are mapped by price and type in Figure III-12. Some neighborhoods in Taylorsville have concentrations of high-priced homes, but overall, home sale prices between \$150,000 and \$300,000 are evenly dispersed throughout the city.

**Figure III-12.**  
**Recently Sold Homes, Taylorsville, August 2016 to June 2018**



Source: Redfin and BBC Research & Consulting.

**What can a household buy today in Taylorsville?** If a household were looking to buy a home in Taylorsville today, housing costs may differ from the median value or sale trends shown previously.

Figure III-13 displays median characteristics for home listings in August 2018. As the figure shows, the median price of Taylorsville listings is more competitive with surrounding communities compared to historical sale trends.

Taylorsville has one of the highest per square foot prices (\$169) among peer communities, only behind Millcreek. Taylorsville also has one of the lowest inventories and average days on the market. Although the homes for sale in Taylorsville tend to be smaller and older, there is still a high demand for housing in this price range.

**Figure III-13.  
Median Characteristics of Listings, Taylorsville and Surrounding Cities, August 2018**

City	Price	Sq.Ft.	\$/Sq.Ft.	Year Built	Days on the market	# of homes on market
Draper	\$599,900	4,168	\$144	2003	45	211
Millcreek	\$374,900	2,108	\$178	1978	31	83
Murray	\$399,999	2,696	\$148	1985	34	69
Sandy	\$444,475	2,907	\$153	1984	33	310
South Jordan	\$469,950	3,151	\$149	2006	36	348
<b>Taylorsville</b>	<b>\$359,900</b>	<b>2,128</b>	<b>\$169</b>	<b>1978</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>152</b>
West Jordan	\$325,000	2,184	\$149	1981	21	239
West Valley City	\$359,900	2,403	\$150	1994	25	260

Source: Redfin and BBC Research & Consulting.

Taylorsville listings may be competitive with peer communities for households currently trying to buy, but the product may not meet the needs or desires of the buyer. As discussed above, the city's housing is generally older than surrounding communities and, as such, may require investment of new buyers to address needed repairs, as well as updating.

Figure III-14 provides examples of homes currently for sale in each community similar to the median characteristics of current listings.

**Figure III-14.**  
**What Can a Resident Buy Today?**

**DRAPER**



Price	Bed	Bath	Sq.Ft.	\$/Sq.Ft.
\$599,900	4	3.5	5,066	\$118

**SOUTH JORDAN**



Price	Bed	Bath	Sq.Ft.	\$/Sq.Ft.
\$469,900	4	3	3,388	\$139

**MILLCREEK**



Price	Bed	Bath	Sq.Ft.	\$/Sq.Ft.
\$369,950	5	2.5	2,378	\$156

**TAYLORSVILLE**



Price	Bed	Bath	Sq.Ft.	\$/Sq.Ft.
\$340,000	5	2.75	3,158	\$108

**MURRAY**



Price	Bed	Bath	Sq.Ft.	\$/Sq.Ft.
\$389,000	3	2.5	2,863	\$136

**WEST JORDAN**



Price	Bed	Bath	Sq.Ft.	\$/Sq.Ft.
\$308,000	3	2.5	2,342	\$132

**SANDY**



Price	Bed	Bath	Sq.Ft.	\$/Sq.Ft.
\$448,700	6	2.75	3,510	\$128

**WEST VALLEY**



Price	Bed	Bath	Sq.Ft.	\$/Sq.Ft.
\$335,000	5	1.75	2,788	\$120

Source: Redfin and BBC Research & Consulting.


## Rental Market Trends

According to HUD’s Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis, apartment vacancy rates in the Salt Lake metro area in the third quarter of 2016 were at 2.9 percent—indicating a tight rental market. The Salt Lake metro overall rental vacancy rate (including apartments, mobile homes, and single-family homes) was 4.8 percent and the average rent was \$967. In Taylorsville, the 2016 rental vacancy rate was 4.3 percent and the average rent was \$930.

Vacancy rates around 5 percent typically indicate a competitive equilibrium in the housing market. Rates that fall below 5 percent indicate a very tight market. Figure III-15 shows vacancy rates for Taylorsville and surrounding communities over the last decade. Taylorsville experienced the highest vacancy rates in 2007 and 2014, but rates never reached 5 percent (reaching a low of 3% in 2009).

Taylorsville had some of the lowest historical vacancy rates compared to Draper, Murray, and Salt Lake City, which experienced the highest vacancy rates among surrounding communities. In 2016, almost every community had vacancy rates at or below 5 percent, except for Salt Lake City, which hasn’t experienced a vacancy rate below 7 percent in the last 10 years.


**Figure III-15.**  
**Vacancy Rates, Taylorsville and Peer Communities, 2007 to 2016**



Source: 3-year and 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.

Figure III-16 shows the distribution of rental prices in Taylorsville in 2000, 2010, and 2016. Although the largest shift in rent distribution occurred between 2000 and 2010, rental prices continue to increase.

**Figure III-16.**  
**Gross Rent Distribution, Taylorsville, 2016**



Source: 2016 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.


The distribution of rent in Taylorsville has drastically changed since 2000, when almost 70 percent of units were priced below \$750. Only 8 percent of units during that time were more than \$1,000.

In 2016, almost 40 percent of the rental units in Taylorsville were priced above \$1,000 and almost a tenth were priced over \$1,500. These rental prices would not be affordable to a low-income family looking to rent in the City today.

According to the 2016 American Community Survey, median rent in Taylorsville was \$930 per month, up from \$681 in 2000. Figure III-17 shows the median rent in Taylorsville compared to peer communities.

Median rent in Taylorsville is lower than many nearby communities but higher than Salt Lake City (\$844). Similar to home value, the southern suburban communities—Draper, Sandy, and South Jordan—had the highest median rents around \$1,200 to \$1,400.

**Figure III-17.**  
**Median Rent, Taylorsville and Peer Communities, 2016**



Source:  
 2016 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.

## Gaps Analysis

To examine how well Taylorsville’s current housing market meets the needs of its residents—and to determine how likely it is to accommodate demand of future residents and workers—this study used a modeling effort called a “gap analysis.” The analysis compares the supply of housing at various price points to the number of households who can afford such housing. If there are more housing units than households, the market is “oversupplying” housing at that price range. Conversely, if there are too few units, the market is “undersupplying” housing. The gap analysis conducted for renters in Taylorsville addresses both rental affordability and ownership opportunities for renters who want to buy. The gap analysis is similar to the approach the State of Utah recommends for Middle Income Housing Studies and the results reflect the needs identified by the state.

**Gaps in the rental market.** Figure III-18 compares the number of renter households in Taylorsville in 2010, their income levels, the maximum monthly rent they could afford without being cost burdened, and the number of units in the market that were affordable to them.<sup>3</sup>

The “Rental Gap” column shows the difference between the number of renter households and the number of rental units affordable to them. Negative numbers (in parentheses) indicate a shortage of units at the specific income level; positive units indicate an excess of units.

Figure III-19 shows the same information, but for 2016.

