## University Neighborhood Overlay District (overview)

The UNO district is Austin's first "form based code". It was enacted in September 2004 as a part of the Combined Central Austin Neighborhood Plan. UNO is an incentive based redevelopment program that was carefully developed by the stake holder group to require public benefits in exchange for increased development rights. The goal was to develop a high density mixed use urban pedestrian housing area for students who were primarily attending the University of Texas at Austin. UNO has 4 sub districts; Dobie, Guadalupe, Inner West Campus, and Outer West Campus. Each of these districts has different allowable maximum heights (see attached height map). UNO relaxed numerous zoning requirements in exchange for streetscape, design, and affordability requirements. The program was/is voluntary. At the Site Plan stage a project indicates whether it is applying to be processed as an UNO project and secures a SMART Housing Certification letter from NHCD.

## AFFORDABILITY:

Paragraph 25-2-765 Affordable Housing; sets out the affordability requirements:

1) Multifamily projects for a period of 15 yrs from date of $C O$ must set aside on site:
a. $10 \%$ of the dwelling units to a household to house persons whose income is $80 \%$ of the median income of the Austin statistical metropolitan area, as determined by director of NHCD, and
b. Provide an additional $10 \%$ of the dwelling units to a household to house persons whose house hold income is less than $65 \%$ of the income as set forth in (a.), except
2) The UNO Housing Trust Fund is established to provide affordable housing in the district and a development can waive 1 (b) by paying a onetime fee of $\$ .50$ per foot of net rentable floor area into said fund.
3) The fund could be used by developments that provided units at $50 \%$ of median income.

## Additionally:

25-2-756 (B) provided an additional 15 ft of height in the Outer West Campus Sub-district if;
a) The project was on land with at least a 50 UNO height limit
b) The project set aside on site an additional $10 \%$ of the units at $50 \%$ of median for 15 years. RESULTS:

2004-2009 Nineteen, 19, UNO projects have been completed ( $\$ 1,300,000.00$ Trust Fund)
a) The College Houses Super Co-op: 176 beds of affordable housing at or below 50\%
b) 16 projects; 1,898 units and 4,529 bedrooms (paid into Trust Fund)
c) 2 projects chose to get the 15 ft height increase 240 units, 492 bedrooms
d) 214 units at $80 \%$ and 49 at $50 \%$ in the "for profit developments"

ISSUES;

The current system of using the HUD Median Income Information is problematic when applied to students.

1) HUD information is produced in April of May of each year. Student leases are typically signed before January of each year for the following fall school term.
2) Students are not "Households" in the traditional meaning and the table makes it impossible to have the least expensive units per person ( $3-4$ bedrooms) available for SMART Housing because the rental rate for the unit based upon HUD is too low.
3) Each student in the unit must be qualified as needy as defined by the income tables and additionally pay no more than $28 \%$ of their monthly income for housing.
4) Developers, to overcome this problem, have chosen to lease there most desirable units (efficiencies and one bed room units) as the SMART Housing Units.
5) The " $80 \%$ affordable rate" using the HUD Income is $\$ 957$ per month and the 1 person house hold income is over $\$ 40,000.00$ annually. These are not the students that need SMART Housing units.

## NEW PROPOSAL:

To increase the number of students receiving assistance by SMART Housing and to lower the cost of the housing, the University Area Partners formed a task group of all the stake holders. The task force offers the following proposal to be adopted as the new requirement for Affordability in the UNO District.

