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Introduction

Planning Process

In June 2018, Prosperity Southwest Wisconsin (PSW) partnered with Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation (WEDC) and its county partners to undertake a study of the region’s housing and workforce. The purpose of the study is to guide the near-term policies for communities, counties, and the region in order to address the existing and near future housing issues in southwest Wisconsin. A secondary purpose is to provide a comprehensive summary of demographic, housing, and workforce data to assist in the decision-making of local elected officials and investors. To achieve these ends, this study examines existing housing in the region, how appropriate that housing is to current and future residents, and what can be done to address the current issues within the next 10 years.

PSW is a non-profit economic development organization whose Board of Directors consists of county and community economic developers from southwest Wisconsin, and who collaboratively work to strengthen the region’s economy. Recognizing that housing is a driver of economy and community, PSW responded to regional employers and industry concerns about future workforce housing development in the region by contracting with SWWRPC to undertake this study. The study addresses housing issues regionally, at the county level for Crawford, Grant, Green, Iowa, Lafayette, and Richland Counties, and at the community level for forty cities and villages within these counties. Members of PSW and other regional economic development collaborators for this plan are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Bowman</td>
<td>Driftless Development, Inc.</td>
<td>Crawford County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Brisbois</td>
<td>Grant County Economic Development</td>
<td>Grant County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara Carper</td>
<td>Green County Economic Development</td>
<td>Green County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Genoway</td>
<td>City of Dodgeville Economic Development</td>
<td>City of Dodgeville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Haas</td>
<td>Lafayette County Economic Development</td>
<td>Lafayette County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Hottman</td>
<td>UW – Extension</td>
<td>Iowa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones</td>
<td>Cuba City Economic Development</td>
<td>City of Cuba City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ela Kakde</td>
<td>Platteville Area Industrial Development Corporation (PAIDC)</td>
<td>Platteville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Koziol</td>
<td>Richland County Economic Development</td>
<td>Richland County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Schneider</td>
<td>UW – Extension</td>
<td>City of Boscobel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding assistance for the plan was provided by PSW member counties, WEDC, and Alliant Energy. Funding was secured a contract was signed between PSW and SWWRPC in June of 2018, with work beginning immediately. As part of the contract agreement, PSW members were responsible for reaching out to local realtors, housing agencies, lenders, and employers to gather input regarding housing in the region. SWWRPC services included undertaking interviews with developers, expansive and comprehensive demographic, housing, and workforce data collection, and drafting and distributing the final plans to PSW.
Outreach

Several groups of stakeholders were identified to provide knowledge of the local housing market, and therefore augment the empirical data with a working experience of professionals engaged in housing. The stakeholder groups were selected based on their intimate knowledge of the local housing markets.

PSW county economic developers undertook interviews with local lenders, realtors, housing agencies, and employers. These groups were identified as having local understandings of the housing markets at the county and local community level. Each economic developer was responsible for interviewing several individuals from each stakeholder group in their respective county or community. The work of housing agencies, lenders, and realtors crosses local community boundaries and thus interviews collected from them are presented as representative of the entire county, unless specifically noted. Interview responses from employers are presented as more narrowly representative of the local communities in which they reside, unless otherwise noted. All interviews were done on an anonymous basis. Table 3 identifies the number of stakeholders by county.

SWWRPC interviewed eleven residential developers. These developers were approached based on their history of working in the region or expressed interest in working in the region, and were selected with input and approval from PSW. Developers were organized into three categories based on the type of residential development and type of funding the developer typically utilizes. The three categories are local builders, regional developers, and national developers. Local builders are characterized by typically building single family housing and almost always having a contract that does not involve financing between the owner and the builder. Regional developers are characterized by developers that build single-family neighborhoods, sometimes with speculative houses, and multi-family homes. Regional developers often utilize financing incentives from the state or community to assist in building. National developers work on an array of projects across the state and nation. Projects are likely to include multi-family housing but can also include single-family residential and commercial. National developers are the most likely to utilize a variety of funding sources at the state and national level. See Appendix F for local, state, and national housing funding tools. Table 4 presents the number of developers interviewed and their respective category. All interviews were conducted on the condition of anonymity.
### Table 4. Interviews Conducted with Residential Developers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developer Category</th>
<th>Local Builder</th>
<th>Regional Developer</th>
<th>National Developer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of interviews</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>Contract for Building Service</td>
<td>Will finance the project, but less likely to utilize state and national financing incentives.</td>
<td>Will utilize local, state, and national financing incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>One – two structures at a time. Not speculative.</td>
<td>Builds 25+ units</td>
<td>Builds 25+ units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Development</td>
<td>Typically, single-family homes.</td>
<td>Multi-family structures, possible single-family homes.</td>
<td>Multi-family structures, possible single-family homes. Experience with all types of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic area of work</td>
<td>Local Community Level</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Statewide/National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Study Organization