The results of the gap analyses show:

- The City has 1,600 renters who earn less than \$25,000 per year. These renters make up 26 percent of the City’s renters. There are 320 rental units to serve these renters—leaving a gap of 1,290 units. The majority of the gap is for the City’s very lowest income renters, those making less than \$15,000 per year. These 795 renters can find just 94 rental units that they can afford in the City.
- Overall, Taylorsville’s rental need is moderate—with a gap of almost 1,300 rental units at the very lowest rent ranges. The 2016 low-income rental gap is slightly larger than in 2010, when it was about 1,200 households. The biggest shift in the rental gap occurred for households earning between \$15,000 and \$25,000, who find fewer affordable rentals available. This gap widened even as the number of lower income renters declined.
- The rental market in Taylorsville is largely priced to serve renters earning between \$25,000 and \$50,000 per year. These households can afford to pay between \$625 and \$1,250 per month in rent and utilities without being cost burdened. Seventy-six percent of the City’s rental units fall within this price range.

---

<sup>3</sup> It is important to note that renters who cannot find affordable rents are not homeless. Those renters who cannot find affordable priced rentals are living in units that cost more than they can afford (or doubling up). These households are “cost burdened.” These households consist of students, working residents earning low wages, residents who are unemployed, and residents who are disabled and cannot work. These data points do not capture persons experiencing homelessness.


**Figure III-18.**  
**Mismatch in Rental Market, Taylorsville, 2010**

Income Range	Max Affordable Rent	Renters		Rental Units		Rental Gap	Cumulative Gap
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Less than \$5,000	\$125	141	3%	0	0%	(141)	(141)
\$5,000 to \$9,999	\$250	361	7%	69	1%	(292)	(433)
\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$375	335	6%	0	0%	(335)	(768)
\$15,000 to \$19,999	\$500	451	8%	165	3%	(286)	(1,055)
\$20,000 to \$24,999	\$625	551	10%	409	7%	(142)	(1,196)
\$25,000 to \$34,999	\$875	903	17%	2,507	43%	1,604	407
\$35,000 to \$49,999	\$1,250	1,045	19%	1,846	32%	801	1,208
\$50,000 to \$74,999	\$1,875	1,020	19%	753	13%	(267)	941
\$75,000 to \$99,999	\$1,875+	623	11%	99	2%	(524)	417
<b>Total/Low Income Gap</b>		<b>5,430</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5,847</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>(1,196)</b>	

Source: 2010 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.

**Figure III-19.**  
**Mismatch in Rental Market, Taylorsville, 2016**

Income Range	Max Affordable Rent	Renters		Rental Units		Rental Gap	Cumulative Gap
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Less than \$5,000	\$125	192	3%	0	0%	(192)	(192)
\$5,000 to \$9,999	\$250	211	3%	24	0%	(187)	(379)
\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$375	392	6%	70	1%	(322)	(701)
\$15,000 to \$19,999	\$500	274	4%	66	1%	(208)	(909)
\$20,000 to \$24,999	\$625	541	9%	160	2%	(381)	(1,290)
\$25,000 to \$34,999	\$875	987	16%	2,276	35%	1,289	(0)
\$35,000 to \$49,999	\$1,250	1,377	22%	2,661	41%	1,284	1,284
\$50,000 to \$74,999	\$1,875	1,295	21%	1,051	16%	(244)	1,039
\$75,000 to \$99,999	\$2,500	828	13%	210	3%	(618)	421
\$100,000 or more	\$2,500+	100	2%	0	0%	(100)	321
<b>Total/Low Income Gap</b>		<b>6,197</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6,518</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>(1,290)</b>	



Source: 2016 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.


The State of Utah provides free planning tools to assist cities with developing the moderate-income housing element of their general plan. As part of these resources, the State includes a rental housing gap assessment.

Figure III-20 shows the State's rental housing gap assessment for Taylorsville in 2015. Both BBC's and the State's gap analyses show a similar rental need for low-income households, particularly those earning 30 percent of the area median income (AMI) or below.

The State's gap assessment shows that:

- In 2015, 20 percent of renters (1,190 households) living in Taylorsville earned 30 percent of AMI or below, up from 15 percent in 2010. These renters need units that cost less than \$500 per month to avoid being cost burdened.
- Of these extremely low-income renters, 91 percent are cost burdened and 82 percent are severely cost burdened.
- Just 385 rental units in the City are affordable to these households. This leaves a "gap," or shortage, of 805 units for extremely low-income households.
- Only a portion (120) of affordable units are available to rent for households earning 30 percent of AMI or below, leaving an even larger gap of 1,070 units.
- For every 100 Taylorsville renters earning 30 percent of AMI or below, there are 32 affordable units, but only 10 affordable *and* available units.

**Figure III-20.**  
**State of Utah's Affordable Housing Gap Analysis, Taylorsville, 2011-2015**



Source: U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development (2018). Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, 2011-2015 (Data). Available at [www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html](http://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html)

**Gaps in the for-sale market.** A similar gaps analysis was conducted to evaluate the market options affordable to renters who may wish to purchase a home in Taylorsville. The for-sale gap model compares renters, renter income levels, the maximum monthly housing payment they could afford, and the proportion of units in the market that were affordable to them. The maximum affordable home prices shown in Figure III-21 assume a 30-year mortgage with a 10 percent down payment and a fixed interest rate of 4.55 percent. The estimates also incorporate property taxes, insurance, HOA fees, and utilities (assumed to collectively account for 35% of the monthly payment).

The “Renter Purchase Gap” column in Figure III-21 shows the difference between the proportion of renter households and the proportion of homes sold between August 2016 and August 2018 that were affordable to them. Negative numbers (in parentheses) indicate a shortage of units at the specific income level; positive units indicate an excess of units.

According to the ownership gaps analysis, renters who want to buy will have trouble finding an affordable home until they earn more than \$50,000—the income at which homes to buy begin to become affordable. During 2016 and 2018, there were only **6 affordable homes to buy for the 100 renters** earning less than \$50,000 and 20 homes for 100 renters earning between \$50,000 and \$75,000. Over the last two years, only 219 homes sold in Taylorsville within that price range (15% of all listed/sold homes); 94 percent of those were attached homes.

It is important to note that home size, condition, and housing preferences are not considered in the affordability model. The model also assumes that renters are able to save for a 10 percent down payment (up to \$19,000 for a household earning less than \$50,000 annually).

**Figure III-21.**  
**Market Options for Renters Wanting to Buy, Taylorsville, 2016 to 2018**

Income Range	Max Affordable Home Price	Renters		Homes Sold 2016 to 2018		Renter Purchase Gap	Percent of Homes that are Attached
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Less than \$35,000	\$132,368	2,597	42%	57	4%	-38%	100%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	\$189,097	1,377	22%	162	11%	-11%	92%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	\$283,645	1,295	21%	747	53%	32%	12%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	\$378,194	588	9%	342	24%	15%	4%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	\$567,291	240	4%	101	7%	3%	0%
\$150,000 or more	\$567,292+	100	2%	5	0%	-1%	0%
<b>Total/ Gap below \$75,000</b>		<b>6,197</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,414</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>-17%</b>	

Note: Maximum affordable home price is based on a 30-year mortgage with a 10 percent down payment, and an interest rate of 4.00%. Property taxes, insurance, HOA and utilities are assumed to collectively account for 35% of the monthly payment. Sale data from Redfin only include homes for which sale prices were available.

Source: Redfin and BBC Research & Consulting.