1) Adopt the University Of Texas Undergraduate Cost Of Attendance for housing to replace the HUD rate. (This rate is relevant to the cost of housing students and is adjusted annually. It is also published on a timely basis and if accessible to students and potential students and parents.)
2) Adopt the need based financial aid letter as provided by the institution of higher learning (UT, ACC, St Edwards, or other qualified institutions) as the income qualifying documentation for a student to be eligible for the SMART Housing.
3) Change from "by the unit" to by the bedroom" for affordability. (This increases the number of students to be served, allows a lower rate to be charged, and allows the most expensive units (efficiencies and one bedrooms) to be leased at market rates. (Although not counted as two affordable students ; doubling up in apartments is encouraged if requests by the applying students)
4) Require all new UNO projects to provide $10 \%$ of the bedrooms onsite for SMART Housing
5) Require these bedrooms to be leased at $75 \%$ of the Undergraduate Cost of Attendance (UCA).
6) Require every new UNO project to pay a fee of $\$ 1.00$ per conditioned residential space into the UNO Affordable Housing Trust Fund. (Fee to be adjusted annually by Austin's CPI)(no project has chosen to built $10 \%$ of the units at $65 \%$ of the median rate)
7) Require an increase of the affordability period from 15 years to 40 years.
8) Amend the bonus height provision from 15 feet to 24 ft in all UNO districts that have an allowable height of at least 45 feet.
9) Require any project that receives a bonus height to provide onsite an additional $10 \%$ of the bedrooms at $55 \%$ of the UCA.
10) UNO Housing Trust Funds will be used to fund projects in UNO that provide $40 \%$ of their beds (for co-ops) or $40 \%$ of their bedrooms at $55 \%$ of the UCA for a period of 40 years.
11) To encourage additional affordability, SMART Housing bedrooms may be leased for double occupancy; provided, that the rental rate for the bedroom shall not exceed $110 \%$ of the required SMART Housing rental rate. Additionally, credit for SMART Housing compliance shall consider such bedrooms whether singly, or doubly, occupied to be "one bedroom".

## EXISTING PROJECTS:

1) Existing projects may voluntarily chose to utilize the new program provided they follow the above requirements except as follows:
a. Existing projects would not be required to pay any additional fee into the UNO Affordability Trust Fund (they have already paid).
b. The term for providing the SMART Housing affordable units would be 20 additional years (starting when the project requested to NHCD in writing that they chose to utilize this modified program).
c. Existing Projects that choose this new approach will:
i. Be forgiven of any previous or pending non-compliance as it relates to providing SMART Housing, and
ii. Be required to provide $10 \%$ of the bedrooms at $75 \%$ of the UCA, and
iii. Be required to provide $10 \%$ of the bedrooms at $55 \%$ of the UCA if they have received the 15 ft height bonus.

## ANTICIPATED BENEFITS:

1) Lower-income students served
2) More students served on each UNO site, with at least a doubling anticipated at each participating location
3) Lower rents for lower-income students
4) Longer term affordability
5) Ease of administration and monitoring that encourages UNO participation
6) Clearer path for monitors (NHCD) to identify non-compliant sites and initiate appropriate enforcement action
7) On-going income provided to Housing Trust Fund as new projects are developed at a rate identified by the outside consultant.


INCOME LIMITS BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE
BASED ON HUD MEDIAN INCOME INFORMATION
AS OF 05/14/10

| \% of Median <br> Income | 1 person | 2 person | 3 person | 4 person |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $30 \%$ | $15,550.00$ | $17,750.00$ | $19,950.00$ | $22,150.00$ |
| $40 \%$ | $20,680.00$ | $23,640.00$ | $26,600.00$ | $29,520.00$ |
| $50 \%$ | $25,850.00$ | $29,550.00$ | $33,250.00$ | $36,900.00$ |
| $60 \%$ | $31,020.00$ | $35,460.00$ | $39,900.00$ | $44,280.00$ |
| $80 \%$ | $41,350.00$ | $47,250.00$ | $53,150.00$ | $59,050.00$ |
| $100 \%$ | $51,660.00$ | $59,040.00$ | $66,420.00$ | $73,800.00$ |

## Maximum Rent Per Person Based on Units

|  | 1 br /1 bed | 2 br /2 beds | 3br/3 beds | 4 br/4 beds |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ | 388.75 | 221.88 | 166.25 | 138.44 |
| $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ | 517.00 | 295.50 | 221.67 | 184.50 |
| $50 \%$ | 646.25 | 369.38 | 277.08 | 230.63 |
| $60 \%$ | 775.50 | 443.25 | 332.50 | 276.75 |
| $80 \%$ | $1,033.75$ | 590.63 | 442.92 | 369.06 |
| $100 \%$ | $1,291.50$ | 738.00 | 553.50 | 461.25 |

## Maximum Rent Per Person Based on Beds

|  | 1 br /1 bed | 2 br /2 beds | 3br/3 beds | 4 br/4 beds |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 388.75 | 388.75 | 388.75 | 388.75 |
| $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ | 517.00 | 517.00 | 517.00 | 517.00 |
| $50 \%$ | 646.25 | 646.25 | 646.25 | 646.25 |
| $60 \%$ | 775.50 | 775.50 | 775.50 | 775.50 |
| $80 \%$ | $1,033.75$ | $1,033.75$ | $1,033.75$ | $1,033.75$ |
| $100 \%$ | $1,291.50$ | $1,291.50$ | $1,291.50$ | $1,291.50$ |

Under UNO we must offer $10 \%$ of our UNITS at the $80 \%$ MFI.