The final products of the Regional Housing and Workforce Study are a series of plans and supplementary documents that present community input and data related to the current condition of housing in the region. Regionally, there is a single plan that addresses the issues of the region as a whole. At the county level, a plan was created for each county. Locally, individual plans were created for forty cities and villages.
Housing Market Analysis

The Village of Monticello is located in northern Green County, in south-central Wisconsin. The population of Monticello is 1,217. The village located in close proximity to the City of Monroe (11 miles) and the City of Madison (30 miles), along State Highway 69. Monticello Public Schools is one of the largest employers in the village as well as Sugar River Cold Storage and Greenwoods State Bank.

Figure 1: Monticello, WI Location

Key Findings

The following sub-sections outline key findings derived from the comments of stakeholders. Stakeholder comments are summarized and presented as bullet points. In some instances, comments offer differing thoughts on the existing housing market. The sub-sections are organized by topics discussed by all stakeholder groups, with the exception of developer comments which are presented on their own. Some comments are supported by additional data gathered from national, state, and local sources. All data can be found in Appendices A, B, and C and all interview responses can be found in Appendices D and E.
Overall Housing Market Conditions

- The current housing market is characterized by the low inventory of homes and strong demand. This has created a “Seller’s Market” characterized by a tight Supply of “good” homes, leading to inflated values. The inflated values make it harder for buyers to qualify for mortgages. Some sellers do not want the contingency of finding another house if they sell their existing home.
- Some residents may be potential sellers but do not feel they would find suitable replacement housing in the same community.
- Strong demand for affordable low-maintenance, single-family housing, and high-end housing.
- Some stakeholders expect increased construction in the next ten years, although rising interest rates are expected to slow demand and cause housing prices to gradually decrease. Additionally, new construction may be limited without the creation of higher paying jobs.
- Overall, the physical condition of the housing stock in the county is fair to good.
- Housing affordable to first-time homebuyers tends to have significant maintenance issues. 25% - 35% of clients are first time homebuyers.
- Families with two incomes, people with strong incomes, middle and upper level management professionals can afford new single-family housing. Some people with existing homes can afford new homes.
- There is not enough affordable housing. The demand for affordable housing comes from seniors, and low-to-moderate income families. More units are needed for senior apartments. There is concern that a lack of affordable housing will lead to increased homelessness.
- The economy is shifting to rentals.
- When employment is high, there is a strong demand for workforce housing, which is currently the case in Wisconsin and nationally. Demand for workforce housing is high.
- New employees struggle to find housing and will often have to find housing outside of the community or even the county.

2016 data shows that Monticello has 559 existing housing units, an increase of approximately 16% since 1990. The trend in Monticello is a steady increase in the amount of housing units. Of the existing housing units, 540 were occupied and 19 were vacant in 2016. Overall, vacancy rates have been low since 1990, between 3% and 4%. Of the vacant units in the village, 1.4% of rental units were vacant and 2.4% of owner-occupied housing units were vacant. The low vacancy rate in the village supports an overall tight housing market and signals that there is demand for more housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Monticello – Total Housing Units¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 540 occupied housing units, 338 (61%) are owner occupied and 209 (39%) are renter occupied.

Of the housing units, single family structures represent the majority of units (72%). The amount of single-family homes in Monticello has steadily increased since 1980. The number of structures with 2-units, 3-4 units, 5-9 units, and 10+ has been stationary or, in some cases, has declined since 1980.  

Similar to Green County, and to all of southwest Wisconsin, the housing stock in Monticello is old. Approximately 36% of all housing units in the village were built prior to 1940. Available housing data identifies the ages of housing on the basis of the decade built, with the 1940s being the oldest decade identified, and all housing built prior to 1940 is grouped together. Another date of consequence when identifying the age of structures is 1978, the year that the sale of lead paint was banned for residential use. Approximately 78% of all housing units in the village were built prior to 1980, these units have a higher likelihood to contain lead-based paint.