**Cost burden.** An important measurement of a city’s housing environment is the percentage of a household’s total monthly income that must be spent on housing costs. It is common practice to label any household spending over 30 percent of their monthly income on housing expenses as “cost-burdened.” For owner-occupied housing, this assessment is split into households with a mortgage and households without a mortgage.

In 2016, approximately 27 percent of Taylorsville’s owner-occupied households with a mortgage spent over 30 percent of their monthly income on housing costs; for those owner-occupied households without a mortgage, this percentage is only 14 percent. In comparison, 24 percent of Utah owner-occupied households with a mortgage and 7 percent of Utah owner-occupied households without a mortgage were “cost burdened.” Figure III-22 distributes both owner-occupied households with and without a mortgage based on the percentage of household monthly income spent on monthly housing costs.

**Figure III-22.**  
**Monthly Housing Costs as Percent of Monthly Income, Owner-occupied Households, Taylorsville, 2016**

Source:  
2016 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.

	With a Mortgage		Without a Mortgage	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Less than 20 percent	4,302	46%	3,132	77%
20 to 24.9 percent	1,516	16%	154	4%
25 to 29.9 percent	1,013	11%	180	4%
30 to 34.9 percent	599	6%	76	2%
35 percent or more	1,954	21%	517	13%
Not computed	22	0%	35	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,406</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4,094</b>	<b>100%</b>

Taylorsville’s renter occupied households have a slightly different distribution to Taylorsville’s owner-occupied households with a mortgage: 43 percent of Taylorsville’s renters spent more than 30 percent of their monthly income on housing costs. In comparison, 42 percent of all Utah renter-occupied households spent over 30 percent of their monthly income on housing costs in 2016. Figure III-23 distributes renter occupied households based on the percentage of monthly household income spend on housing costs.

**Figure III-23.**  
**Monthly Housing Costs as Percent of Monthly Income, Renter Occupied Households, Taylorsville, 2016**

Source:  
2016 5-year ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.

	Number	Percent of Total
Less than 20 percent	1,383	22%
20 to 24.9 percent	774	12%
25 to 29.9 percent	1,018	16%
30 to 34.9 percent	431	7%
35 percent or more	2,242	36%
Not computed	349	6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,197</b>	<b>100%</b>


**Older adults and seniors.** Ten percent of Taylorsville residents—or 6,226 people—are age 65 and older. This compares with 5,319 seniors in 2010 and just 3,624 in 2000. The proportion of the population’s residents who are seniors has steadily increased from 6 percent in 2000 to 9 percent in 2010. This is expected to continue over the next 10 years with the aging of the large baby boomer cohort.

Taylorsville currently has a higher proportion of senior residents than the county. Seniors will comprise 16 percent of residents in the county, compared to just 8 percent in 2010.

Figure III-24 shows the number of seniors in Salt Lake County for 1990 through 2010 and projected for 2020, 2030, and 2040.

**Figure III-24.  
Number and Proportion of  
Seniors, Salt Lake County,  
1990-2010 and 2020-2040  
Projections**

Source:  
Governor's Office of Planning and  
Budget, 2012 Baseline Projections, and  
BBC Research & Consulting.



**Age and housing choices.** Future seniors have the potential to significantly impact housing demand if only because of their large numbers. They will also affect needs for supportive services that seniors patronize including home health care, meal delivery, and transit.

Another large cohort—residents between the ages of 25 and 34, also known as generation Y or millennials—is already affecting the delivery of housing products. These residents, who are delaying marriage, childbearing, household formation, and homeownership relative to past generations, have played an important role in the revival of the rental market, which had some of the highest vacancy rates in recent history during the mid-2000s.

It is generally agreed upon that, during the next 10 to 20 years, the aging of these two large cohorts—baby boomers and millennials—will significantly impact the housing market. There are divergent views on how these impacts will be felt. Some believe that once millennials form families they will migrate toward the suburbs, much like generations before them. Others believe they will remain in the urban centers they have helped to revitalize and create.

The Urban Land Institute (ULI) has done some of the most comprehensive and recent surveying of millennials/generation Y's housing preferences. The 2013 ULI survey of this cohort found favorable responses to developments that have a variety of housing types, are mixed-use and pedestrian friendly, suggesting a desire for both urban and “urban light,” mixed-use settings that are growing in suburban markets.<sup>4</sup>

Some research has shown similar preferences toward denser, walkable residential environments among baby boomers. Yet the behavior of seniors, historically, has been to remain in their own homes as long as possible. If this continues, there will be a large need for expanded home health care networks to accommodate growth in seniors throughout the region, as well as home modifications to accommodate disabilities, senior-friendly transit and, for seniors who can afford and desire to move, senior-friendly residential communities.

<sup>4</sup> <http://uli.org/research/centers-initiatives/terwilliger-center-for-housing/research/community-survey/> contains a compilation of recent surveys, articles and opinions on millennials' housing preferences.

**Mobile homes.** Mobile homes are a form of affordable housing that allow lower income residents to become homeowners. Although this creates more housing opportunity for these households, mobile home parks can also be an environment of uncertainty. Most mobile home owners do not own their land and have to pay a monthly rent for the lot, subjecting tenants to the volatility of the housing market that could make monthly payments unaffordable.

Increasing home and land values in the Salt Lake metro has also given mobile home park owners a large incentive to sell, putting additional pressure on tenants who would need to relocate their home. Many homeowners become displaced because they either cannot find somewhere to move their mobile home, or their home is too old to be relocated. Mobile home owners have increasingly limited options.

The number of mobile homes in Taylorsville has fluctuated over the last decade but has increased slightly from 871 units in 2010 to 985 units in 2016. About 5 percent of the total housing stock in Taylorsville are mobile home units.

The 2016 median value for mobile homes in Taylorsville was \$23,900—the highest since the housing market crashed. In 2013, mobile home values reached a ten year low at \$19,400. While this type of housing product may allow some households to become homeowners, mobile homes do not provide the same type of stability or equity as other for-sale homes.

Regardless of the uncertainty or lack of stability, there is still a demand for this type of affordable homeownership in Taylorsville. There are currently 7 mobile homes for sale in Taylorsville for a median list price of \$50,000. Most of the mobile home listings were built in the 1990's and require some level of maintenance. Although these prices appear affordable compared to a single-family home or attached home, the mortgage payment may only be a small portion of a household's monthly housing costs.

Lot rents for mobile home parks are often higher than mortgage payments, which can increase monthly costs substantially. The average lot fee for mobile home parks in Taylorsville is around \$700 per month. For a mobile home priced at \$50,000, the monthly payments would be around \$330<sup>5</sup>. Without adding the fee for the lot, a household would need an income of just over \$13,000 to afford this mortgage. Monthly costs increase to \$1,000—a 500 percent increase—when the average lot rent is incorporated into the mortgage payment. To afford to purchase this mobile home and pay lot rent, a household would need to earn almost \$41,000 annually. More than half of Taylorsville renters would not be able to afford the current median list price of a mobile home without being cost-burdened.

Although there is a common perception that mobile homes are affordable, current prices and lot rents show that this type of housing is not a viable option for many low-income residents in Taylorsville.