We have 670 units - therefore, 67 S.M.A.R.T. housing units

The highest income level at the current $80 \%$ mark is $\$ 41,350$

The most we can charge for rent is $28 \%$ of their annual income.
$\$ 41,350 \times 28 \%=\$ 11,578$
So, for a 12-month lease agreement we can charge up to $\$ 965$.
A student's income can be from employment, grants/loans (less tuition) and/or parental contribution (up to 30\%). See below:

| Income | + | Grants / Loans | + | Parental Support | - | Tuition | = | Annual income |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| w2 or 3 recent |  | Financial Aid Award Letter |  | Limited to $30 \%$ of |  | Copy of |  |  |
| paystubs or the |  |  |  | annual income |  |  |  |  |
| Employer Affidavit notarized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Most of the students who have need-based financial aid fall closer to the $50 \% \mathrm{MFI}$ level with an annual income around $\$ 25,000$.

Under the current guidelines, they would qualify for SMART housing. However, we could only charge them $\$ 583$ per month.

Market rent on our 1 bedroom apartments is around $\$ 1200$ per month.

Market rent on our 4 bedroom apartments is around $\$ 700$ per bedroom or $\$ 2800$ per unit per month.

Since the loss is substantially less on the one bedroom apartments, we utilize these for our SMART housing requirements.

The program sets the CEILING, but not the FLOOR. We do not gain more by leasing to someone at the $50 \%$ level versus the $80 \%$ level. To minimize rental income loss, we work hard to find those who qualify at the upper level of the parameters.

Unfortunately, those who can pay the $\$ 965$ per month are not truly those with need. Those that truly have need would much prefer to lease a bedroom in a 4-bedroom apartment at the market rate of $\$ 700$. These students typically enter into a dual-
occupancy lease where they share that bedroom with another student further reducing their rent to a more comfortable $\$ 350$.

Our 1 bedroom apartments are our most dense $\$ / s f$ unit. These are our premium units. We lose a good number of them to the program.

If we were able to revise the program so that in lieu of $10 \%$ of our UNITS at the $80 \%$ level, we offer $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ of our BEDROOMS at the $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ level, we could:

- Impact the students with proven need - those at the $50 \% \mathrm{MFI}$
- Increase the number of students who are able to be assisted under the program $-10 \%$ of our units $=67$ students benefit $-10 \%$ of our beds $=155$ students benefit. This is an increase of $231 \%$
- Reduce the loss to the developers:

| 1-Bedroom UNIT |
| :--- |
| $\$ 1200$ market rent |
| less |
| $\$ 965$ (max rent under 80\%) |
| $\$ 235$ loss to owner |
| $X$ |
| 67 SMART units |
| $\$ 15,745$ monthly loss |
| $X$ |
| 12 -month lease |
| $\$ 188,940$ total annual loss |

4-Bedroom BEDROOM
\$700 market rent less
\$603 (max rent under 50\%)
\$97 loss to owner
X
155 SMART beds
$\$ 15,035$ monthly loss
X
12-month lease
\$180,420 total annual loss

Another hurdle on-site operators are facing is the administrative burden to qualify the students. We would like to allow any student who has already been identified through the US Dept of Education as need-based to be eligible for the program. These students have already provided proof of need through the detailed FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid). Amending the approval process to allow immediate recognition would enhance the workflow and aid in ensuring the financial information presented is fair and accurate.