---

Demographic Changes Impacting the Housing Market

- Older generations are selling their houses as they move into smaller places, assisted living, or nursing homes.
- Appropriate housing for an aging population is needed.
- First-time home buyers, seniors, and those with lower incomes are in the most need of affordable housing.
- Customers are looking to downsize or move to maintenance-free homes (older generation).
- Young families and seniors are demanding affordable housing.
- The existing housing does not meet the needs of the existing population. Older generations do not have options available to them, which causes them to stay in their homes for longer. This in turn causes a tighter market for first time home buyers.

According to the US Census Bureau, there are 131 households in Monticello with at least one person that is over the age 65, which is 24.3% of all households. Of the 131 households with an individual over the age 65, 69 of those households (53%) represent people 65 years of age and older that live alone. Overall, 12.85% of households in Monticello are occupied by an individual 65 years old or older living alone.5

| Table 8. Monticello – Households with One or More People Over 656 |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Households with 1+ person over 65 | 155  | 158  | 136  | 122  | 131  |
| % Households with 1+ person over 65 | 34.4% | 0.0% | 27.3% | 22.7% | 24.3% |

The table below is based on the State of Wisconsin Department of Administration’s (DOA) population and household projections for 2030. This is one method of projecting future housing demand. This analysis is driven by historical demographic trends and is a broad-based and objective forecast of future housing demand over the next 10 – 12 years. However, this method does not anticipate proposed and/or ongoing developments that will impact the population and number of households in community during the writing of this plan. For this reason, comments from economic developers and key stakeholders are utilized to develop a more complete story. The analysis begins with the number of households that DOA projects for the village in 2030. A household is an occupied housing unit. A healthy housing market will have a percentage of vacant units available, so this analysis adds 5% to account for a desired number of vacant units. Additionally, some housing will need to be replaced overtime for a variety of reasons such as rebuilding or unexpected issues such as fires, and so the analysis adds 0.5% to account for this. The number of households and desired vacant and replacement units accounts for a projected number of housing units in 2030. From that number, the existing housing units counted during the 2010 census and the number of building permits issued for new housing since 2010 are removed. The resulting number is an estimate of number of additional housing units to be built by 2030. Monticello should anticipate the need for an additional 38 housing units by 2030.

---


6 Ibid.
### Table 9. Monticello – Future Housing Demand Forecast

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2030 projected # of households</strong></td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ desired vacancy rate of 5%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ replacement housing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= required number of housing units</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Available number of housing units</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010 Census)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Units built 2010 – 2017</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= total housing units to be built for 2030</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table identifies the amount of land suitable for future housing development both within the municipal boundaries of the village and within the extra-territorial zoning (ETZ) boundary. The land suitability analysis identified land that may be suitable to future development by identifying the acreage and number of parcels that have a low-slope, are outside of environmental regulations (floodplains, wetlands, etc.), and within proximity to existing road infrastructure. The following table identifies that 90 acres exist within the village that may be suitable to development and there are 1,288 acres within the ETZ that may be suitable to development.

### Table 10. Monticello – Land Suitable for Future Housing Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Within Municipal Boundaries</th>
<th>Within ETZ Boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parcels</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than 1 acre</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 – 5.99 acres</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 – 10.99 acres</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 – 20.99 acres</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21 – 40 acres</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over 40 acres</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost and Affordability

- There is demand for housing under $180,000, entry level housing, senior condos, and ranch style homes.
- First-time home buyers have a hard time finding affordable housing under (defined by stakeholders as $100,000 and under).
- There is demand for homes in the $250,000 to $350,000 range.
- There are limited qualified buyers for homes above $300,000.
- Demand for homes under $160,000.
- Most needed housing is in the range of $80,000 - $100,000, also medium-priced housing between $100,000 and $160,000

---

7 Barroilhet, Dan and Egan-Robertson, David. *Minor Civil Division and Household Projections, 2010-2040*. Wisconsin Department of Administration, Demographic Services Center. 2013.