**Workforce and affordability.** Figure III-25 displays affordable rental and ownership options for workers earning the average wage by industry. Among the five largest industries of Taylorsville

---

<sup>5</sup> Monthly mortgage payments assume 10 percent down payment, August 2018 interest rate of 4.55%, \$125 in monthly utilities, and \$375 in annual property taxes.

residents (those who live and work in the City as well as out-commuters), which account for nearly half of all resident workers, two—Health/Social Services and Manufacturing—have average wages high enough to afford the City’s median rent (\$930), but none of these industries can afford the 2016 Zillow home value \$235,950.

Affordability for Taylorsville workers (those who live and work in the City as well as in-commuters) is slightly better: two of the top five industries (Professional Services and Finance/Insurance) can afford median rent and one (Finance/Insurance) can afford the median home price.

The only industries that can afford Taylorsville’s median home price have average wages over \$68,000, but these industries comprise a small portion all jobs for resident and workers.

Overall, the average worker in the Salt Lake region—earning \$51,033 per year—could afford 82 percent of Taylorsville’s rental units, but only 19 percent of the homes sold in Taylorsville in 2016 (the majority—79 percent—of which were attached homes).

**Figure III-25.**  
**Affordability for Workers by Industry, Taylorsville, 2016**

Industry	Job Distribution for Taylorsville Residents	Job Distribution for Taylorsville Workers	Average Annual Wage in Salt Lake MSA	Max Affordable Rent	Can Afford Median Rent?	Max Affordable Home Price	Can Afford Median Home Price?
Private, Total, all industries	100%	100%	\$51,033	\$1,276	yes	\$191,074	no
Retail Trade	12%	11%	\$36,194	\$905	no	\$135,515	no
Health and Social Services	10%	9%	\$45,490	\$1,137	yes	\$170,320	no
Manufacturing	10%	3%	\$60,589	\$1,515	yes	\$226,852	no
Educational Services	9%	16%	\$35,328	\$883	no	\$132,272	no
Admin and Waste Services	8%	15%	\$36,335	\$908	no	\$136,043	no
Accommodation and Food Services	7%	9%	\$18,575	\$464	no	\$69,547	no
Professional Services	7%	11%	\$59,523	\$1,488	yes	\$222,861	no
Construction	6%	2%	\$52,129	\$1,303	yes	\$195,177	no
Finance and Insurance	6%	11%	\$72,297	\$1,807	yes	\$270,689	yes
Transportation and Warehousing	5%	0%	\$51,180	\$1,280	yes	\$191,624	no
Wholesale Trade	5%	1%	\$68,982	\$1,725	yes	\$258,277	yes
Public Administration	4%	4%	\$55,211	\$1,380	yes	\$206,717	no
Other Services	3%	1%	\$39,104	\$978	yes	\$146,410	no
Information	2%	3%	\$77,740	\$1,944	yes	\$291,068	yes
Real Estate	2%	2%	\$54,716	\$1,368	yes	\$204,863	no
Management of Companies	2%	1%	\$94,463	\$2,362	yes	\$353,681	yes
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	1%	2%	\$32,804	\$820	no	\$122,822	no
Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction	0%	0%	\$85,560	\$2,139	yes	\$320,347	yes
Natural Resources	0%	0%	\$35,121	\$878	no	\$131,497	no
Utilities	0%	0%	\$94,422	\$2,361	yes	\$353,527	yes

Note: Public Administration, Other Services, Information, and Management of Companies do not have wage data available at the MSA level and were replaced with County data, which has slightly higher wages than the MSA overall.

Source: US Census Bureau’s Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, Bureau of Labor Statistics Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (BLS QCEW), Genesis Group MLS data, 2016 ACS and BBC Research & Consulting.



# 10 Moderate Income Housing

Taylorsville encourages housing choices that are affordable for residents through all stages of life, that provide access to opportunities, are interconnected to multi-modal transportation options, and preserve the unique character of the community.



# Taylorsville General Plan

## Chapter 10: Moderate Income Housing

### Chapter 10 Contents:

#### 10.1 Housing Programs

#### 10.2 Land Use Transitions and Zoning Ordinances

#### 10.3 Transportation Infrastructure

Taylorsville encourages housing choices that are available, varied and affordable for residents through all stages of life, that provide access to opportunities, are interconnected to multi-modal transportation options, and preserve the unique character of the community.

The Moderate-Income Housing Plan, as required in *SB 34 - Affordable Housing Modifications* from the 2019 Utah legislative session, outlines State statutory requirements that municipalities must follow and consider when examining moderate-income housing needs. SB 34 encourages communities to plan for housing for residents of all income levels and to coordinate that housing with transportation and land use. Taylorsville must report annually on their Moderate-Housing plan. The City must implement at least three strategies (“menu items”) identified in State Code that support affordable housing.

The Moderate-Income Housing element of the General Plan is a subsection of the addendum Moderate-Income Housing Plan. This subsection outlines the City’s goals and objectives to retain and sustain moderate-income housing options for Taylorsville residents as it pertains to Housing Programs, Land Use Transitions and Zoning Ordinances, and Transportation Infrastructure. As such it should be noted that many of the requirements as outlined in the statutory framework will be found in the addendum, not in this section. The statutory requirements and where that information can be found is outlined below.

As Utah Code requires, a jurisdiction’s plan for moderate-income housing must include the following:

- An estimate of the existing supply of moderate-income housing located within the municipality (Section III Housing Profile);
- An estimate of the need for moderate-income housing in the municipality for the next five years (Section III Housing Profile);

**SB 34 Menu:**

- (A) rezone for densities necessary to assure the production of MIH
- (B) facilitate the rehabilitation or expansion of infrastructure that will encourage the construction of MIH
- (C) facilitate the rehabilitation of existing uninhabitable housing stock into MIH
- (D) consider general fund subsidies or other sources of revenue to waive construction related fees that are otherwise generally imposed by the city
- (E) create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, accessory dwelling units in residential zones
- (F) allow for higher density or moderate income residential development in commercial and mixed-use zones, commercial centers, or employment centers
- (G) encourage higher density or moderate income residential development near major transit investment corridors
- (H) eliminate or reduce parking requirements for residential development where a resident is less likely to rely on their own vehicle, e.g. residential development near major transit investment corridors or senior living facilities
- (I) allow for single room occupancy developments
- (J) implement zoning incentives for low to moderate income units in new developments
- (K) utilize strategies that preserve subsidized low to moderate income units on a long-term basis
- (L) preserve existing MIH
- (M) reduce impact fees, as defined in Section 11-36a-102, related to low and MIH
- (N) participate in a community land trust program for low or MIH
- (O) implement a mortgage assistance program for employees of the municipality or of an employer that provides contracted services to the municipality
- (P) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for state or federal funds or tax incentives to promote the construction of MIH
- (Q) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for programs offered by the Utah Housing Corporation within that agency's funding capacity
- (R) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for affordable housing programs administered by the Department of Workforce Services
- (S) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for programs administered by an association of governments established by an interlocal agreement under Title 11, Chapter 13, Interlocal Cooperation Act [not in county list of recommendations]
- (T) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for services provided by a public housing authority to preserve and create MIH
- (U) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for programs administered by a metropolitan planning organization or other transportation agency that provides technical planning assistance
- (V) utilize a MIH set aside from a community reinvestment agency, redevelopment agency, or community development and renewal agency
- (W) any other program or strategy implemented by the municipality to address the housing needs of residents of the municipality who earn less than 80% of the area median income

- A survey of the total residential land use (Section III Housing Profile);
- An evaluation of how existing land use and zoning affect opportunities for moderate-income housing (Section IV Moderate-income Housing Plan); and
- A description of the municipality's program to encourage an adequate supply of moderate-income housing (Section IV Moderate-income Housing Plan).
- A recommendation to implement three or more strategies from the "menu" of options. [see figure 10.1]

The State of Utah provides a number of tools and resources to assist cities planning for the moderate-income housing needs of their communities and to meet annual reporting requirements. This "tool kit" includes an outline and writing guide, a plan example, a database of all plans in the state, affordable housing data, housing gap analyses, mode resolution for amending a general plan, and a reporting form. Many of these resources were used to support the analysis in this report.

The Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) has provided data resources to verify the need for moderate-income housing as it relates to transportation, land use, and economics. These analytical data tools provide a foundation for the City to examine land use designations and transitions that provide access to opportunities, economic nodes, education centers, and transportation networks while looking through the lens of housing affordability and housing opportunity. The 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was reviewed in addition to existing County and State plans to determine the need for land use transitions as they pertain to the development of multi-modal transportation networks in the City. The RTP is analyzed in greater detail in the Land Use and Transportation elements of the General Plan.

Taylorville is committed to future development that utilizes a multi-modal transportation system and other tools as a mechanism to reduce housing cost -burden, improve air quality, and provide residents with a better community experience. Taylorville is primarily built-out and future redevelopment in the community will be guided by stakeholder involvement in the creation of community-based plans. Due to the lack of greenfield development future housing development will be centered around infill and the transitions of existing land use. The City has embarked on several long-range planning projects to examine the redevelopment of the community. Each one of the studies looks at opportunities for future land use transitions with the intent of reducing the cost burden of Taylorville residents through integrated

**Figure 10.1: Moderate Income Housing Strategies "Menu"**

community design, development centered around access to opportunities, housing choices for all residents, and a diversified job market. Some of the studies include:

- Mid-Valley Active Transportation Plan—A recommendation for active transportation routes through Millcreek, Holladay, Midvale, Cottonwood Heights, Murray and Taylorsville that encourages non-automotive access between municipalities to key nodes like job centers, education facilities, economic centers, and the transit network.
- City of Taylorsville Trails Master Plan—This Plan builds upon the recommendations outlined in the Mid-Valley Active Transportation Plan, Salt Lake County Active Transportation Plan, WFRC Regional Transportation Plan and other applicable studies to drill down into the specific connectivity needs of the City
- Taylorsville Expressway Study—This study focuses on the revitalization of several key nodes along the Midvalley Connector Bus Rapid Transit line and examines land use, housing, economics, connectivity, and infrastructure development along the Taylorsville Expressway along the corridor.
- Taylorsville Commercial Centers Master Plan—This Plan contains recommendations for key commercial nodes in the City to determine the best strategies for redevelopment including commercial enhancement, land use, housing, economics, connectivity, and infrastructure development.
- Community Development Block Grant Five-Year Consolidated Plan—The Five-Year Plan provides an analysis of housing choice, impediments to fair housing, and opportunities to utilize CDBG funding for the next five years. Further, this plan identifies housing goals and programs that relieve the burden of residents that are 80% or below AMI and is updated every five years.

The Land Use and Transportation chapters of the Taylorsville General plan further evaluate land use and transportation connection strategies to ensure better utilization of public infrastructure investments and appropriate land use transitions.

## **10.1 Housing Programs**

**Goal: Promote, preserve and develop community partnerships to facilitate the creation and retention of moderate-income housing stock.**

### **Community Partnerships**

Using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME funds granted to the City from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the City funds several low- to moderate-income housing programs. These programs are targeted at residents 80% or below AMI and are intended to keep residents in their homes while also preserving the unique character of Taylorsville neighborhoods. The City utilizes CDBG and HOME funds for the following programs:

- Housing rehabilitation—organizations like ASSIST and Community Development Corporation of Utah (CDC) provide housing rehabilitation programs for low- to moderate-income residents. Through the Salt Lake County Consortium, the City also has access to County-funded housing rehab programs like Green and Healthy Homes, Habitat for Humanity, and NeighborWorks Salt Lake. Additionally, the City funds the Idea House program administered by CDC, which is a program that purchases blighted homes and renovates them using energy efficient materials to reduce the overall monthly payment for the homeowner. The City's housing rehab programs help low- to moderate-income residents stay in their homes while also preserving the character of the City's neighborhoods (implements menu item L).
- Down Payment Assistance—the City has partnered with CDC to offer down payment assistance to first time home buyers looking to purchase homes in Taylorsville. This program provides an extra incentive for residents 80% AMI or below to be able to purchase a home. While this program is a great resource, the City has seen challenges with residents being able to utilize the funding because of the rising costs of housing along the Wasatch Front. Additionally, as demonstrated in this report, there is a shortage of homes that moderate-income families can afford, and those homes only stay on the market for several days (implements menu item L).

The City of Taylorsville utilizes the resources of Housing Connect, formerly the Housing Authority of the County of Salt Lake (HACSL). Housing Connect has 32 units of public housing located in Taylorsville and provides rental assistance to another 154 households under the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program. All households are extremely low-income, earning on average \$13,000 per year. The organization has recently gone through an extensive process with the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to transition its public housing portfolio to a more stable structure, through Disposition and Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) programs. Taylorsville has met with Housing Connect to monitor this process and support it where it is appropriate (implements menu item T).

**Moderate Income Housing Objective 10.1.1 Develop and maintain strong community partnerships that help provide housing options for all residents despite age, income, race, or ability.**

**Actions:**

- A 10.1.1 (a): Develop a marketing plan for housing programs that can be provided to community-based partners.
- A 10.1.1 (b): Create an inventory of housing programs and make that information readily available to real estate agents and to existing and potential residents seeking homeownership opportunities, housing rehabilitation services and rental assistance.
- A 10.1.1 (c): Purchase, rehab and sell homes to residents 80% AMI or below through the City's Idea House program.

**Actions (continued):**

- A 10.1.1 (d): Assist income eligible first-time homebuyers in purchasing homes in Taylorsville through the Down Payment Assistance program.
- A 10.1.1 (e): Maintain a close partnership with Housing Connect (formerly the Housing Authority of Salt Lake County) to facilitate rental assistance vouchers or other eligible programs to residents.
- A 10.1.1 (f): Work with community-based partners to develop a Taylorsville specific marketing policy.

**Policies:**

- P 10.1.1 (a): Promote an understanding of housing needs regardless of income, age and ability.
- P 10.1.1 (b): Encourage and support community partnerships through funding resources, resource collaboration and marketing.
- P10.1.1 (c): Support the development of new and innovative strategies by community partners to assist residents in obtaining housing choice while minimizing housing cost burden.