## MACK E.

SMART Housing Analysis Quarters Phase




| Block on 28ih |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of Student Assisted Under Current Program | Average Rent Under Current Progrom | Revenue Loss to the Asset Under Current Program | a of Student Assisted Under REVISED PROGRAM | Average Rent Under REVISED PROGRAM | Revenue Loss to the Assel Under REVISED PROGRAM |
| 10 | \$957 | -\$16.380 | 21 | \$709 | - 811.352 |


| Block on 25th |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of Student Assisted Under Current Program | Average Rent Under Current Program | Revenue Loss to the Asset Under Current Progrom | \# of Student Assisted Under REVISED PROGRAM | Average Rent Under REVISED PROGRAM | Revenue Loss ic the Assel Under REVISED PROGRAM |
| 16 | \$957 | -\$54,216 | 42 | \$709 | -\$55.044 |


|  | Block on Leon |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of Student <br> Assisted Under <br> Current <br> Program | Average Rent <br> Under Current <br> Program | Revenue Loss to <br> the Asset Under <br> Current <br> Program | \# of Student <br> Assisted Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM | Average Rent <br> Under REVISED <br> PROGRAM | Revenue Loss to <br> The Asset Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM |  |
| 27 | $\$ 957 / \$ 599$ | $-\$ 102.876$ | 55 | $\$ 709 / \$ 520$ | $-\$ 66.936$ |  |


| Block on 23rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of Student | Averoge Rent | Revenue Loss to <br> Assisted Under <br> Current <br> Program | Under Current <br> Program | Current <br> Program | \# Student <br> Assisted Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM | Average <br> Rent Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM | | Revenue Loss to Asset Under |
| :---: |
| REVISED |
| PROGRAM |


| Block on Pearl |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of Studeni Assisted Under Current Program | Average Rent Under Current Program | Revenue Loss to the Asset Under Current Program | a of student Assisted Under REVISED PROGRAM | Average Rent Under REVISED PROGRAM | Revenue Loss io the Asset Under REVISED PROGRAM |
| 10 | \$957 | - \$23,820 | 21 | \$709 | -\$15.252 |


|  | Block on Rio |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of Student <br> Assisted Under <br> Current <br> Program | Average Rent <br> Under Current <br> Program | Revenue Loss to <br> the Asset Under <br> Current <br> Program | \# of Student <br> Assisled Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM | Average <br> Rent Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM | Revenue Loss to <br> The Assel Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM |
| 18 | $\$ 957 / \$ 599$ | $-\$ 64,032$ | 45 | $\$ 709 / \$ 520$ | $-\$ 62.4 .96$ |


| The Block Phase I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# ol Student <br> Assisted Under <br> Current <br> Program | Average Rent <br> Under Current <br> Program | Revenue Loss to <br> the Asset Under <br> Current <br> Program | \# ol Student <br> Assisled Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM | Average Rent <br> Under REVISED <br> PROGRAM | Revenue Loss to <br> The ASsel Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM |  |  |
| 47 | $\$ 957 / \$ 599$ | $-\$ 143.076$ | 97 | $\$ 709 / \$ 520$ | $-\$ 93.540$ |  |  |


| The Block Phase II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of Student <br> Assisted Under <br> Current <br> Program | Average Rent <br> Under Current <br> Program | Revenue Loss to <br> the Asset Under <br> Current <br> Program | \# of Student <br> Assisted Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM | Average <br> Rent Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM | Revenue Loss to <br> the Asset Under <br> REVISED <br> PROGRAM |  |  |  |
| 44 | $\$ 957 / \$ 599$ | $\$ 149.748$ | 109 | $\$ 709 / \$ 520$ | $-\$ 148.284$ |  |  |  |


| Total Block Portolio |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of Student Assisted Under Current Program | Average Rent Under Current Program | Revenue Loss to the Asset Under Curent Program | \# of Student Assisted Under REVISED PROGRAM | Average Rent Under REVISED PROGRAM | Revenue Loss to the Assel Under REVISED PROGRAM |
| 91 | \$957/\$599 | -\$292,824 | 206 | \$709/\$520 | -\$241,824 |