8 Barroilhet, Dan. *New Housing Starts Annual Survey 2010 – 2017*. Wisconsin Department of Administration, Demographic Services Center.
The median home value in Monticello in 2016 was $129,200, which is less than Green County’s median home value of $161,900. Just over half (51%) of home values in the village were between $100,000 - $150,000 and 16% of homes in the village were between $50,000 and $99,999. Additionally, the Multiple Listing Service Corporation reported an average sale price of a home in Green County in 2016 as $186,226, showing that increasing demand for housing is causing home sales prices to increase further.

A measure of housing affordability, specifically related to the availability of an affordable mortgage, is the ratio of home value to household income. Affordable housing has a ratio of home value to household income under 2.5. If the ratio of home value to household income exceeds 2.5, housing expenses are considered unaffordable. Monticello’s median household income in 2016 was $50,682. The following table identifies the affordability gap for owner-occupied housing and rental housing in Monticello. The table identifies that households with the median income for Monticello will have a gap of $2,245 between an affordable mortgage and the median home value in the village. The analysis for renters shows that rental units remain affordable for those making the median household income.

The following table identifies a 2015 estimate of the number of households with an income less than the median for Monticello, and if they are renters or owners. This table shows renter-occupied households are more likely to have an income less than the median in Monticello, although owners outnumber renters in two income ranges, 80% to 100% and 30% to 50% of median household income.

---

Table 12. Monticello – Residents with household income less than median\textsuperscript{12}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household income &lt;= 30% median income</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household income &gt;30% to &lt;= 50% median income</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income &gt;50% to &lt;= 80% median income</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income &gt;80% to &lt;= 100% median income</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, an analysis of Green County residents shows approximately 49% of residents require three-times their median income to purchase a home at the median home value in Green County. Over the past five years, 1508 new jobs were created in Green County. Of those newly created jobs, approximately 46% of those occupations require three times their annual income to purchase a home at the median home value in Green County. The analysis of existing and new jobs in Green County shows an existing and future demand for workforce housing based on the existing occupations and future occupations being created in the county.\textsuperscript{13}

Another metric available to examine housing affordability is the data available on the State of Wisconsin’s Homestead Tax Credit. The Homestead Tax Credit is a benefit available for renters and homeowners with low or moderate incomes designed to lessen the impact of rent and property taxes. To be eligible for the tax credit an applicant must rent or own a home that is their primary residence. In 2016, Monticello had 54 homestead tax credit claims, this is approximately 4.4% of residents.

**Housing Preferences**

- Proximity to employment, schools, and childcare is important, although some prefer living in the country.
- Single family homes are in the greatest demand. Ranch style homes are in strong demand as people age.
- Housing that is safe and clean, without a lot of needed repairs is in demand.
- Neighborhoods need to be built with a different mindset – smaller lots, smaller homes, and more affordable.
- There is demand for single-family houses in the region but that demand does not line up with the economics. The narrative of apartments needs to change.

As mentioned in our stakeholder comments, schools are a driving force for where young families choose to locate. The maps below indicate that over the past 10 and 18 years, the Monticello district has experienced decreases in enrollment. Over the past 10 years, the district enrollment decreased by 44 or 10% overall and since 2000, the district decreased by 100 students, or by 23% overall.\textsuperscript{14} The 2017 – 2018 School District Report Card for Monticello was positive and rated the district exceeding expectations overall.\textsuperscript{15}


\textsuperscript{14} State of Wisconsin, Department of Public Instruction. *School District Enrollment Data 2000 – 2018*.

Figure 4: School Enrollment Net Change 2009-2018.
Barriers to Home Buying

- First-time home buyers have a hard time securing a loan, in part due to the repair requirements and conditions of the houses in their price range.
- Student debt is a significant barrier to first time homeownership.
- First time home buyers often lack a down payment and closing cost funds, as well as a reserve for lower priced homes requiring maintenance.
- Low income or first-time home buyers have a hard time securing a loan, in part due to the repair requirements and conditions of the houses in their price range.

Developer Insights

The following bullet points are taken from eleven interviews done with a variety of developers. The targeted had either worked in or expressed interest in working in southwest Wisconsin. A complete list of developer comments can be viewed in Appendix E.