**Incentives**

The City of Taylorsville in conjunction with the State of Utah, Salt Lake County and other partners have several incentive-based programs to assist in the development and retention of the moderate-income housing stock. Incentives and financing programs are an important tool that can be used by the City and the development community. These incentives or programs that are available in the City or can be implemented by the City are outlined in detail below:

- Community Reinvestment—In August 2019 the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Taylorsville passed Resolution RDA 19-04 “A Resolution of the Redevelopment Agency of Taylorsville City Board Authorizing the Use of Housing Funds.” This resolution follows the statutory framework outlined in UTAH CODE ANN. §17C-1-412. (1)(a) that states a Community Reinvestment Agency shall use twenty percent (20%) of Tax Increment from Urban Renewal Project Areas and Project Areas where blight was found as approved in the Project Area Plan and Budget for housing within the Project Area or affordable housing within the boundaries of the City. Resolution RDA 19-04 further reinforces the RDA’s existing policy that was developed in 2008 with the formation of the first project area in Taylorsville that the City will continue using the 20% housing set aside according to statutory requirements and to attract additional investment in the City. The Tax Increment can be used on the items outlined below and in Resolution RDA 19-04, but are not limited to (implements menu item V):
  - Replacement housing units,
  - Planned and proposed housing, affordable housing, or income targeted housing,

- Student housing,
  - Mobile home park resident housing,
  - Debt service for bonds to build housing and units, or
  - Other allowed housing purposes.
- Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC)—LIHTC is a federal low-income housing tax credit program that will provide a subsidy for the construction of affordable rental units serving residents at 60% area median income or below. Developers can utilize a competitive 9% credit or a 4% IRS credit. The Utah Housing Corporation manages the LIHTC program in Utah and ensures compliance with IRS requirements and long-term deed restrictions. LIHTC has been a successful tool used on a national and local level to build and sustain the moderate-income housing stock (implements menu item Q).
- Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (OWHLF): The OWHLF develops housing that is affordable to very low-, low-, and moderate-income households as defined by HUD. OWLHF offers financial assistance for the acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of multi-family housing. The Fund has resources to help disabled residents with financial and mortgage assistance (implements menu item R).
- Density Bonus—Density bonus programs can be a resource used by developers to leverage additional density than current zoning ordinances allow, they are also commonly used to complement the use of LIHTEC tax credits. A density bonus can provide an increase in the number of dwelling units per acre, overall height or floor area ratio with the ultimate goal of more units being built on a single parcel. Density programs allow for a percentage of increase in baseline permitted density in exchange for affordable housing units (implements menu item J).
- Land Acquisition—Many communities use land acquisition as a means to incentivize developers to create moderate-income housing stock. This tool creates a public-private partnership in which the City owns land and, through a competitive process, “grants” the land to a qualified developer to build a housing product that addresses the needs of the community. This program helps reduce the parcel purchase cost for the developer and is a mechanism to help the overall affordability of the project (implements menu item J).
- Bonding for Infrastructure Development-- Some communities use this tool to accelerate installation of or reconstruction of above and underground utilities and infrastructure.

**Moderate Income Housing Objective 10.1.2: Create and utilize existing programs to incentivize the development community to create moderate-income housing and to potentially reduce development costs associated with housing production.**

**Actions:**

- A 10.1.2 (a): Develop a best practice guide on housing incentive programs supported by the City.
- A 10.1.2 (b): Market incentive programs to developers and provide resources to developers to leverage those programs.
- A 10.1.2 (c): Consider strategic acquisition or rezoning of property within the City that can be used for the development of mixed-use and mixed-income developments.
- A 10.1.2 (d): Develop and present for consideration to the Taylorsville Planning Commission and City Council an ordinance amendment or official policy of the city that:
- Offers density incentives for multi-family residential projects that include a minimum number of targeted units to residents at 50% AMI or below.
  - Requires any multi-family project that receives a City incentive to dedicate a minimum number of units to residents at 50% AMI or below.
  - Establishes minimum affordable housing requirements for all new multi-family projects.
  - Clarifies criteria for utilizing and prioritizing incentive based programs for housing.
  - Requires all new multi-family developments within 1/2 mile of a *Major Transit Investment Corridor* to have a minimum percentage of units dedicated to residents at 50% AMI or below.
- A 10.1.2 (e): The RDA will continue to track, set aside, and use the 20% housing TIF allocation as authorized by State Code and City Ordinance.

**Policies:**

- P 10.1.2 (a): Encourage the utilization of LIHTC for the development of moderate-income housing in the City targeting populations 50% AMI or below.
- P 10.1.2 (b): Promote the utilization of incentive-based programs for the development of moderate-income housing in Taylorsville.
- P 10.1.2 (c): Utilize State and County resources to further the development of moderate-income housing in Taylorsville .
- P 10.1.2 (d): Consider policy changes that would allow for an expediated review process for projects that focus on moderate income housing.

**Preserve Existing Housing Stock**

The preservation of existing housing stock and community character is of utmost importance to the City and its residents. Maintaining the existing housing stock allows residents to age in place and provides housing choice for residents through all stages of life. Additionally, ensuring that low

-to moderate-income residents have the resources needed to assist with housing rehabilitation projects is an important resource for the City to provide. Neighborhoods are the fabric of a community and are a critical component to preserving the character of the City (implements menu item L).

**Moderate Income Housing Objective 10.1.3: Preserve the character of Taylorsville neighborhoods by maintaining and rehabilitating existing housing stock to ensure housing options for residents through all stages of life.**

**Actions:**

- A 10.1.3 (a): Develop a city ordinance that requires a Taylorsville specific relocation plan for any land use transition that impacts the moderate-income housing supply.
- A 10.1.3 (b): Evaluate a city-run program that would provide design standards, guidelines, and assistance for home rehab projects.
- A 10.1.3 (c): Perform an assessment of the City's existing housing stock to identify neighborhoods that would benefit from housing rehabilitation programs.
- A 10.1.3 (d): Evaluate city ordinances, standards, and regulations to determine if there are barriers to maintaining and improving the City's existing housing stock.

**Policies:**

- P 10.1.3 (a): Help maintain existing moderate income housing stock through community partnerships.
- P 10.1.3 (b): Ensure that all housing programs enacted by the City preserve and/or enhance the quality and/or unique character of existing Taylorsville neighborhoods.

## **10.2 Land Use Transitions and Zoning Ordinances**

**Goal: Implement land use transitions and zoning ordinances that support a diverse housing stock that facilitates the needs of Taylorsville residents through all stages of life.**

As population continues to increase, the demand for housing will continue to rise and infill redevelopment will be the foundation of future land use transitions in the City. Additionally, the City will continue to see a rise in the number of seniors with the aging of its largest age cohort—residents between the age of 35 and 54 years. With two higher education facilities in Taylorsville, it will be important to provide housing and resources for the students attending Salt Lake Community College and the Utah State University Extension. With these factors in mind, it will be imperative that the City works closely with developers to ensure that future land use transitions increase the moderate-income housing stock, support home ownership, and reduce the rental gap. Land use transitions that impact existing housing stock should have a Taylorsville specific relocation plan that meets the housing needs of the displaced residents.

It is imperative that the City has zoning ordinances and land use designations in place that facilitate the type of development Taylorsville residents expect and enjoy, while also ensuring an adequate housing stock that provides for a variety of future housing options. The City will need to review the existing zoning ordinance to ensure that there is flexibility, options, and opportunities to address infill redevelopment on a case-by-case basis. In the development of the Moderate-Income Housing Plan, current zoning ordinances and the Zoning Map were reviewed to determine any barriers to the development of moderate-income housing. No impediments were found. However, the City will continue to amend ordinances and land uses to ensure it is staying competitive in the development market (implements menu item A, E, F, G and L).