WHST CAMPIS - M.ARKHIT SLMMARY

| 5/29/2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Properis <br> Information | Beds | Bath | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tutal } \\ & \text { Inits } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { Beds } \end{aligned}$ | NRS: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { NRs: } \end{aligned}$ | Avg. <br> Base Ratc | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NRSF } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | Fall '10 Occupancy | Pall'I1 <br> Prolense | Conc. | 1.acitor | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ip Front } \\ \text { Fece } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate } \\ \text { Guarantee } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | Jefferson 26 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 367 | 1,026 | 1,094 | 401,613 | \$768 | \$1.96 | 91.1\% | 86.9\% | So | \$250 | \$250 | 12/31/2010 |
| 2 | Jefferson West | 3.4 | 3.4 | 76 | 388 | 1,520 | 115,532 | 579 | 1.94 | 99.2\% | 86.1\% | 0 | 250 | 250 | 12/31/2010 |
| 3 | Quarters - Ph. I | 1.9 | 1.9 | 252 | 478 | 925 | 233,194 | 909 | 1.86 | 99.8\% | 81.0\% | 0 | 250 | 250 | 0 |
| 4 | Quarters - Karnes | 2.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 24 | 1,033 | 12,400 | 1,400 | 2.71 | 99.8\% | 81.0\% | 0 | 250 | 250 | 0 |
| 5 | Quarters-Grayson | 2.0 | 2.0 | 101 | 197 | 889 | 89.809 | 853 | 187 | 99\%\% | 81.0\% | 0 | 250 | 250 | 0 |
| 6 | Quarters - Nueces | 2.0 | 20 | 217 | 436 | 946 | 205,211 | 865 | 1.84 | 99.8\% | 81.0\% | 0 | 250 | 250 | 0 |
| 7 | Block - Pearl (Ph. I) | 2.1 | 1.9 | 96 | 202 | 921 | 88,370 | 813 | 186 | 98.7\% | 81.4\% | 0 | 300 | 250 | 0 |
| 8 | Block - Leon (Ph. 1) | 2.0 | 19 | 139 | 284 | 947 | 131,660 | 770 | 166 | 98.7\% | $814 \%$ | 0 | 300 | 250 | 0 |
| 9 | Block - 28th (Ph. I) | 21 | 2.0 | 101 | 208 | 928 | 93.697 | 771 | 1.71 | 98.7\% | 81.4\% | 0 | 300 | 250 | O |
| 10 | Block - Rio Grande (Ph. II) | 2.7 | 2.4 | 85 | 227 | 1.146 | 97,439 | 724 | 169 | 98.7\% | 81.4\% | 0 | 300 | 250 | 0 |
| 11 | Block - 23 rd (Ph . II) | 24 | 22 | 92 | 220 | 990 | 91,086 | 751 | 181 | 98.7\% | 81.4\% | 0 | 300 | 250 | 0 |
| 12 | Block - $25 \operatorname{th}$ ( Ph II) | 27 | 23 | 179 | 481 | 1,234 | 221,149 | 846 | 184 | 98.7\% | $814 \%$ | 0 | 300 | 250 |  |
| 14 | Villas on Guadalupe | 23 | 20 | 148 | 345 | 1,028 | 152.150 | 873 | 198 | 970\% | 80 8\% | 0 | 250 | 199 |  |
| 15 | Venue on Guadalupe | 1.9 | 1.9 | 75 | 146 | 1.109 | 83,149 | 945 | 166 | 100\% | 870\% | 0 | 250 | 100 | 0 |
| 16 | Texan - West Campus | 28 | 22 | 44 | 124 | 1,196 | 52,641 | 718 | 169 | 1000\% | 100\%\% | 0 | 360 | 50 | 0 |
| 17 | Texan - Pearl | 20 | 18 | 78 | 156 | 883 | 68,836 | 808 | 183 | 1000\% | 930\% | 0 | 931 | 100 | 0 |
| 18 | Texan - Shoal Creek | 19 | 18 | 79 | 148 | 922 | 72.815 | 903 | 184 | 100.0\% | 90.0\% | 0 | 948 | 100 |  |
| 19 | Vintage West Campus | 20 | 20 | 62 | 121 | 865 | 53,656 | 935 | 211 | 1000\% | $920 \%$ | 0 | 468 | 50 | O |
| 20 | 21 Rio | 1.9 | 17 | 158 | 301 | 1,098 | 173,523 | 1,065 | 185 | 98.0\% | 51.1\% | 0 | 300 | 100 | 0 |
| Totals / | rages: | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.361 | 5,512 | 1,032 | 2,437,930 | S821 | \$1.86 | 97.6\% | 82.3\% | s0 | S313 | \$217 |  |