- Communities should make the process for developers easier and more attractive.
- Construction costs are out of control due to demand for materials and labor. If building costs continue to rise, it will result in a lack of affordable housing. Construction costs are high for both single-family homes and for multi-family.
- Rising interest rates are a barrier to new home construction. Rising interest rates make financing projects more
expensive.
• Cost is more than the purchase of existing homes.
• All of Green County is eligible for programs that focus on rural areas.
• Developers receive little assistance from municipalities and cannot afford the cost of building specifically for a small percentage of homebuyers that do not make a lot of money.
• There is an opportunity to meet the need for affordable rental housing and lower priced single-family homes.
• Future demand appears strong, although some developers believe multi-family housing is being overbuilt in larger cities throughout the state and will cause a crash in multi-family construction for the entire state.
• Cities and villages need to remove red tape for developers.
• City-owned land is attractive to developers because it means the city controls the land and it makes the process move quicker.
• Cities and villages need to make the investment in their future. If cities bought the land and installed the utilities, it would be more attractive to developers.
• Trust. Communities need to trust developers are their partners. Demand for workforce housing is high.
• Businesses need to pressure local government and be vocal about the need for additional housing. Get buy-in from local growth industries.
• Housing needs to be part of economic development agenda.
• Incentives are needed to bridge the gap
• Infill development is attractive, especially if multiple grant funding opportunities exist such as historic tax credits or brownfield redevelopment.
• If Cities and villages “do the math” for the developers. If the city has a desired purchase price for a home, they will need to work with developers to reach that end goal.
• Cities and villages need to plan ahead and zone for multi-family.

The following table identifies the amount of land suitable for future housing development both within the municipal boundaries of the village and within the extra-territorial zoning (ETZ) boundary. The land suitability analysis identified land that may be suitable to future development by identifying the acreage and number of parcels that have a low-slope, are outside of environmental regulations (floodplains, wetlands, etc.), and within proximity to existing road infrastructure. The following table identifies that 90 acres exist within the village that may be suitable to development and there are 1,288 acres within the ETZ that may be suitable to development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Within Municipal Boundaries</th>
<th>Within ETZ Boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parcels</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 acre</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5.99 acres</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10.99 acres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 20.99 acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 40 acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40 acres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations and Implementation

The following section was developed in response to what was heard in stakeholder interviews and what was determined through data analysis. A principal reason for undertaking the study is current housing supply may not be meeting the current demand, both in terms of amount of housing and in terms of type of housing. For many municipalities this was confirmed through stakeholder interviews and data analysis. The following strategies and actions are meant to inform municipalities of their options to address the gaps in the private housing market. The local municipality and county economic development staff are largely responsible for determining the extent to which they are willing to act towards adjusting the market to incentivize private housing investment in the community.

1. Current housing markets require community investment to address gaps in private housing development.

   **Existing Condition:** Housing development is not a universally accepted or acknowledged role of traditional economic development agencies or municipalities in southwest Wisconsin. However, the current economy in southwest Wisconsin is constricted by a lack of workforce, which is itself tied to a lack of quality affordable housing. The existing housing market requires community investment to address gaps in private housing development. Municipalities, counties, and county economic development organizations have different levels of authority and ability to act in the housing market.

   - **Action:** Identify responsibilities and roles at the community level to undertake the recommendations of this study.
   - **Action:** Identify key stakeholders who are committed and concerned with addressing housing and workforce issues. This may include local businesses, local realtors, lenders, and government officials. These stakeholders should form a local housing committee focused on attaining additional housing.
   - **Action:** Work with the county and county economic development organizations to address housing issues identified in this study.
   - **Action:** Update housing study document with new data following the 2020 census.

2. Incentivize housing developers.

   **Existing Condition:** The overall market in southwest Wisconsin is not as attractive for developers as the more urban areas due to lack of population density, disinterest by many municipalities in getting involved in the market, and outdated regulations and zoning ordinances. Additionally, developers cited recent increases in construction costs and interest rates as a barrier to development. To address the increased cost developers will look for incentives to work in smaller communities.

   - **Action:** Ask local growth industries and large employers in the community to advocate for additional housing in the community through written commitment or other means to establish “buy-in.”
   - **Action:** Develop a marketing strategy to inform potential developers of potential incentives, community “buy-in”, available land, and the need for additional housing.
   - **Action:** Invite developers to visit the community and discuss what they need in order to profitably invest in new housing.
   - **Action:** Create a culture that welcomes and incentivizes investment in the region by housing developers through long-range land-use planning and marketing of the specific needs of the community (income, ages, etc.).
3. Address issues associated with the demographic changes that impact the housing market and housing preferences.