**Moderate Income Housing Objective 10.2.1: Develop and maintain a vision for future land use transitions and ensure the City's municipal code allows for the transitions and housing stock that meet the needs of Taylorsville residents.**

**Actions:**

- A 10.2.1 (a): Annually review ordinances, codes, regulations, and the permitting process to eliminate requirements that discourage a diversity of housing types in the City.
- A 10.2.1 (b): Conduct developer, builder, and stakeholder focus groups to discuss barriers to affordable housing development and what role the City should play in facilitating development and redevelopment.
- A 10.2.1 (c): Review standards, ordinances and criteria for the creation of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's) and guest houses to allow their continued uses
- A 10.2.1 (d): Study the possibility of grandfathering existing ADU's and guest houses to recognize them to be legal non-conforming uses
- A 10.2.1 (e): Explore text amendments to the municipal code that impact minimum lot size, setbacks reductions, minimum house size, flag lots, and deep lots.
- A 10.2.1 (f): Annually review the Taylorsville Zoning Map to determine areas where higher density housing or other housing fits within the vision for the City. Specific consideration will be paid to major transportation corridors.
- A 10.2.1 (g): Consider the creation of city approved criteria for town home development on narrow infill lots in designated zoning districts.
- A 10.2.1 (h): Develop a Taylorsville-specific relocation plan for any redevelopment that impacts existing moderate-income housing.
- A 10.2.1 (i): Continue to conduct studies and develop small area master plans for nodes throughout the City to better understand what land use transitions are appropriate to facilitate job creation and retention, economic prosperity, moderate-income housing development, and economic sustainability.
- A 10.2.1(j): Develop a report examining redevelopment potential of underutilized properties that analyzes vacancy rates, structure to land value ratio, status of delinquent property taxes, and potential partnerships to create mixed-income residential projects.

**Policies:**

- P 10.2.1 (a): Utilize where appropriate the Site-Specific Development (SSD) ordinance as a mechanism to create moderate-income housing in the City.
- P 10.2.1 (b): The City will review any proposed development, redevelopment or code amendment for potential impacts on housing, including potential impacts on special needs, elderly, or low-income populations, including if those changes could result in displacement.
- P 10.2.1 (c): Encourage energy efficient and sustainable development practices as a means to reduce monthly expenses.
- P 10.2.1 (d): As the demand for housing continues to rise, the City will continue to look for ways to add units to the City's housing stock.
- P 10.2.1 (e): Continue to foster and develop relationships with the higher education facilities in the City to ensure student housing needs are being met.
- P 10.2.1 (f): Encourage mixed-use structures where the underlying zone supports such development to maximize land potential.

### **10.3 Transportation Infrastructure**

**Goal: Facilitate land use transitions and infrastructure development that promotes walkability, connectivity, and access to multi-modal transportation options that reduce transportation costs for Taylorsville residents.**

The City of Taylorsville is primarily built-out, which poses unique challenges in addressing the development of moderate-income housing. Future housing development in Taylorsville will include redevelopment and transitions of existing land uses. With that in mind, the City will continue to look at factors that contribute to residents' housing costs and mechanisms to reduce the overall housing cost burden. Transportation costs are a major contributing factor to monthly expenditures for Taylorsville residents.

Transportation Infrastructure :

- Roads—The City has several large transportation projects projected in the next five years, one of which is the reconstruction of Redwood Road from 5400 South to 4100 South. The Redwood Road project will consist of reconfiguring lanes, adding bus pullouts, consolidating access points, widening walkways, installing a park strip with street trees, and adding pedestrian scale lighting. This project is important because it will facilitate the creation of a safer pedestrian experience on Redwood Road, which will enhance walkability along a key corridor in the community and will provide better access to transit opportunities along Redwood Road. The Redwood Road Corridor is one of UTA's most heavily used bus routes in the State. Additionally, this Corridor has high rates of ADA ramp deployments.

- Bus Rapid Transit—Taylorsville is working with UTA, UDOT, Murray, Salt Lake County, Salt Lake Community College, and West Valley City on the construction of the Midvalley Connector Bus Rapid Transit project. The Midvalley BRT as dictated on the Regional Transportation Plan is a BRT line that connects Taylorsville residents to the Murray Front Runner and TRAX station and the West Valley TRAX and MAXX lines. The BRT route in Taylorsville will have a center-running dedicated bus lane down 4700 South and a complete street with active transportation routes, wide pedestrian pathways, and safe crossings to the stations. As the BRT enters into the heart of the City, the bus will have a station at Salt Lake Community College and will continue down the 4700 South corridor to 2700 West, with stations planned by the State office complex. The BRT line will provide residents access to multi-modal transportation options through the utilization of bus, rail, and trail. Taylorsville residents will have connectivity to a regional network of transit options, which will help reduce transportation monthly costs (implements menu item B).
- Transit Oriented Development—Transit Oriented Development (TOD) is development that is centered around transit opportunities. TOD usually consists of high density, mixed-use buildings, pedestrian scale environment, walkability, connectivity, parking reductions and inter-modal opportunities. TOD focuses on the pedestrian rather than the auto. TOD is a catalyst for reducing housing cost burden from transportation costs as TOD communities are centered around access to transit opportunities. Additionally, TOD development typically allows for higher densities and is ranked high when applying for incentives (implements menu item A, B, G and H).
- Major Transit Investment Corridor—Major Transit Investment Corridors (MTIC) are a new tool that was included in the 2019 Housing Affordability Modifications legislation passed by the State Legislature. MTIC's can consist of a public transit rail right-of-way, dedicated road right-of-way for the use of bus rapid transit, or fixed-route bus corridors that are subject to an interlocal agreement. The Wasatch Front Regional Council has identified three areas in Taylorsville that could be classified as MTIC. These areas include the Midvalley Connector Bus Rapid Transit, the Redwood Road fixed-bus route, and the 5400 South fixed-bus route (implements menu G and H).
- Trails—Trails, active transportation routes, safe-walking routes to school, and connectivity to key destinations and nodes within the City comprise a critical component to providing a safe pedestrian environment that facilitates multi-modal transportation opportunities and reduces transportation costs. The City of Taylorsville is participating in the Mid-Valley Active Transportation Plan, which is a six city plan to develop a regional active transportation backbone. The Mid-Valley Plan will connect Taylorsville to Murray, Millcreek, Holladay, Cottonwood Heights and Midvale. This plan will build upon existing regional active transportation plans (implements menu B).

**Moderate Income Housing Objective 10.3.1: Invest in infrastructure that facilitates access to multi-modal transportation opportunities and promotes walkability and connectivity within the City.**

**Actions:**

- A 10.3.1 (a): Pursue funding for the development of a Trails Master Plan that focuses on safe walking routes to schools, connections to recreation, education, job centers, economic opportunities, and transit facilities.
- A 10.3.1 (b): Integrate related elements of the regional active transportation plans and recreational trails plans into a Taylorsville-specific plan.
- A 10.3.1 (c): Pursue an interlocal agreement with the Utah Transit Authority for the designation of Major Transit Investment Corridors.
- A 10.3.1 (d): Seek funding for implementation of the trail network in Taylorsville.
- A 10.3.1 (e): Participate in regional discussions and planning efforts to ensure connectivity to surrounding communities and transit opportunities.
- A 10.3.1 (f): Plan for high density, high quality, mixed use zoning and development along Major Transit Investment Corridors.
- A 10.3.1 (g): Allow for parking reductions in future development along Major Transit Investment Corridors.

**Policies:**

- P 10.3.1 (a): Encourage pedestrian scale development along Major Transit Investment Corridors.
- P 10.3.1 (b): Ensure complete street development along applicable segments of the Midvalley Connector Bus Rapid Transit corridor.
- P 10.3.1 (c): Encourage moderate income housing options near planned transportation projects as identified on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Summary of SB 34 Affordable Housing Modifications (4th Substitute)

Sen. Jake Anderegg / Rep. Val Potter

**Summary:** SB34 encourages local communities to plan for housing for residents of all income levels, and coordinate that housing with transportation. Communities are required to develop a moderate income housing (MIH) plan as part of their general plan. Communities that are required to annually report on their MIH plan implementation must satisfy these requirements to remain eligible for state transportation investments.

**Revisions to required elements of municipal and county general plans:**

Land Use element must now consider location of land for housing for residents of various income levels in addition to the other categories of public and private uses of land (line 481 for municipalities; 1172 for counties).

Transportation and Traffic Circulation element:

- “Provide the general location and extent” of active transportation facilities in addition to freeways, arterial and collector streets, public transit, and other modes of transportation (491; 1182).
- Plan residential and commercial development around “major transit investment corridors” to improve connections between housing, employment, education, recreation, and commerce (494; 1185).
  - Defines “major transit investment corridor” as public transit service that uses or occupies: (a) public transit rail right-of-way; (b) dedicated road right-of-way for the use of public transit, such as bus rapid transit; or (c) fixed-route bus corridors subject to an interlocal agreement or contract between a municipality or county and (i) a public transit district as defined in Section 17B-2a-802, or (ii) an eligible political subdivision as defined in Section 59-12-2219 (246; 858).
  - Municipalities without a major transit investment corridor must plan for residential and commercial development in areas that maintain and improve these connections (498).
- Correlate the transportation plan with population and employment projections, and the proposed land use element (502, 1188).
- Consider the regional transportation plan developed by the region’s metropolitan planning organization (MPO); if outside an MPO, consider the long-range transportation plan developed by UDOT (575; 1258).

Moderate Income Housing (MIH) element:

- **Municipalities/counties covered:** Utah Code has long required municipalities and counties to plan for moderate income housing growth. SB34 requires, by December 1, 2019, the following municipalities and counties to update and adopt the moderate income housing element of their general plan (444; 1074), and annually report on implementation (614; 1296):
  - all municipalities of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th class;
  - cities of the 5th class with a population of 5,000 or more that are located in counties of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd class;
  - metro townships with a population of 5,000 or more; and
  - all counties must plan and adopt a MIH element including strategies from the ‘menu’ (see below) but only counties of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd class with an unincorporated population of 5,000 or more must annually report on implementation.
- Facilitate a reasonable opportunity for a variety of housing including MIH and shall now 1) meet the needs of people of various income levels living, working, or desiring to live or work in the community (509; 1198); 2) “allow people with various incomes to benefit from and participate in all aspects of neighborhood and community life” (511; 1200); 3) towns may and cities shall analyze how they will provide a realistic opportunity for the development of MIH within 5 years for cities (513) and within the planning horizon for counties (1203).

- **Menu:** Shall include a recommendation to implement 3 or more of the following strategies, aka the ‘menu’ (518; 1205):
  - (A) rezone for densities necessary to assure the production of MIH
  - (B) facilitate the rehabilitation or expansion of infrastructure that will encourage the construction of MIH
  - (C) facilitate the rehabilitation of existing uninhabitable housing stock into MIH
  - (D) consider general fund subsidies or other sources of revenue to waive construction related fees that are otherwise generally imposed by the city
  - (E) create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, accessory dwelling units in residential zones
  - (F) allow for higher density or moderate income residential development in commercial and mixed-use zones, commercial centers, or employment centers
  - (G) encourage higher density or moderate income residential development near major transit investment corridors
  - (H) eliminate or reduce parking requirements for residential development where a resident is less likely to rely on their own vehicle, e.g. residential development near major transit investment corridors or senior living facilities
  - (I) allow for single room occupancy developments
  - (J) implement zoning incentives for low to moderate income units in new developments
  - (K) utilize strategies that preserve subsidized low to moderate income units on a long-term basis
  - (L) preserve existing MIH
  - (M) reduce impact fees, as defined in Section 11-36a-102, related to low and MIH
  - (N) participate in a community land trust program for low or MIH
  - (O) implement a mortgage assistance program for employees of the municipality or of an employer that provides contracted services to the municipality
  - (P) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for state or federal funds or tax incentives to promote the construction of MIH
  - (Q) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for programs offered by the Utah Housing Corporation within that agency's funding capacity
  - (R) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for affordable housing programs administered by the Department of Workforce Services
  - (S) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for programs administered by an association of governments established by an interlocal agreement under Title 11, Chapter 13, Interlocal Cooperation Act [not in county list of recommendations]
  - (T) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for services provided by a public housing authority to preserve and create MIH
  - (U) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for programs administered by a metropolitan planning organization or other transportation agency that provides technical planning assistance
  - (V) utilize a MIH set aside from a community reinvestment agency, redevelopment agency, or community development and renewal agency
  - (W) any other program or strategy implemented by the municipality to address the housing needs of residents of the municipality who earn less than 80% of the area median income
- In addition to the recommendations required above, municipalities that have a “fixed guideway public transit station” shall include a recommendation to implement either “G” or “H” (568) [not required for counties].

- **Annual reporting and review of the moderate income housing plan:** The municipal/county legislative body shall annually review their MIH plan and implementation of that plan; prepare and post a report of their findings on their website; and send the report to Dept. of Workforce Services, AOG, and MPO if applicable (612; 1294).
  - The report shall include: a) revised estimate of the need for MIH in the next 5 years; b) description of progress made to provide MIH by analyzing and publishing data on the # of housing units that are at or below 80%, 50%, and 30% adjusted median family income; c) description of efforts to utilize a MIH set-aside from community reinvestment agency, redevelopment agency, or community development and renewal agency; d) description of the implementation of the MIH recommendations aka 'menu'.
  - Requires the DWS Division of Housing and Community Development to (i) assist in the creation of the MIH reports, and (ii) evaluate the reports for purposes of determining eligibility for state transportation funds. Gives DWS rulemaking authority to develop the evaluation process (1414).

**Revisions to Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (1325):** SB34 did not provide any additional funding for housing. Revises Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund board to add 1 member w/expertise in transit-oriented development and 1 member who represents rural interests. The board must hold two public input meetings each year, once in a rural area. Allows fund money to be used to purchase land for low-income housing (1388).

**Revisions to state transportation funding:**

- Adds access to educational facilities and MIH to the prioritization process for new transportation capacity projects administered by the Utah Transportation Commission (1749).
- State Transportation Investment Fund (TIF) or Transit Transportation Investment Fund (TTIF) funds may not be used in a municipality or unincorporated county that has failed to adopt a MIH plan or has failed to report on implementation of their MIH plan as determined by DWS. TIF funds can still be used for a limited-access facility, but not for construction, reconstruction, or renovation of an interchange. TTIF funds can still be used for a multi-community fixed-guideway public transportation project, but not for the construction, reconstruction, or renovation of a station (1808).