**Existing Condition:** Based on demographic data, the village should anticipate the need for an additional 38 housing units by 2030. Local improvements and growing housing demand extending from the Madison market will likely increase need for housing.

- **Action:** Regional agencies can assist with identifying buildable lots. A database should be developed and shared with developers. The initial step is identifying the parcels most suitable to construction. GIS software can assist in identifying parcels with low-slope, outside of environmental regulations, and within proximity to existing road infrastructure. Following the identification of parcels, additional discussion can occur regarding subjective elements of development.
- **Action:** Create a database of developers the community has worked with in the past or have shown interest in working with the community.
- **Action:** Implement a housing marketing strategy by targeting identified developers with key information such as available land, incentives, community and local business “buy-in”. Invite developers to your community.
- **Action:** Review the community’s future capital improvement investments with the developer to determine what future investments may be moved forward to leverage investments and reduce gap financing.
- **Action:** Identify in-fill areas or future land near commercial downtowns and schools for new housing. Incorporate this in a future land use map and update the comprehensive plan accordingly.

**Existing Condition:** Based on stakeholder comments and data, new housing units are needed that are affordable for the growing population of fixed-income seniors. Data demonstrates the sale price of housing is often greater than the median home values in the community, and the majority of home values in the community are in the range of affordable housing, between $50,000 and $150,000. In short, this means much of the affordable housing is occupied. Furthermore, data suggests residents of owner-occupied housing are more likely to have a median income less than renter occupied households. Creating housing for the growing senior population is likely to open up existing affordable homes.

- **Action:** Work with developers to determine options available for senior housing, including number of units, unit cost, and other financial incentives.
- **Action:** Gather input from existing homeowners through a targeted survey to identify future housing preferences of older homeowners.

4. Address issues of housing costs and affordability.

**Existing Condition:** New housing units are needed to accommodate the incomes of existing and projected occupations. Affordable housing is needed to attract future business development. Stakeholder identified affordable single-family housing as $100,000 and under. A balance of homes for seniors and workforce is desired, with most to be closer to amenities with smaller grounds to care for, and some larger homes for those with larger incomes.
Existing Condition: Data suggests existing owner-occupied households are more likely to have median incomes lower than existing renter occupied housing. This data along with an aging population suggests demand for additional multi-family renter-occupied housing units.

- **Action:** Meet with local businesses to determine the incomes of workforce to identify housing costs appropriate to the existing and future workforce.
- **Action:** Review and revise zoning ordinances to allow for mixed-use commercial and residential units in or near the downtown to allow for smaller, more affordable, mixed-income, and inter-generational housing opportunities.
- **Action:** Develop a catalog of housing types and costs with input from developers. Determine costs that could be borne or off-set to buy-down cost of development and incentivize investment by communities.
- **Action:** Meet with developers to determine what gap financing amounts are needed to make a project work in the community.
- **Action:** Establish a desired purchase price for new housing and rental rates. Work with developers to “do the math” to determine what incentives are needed to reach those goals.
- **Action:** Develop a set of tools and a database of state and federal programs designed to meet this gap.
- **Action:** Keep existing TIDs open for additional year to raise funds for affordable housing programs or to assist in funding costs for existing housing programs.

5. Work to address issues associated with the purchase of existing homes.

**Existing Condition:** Existing housing stock is old, and affordable housing is in need of repairs. Maintenance or costs to update are often a barrier to first-time home owners since they increase the borrowing amount, and therefore down payments.

- **Action:** With input from realtors, develop a set of conditions that appear to be the largest investments needed in old housing, and develop associated costs with input from developers and builders. This will form a database to inform investments needed in existing housing.
- **Action:** Develop local funding to off-set or cover costs needed to make existing housing livable for young families or seniors. This could include low or no-interest loans, down-payment assistance grants conditional upon home ownership and/or improvements, partnerships with industry needed to incentivize workforce, etc. Existing TIF districts should be kept open for an additional year to fund affordable housing programs.
- **Action:** Work with local realtors and banks to establish and educate prospective homebuyers and local developers on 203(k) “Purchase and Renovate” loans. These loans allow home buyers to secure a loan for the estimated appraised value of a home after renovations. This lending tool allows banks to lend money above the current appraised value of a home after a 203(k) consultant reviews the financial feasibility of the renovation project.