TABLE 3-1

PIKE COUNTY

HOUSEHOLDS AND POPULATION PER HOUSEHOLD, 1970 – 2030

YEAR	POPULATION	GROUP QUARTERS*	HOUSEHOLDS	PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD
1970	61,059	N/A	17,335	3.55
1980	81,123	329	26,466	3.05
1990	72,583	754	26,148	2.75
2000	68,736	810	27,612	2.46
2005	67,406	985	27,908	2.38
2010	65,532	880	27,988	2.31
2015	63,777	968	27,669	2.27
2020	61,952	966	26,866	2.27
2025	60,082	967	26,042	2.27
2030	58,001	965	25,126	2.27

Source: U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 1970 - 2000
"Kentucky Population Projections" by Michael Price, Kentucky State Demographer

* Persons in group quarters 2005 - 2030 is derived by multiplying the persons per household and households and then subtracting the results from the total population.

TABLE 3-2

PIKEVILLE

HOUSEHOLDS AND POPULATION PER HOUSEHOLD, 1970 – 2030

YEAR	POPULATION	GROUP QUARTERS	HOUSEHOLDS	PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD
1970	4,576	296	1,547	2.89
1980	4,756	278	1,825	2.45
1990	6,324	387	2,552	2.33
2000	6,295	512	2,705	2.14
2010	6,003	512	2,566	2.14
2020	5,672	512	2,411	2.14
2030	5,310	512	2,242	2.14

Source: U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 1970 - 2000

but not the children of the female head of house (i.e. grandchildren, nieces/nephews, younger siblings, cousins, etc.); only 1.4% of children living in married couple families fall into that category.

The overall rate of home ownership within the City is relatively low: less than half of occupied units are owner-occupied, at 47.4%. Home ownership is most restricted among single person households (only 48.9% own), and households of seven persons or more (only 8.3% own). However, these figures may be somewhat misleading when adjusted for the most likely portion of the population to be homeowners, those wage-earners, as noted below.

Housing characteristics: Within the City, the majority of housing units are single families homes, although 17.15% (464) are multi-unit complexes administered by the Pikeville Housing Authority and serving special needs populations within the city: Myers Tower provides 200 apartments to the elderly, near elderly and disabled; Fairview Court has 40 apartments for the elderly and disabled and 48 designated for low-income household; Hames Park has another 48 apartments for low-income households; Northgate Apartments offers 68 units available to households qualifying for Section 8 Housing Vouchers; and the Kentucky Avenue Apartments Phases II and IV provide 60 attractive townhouses for low income families, including those qualifying for Sections 8 Housing vouchers. In addition, there are privately owned multi-unit complexes, bringing the total number of households in multi-unit complexes to 1122, or 41.5% of the household units in the City.

TABLE 3-3

PIKE COUNTY

TENURE BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE, 2000

	OWN	%	RENT	%	TOTAL
Total Occupied Units	21,729	78.7%	5,583	21.3%	27,612
1 person households	4,567	68.5%	2,099	31.5%	6,666
2 persons households	7,792	83.2%	1,575	16.8%	9,367
3 persons households	4,800	80.0%	1,197	20.0%	5,997
4 persons households	3,345	82.8%	695	17.2%	4,040
5 persons households	922	79.1%	244	20.9%	1,166
6 persons households	227	81.7%	51	18.3%	278
7 + persons households	76	77.6%	22	22.4%	98

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 2000

Home ownership is predictably lower among lower-income households: although households with incomes under $25,000 make up more than half of total households, they have only 22.5% ownership as compared 76.8% ownership for households with incomes of $25,000 and above. This is in large part a reflection of the population distribution, particularly the number of residents age 65 and older, as well a small number of transient college and medical school students. While home ownership may not be a reality for many persons in that income range, it is important to consider a number of housing alternatives in all price ranges, including lower priced condominiums and townhouses that could be purchased, especially as the population of the city ages.

A more accurate reflection of home ownership is to consider the mean income based on earnings rather than the overall median income that includes persons on fixed incomes who are generally not expected to achieve home ownership. According to the 2000 Census the mean income based on earnings for households within the City was $56,366.

TABLE 3-4

PIKEVILLE

TENURE BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE, 2000

	OWN	%	RENT	%	TOTAL
Total Occupied Units	1,283	47.4%	719	52.6%	2,705
1 person households	337	48.9%	352	51.1%	689
2 persons households	440	69.0%	198	31.0%	638
3 persons households	250	71.4%	100	28.6%	350
4 persons households	180	81.4%	41	18.6%	221
5 persons households	65	89.0%	8	11.0%	73
6 persons households	9	69.2%	4	30.8%	13
7 + persons households	2	8.3%	22	91.7%	24

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 2000

Based on the common rule that householders spend three times what they earn on housing, that means the highest demand for housing ownership should be in the $170,000 range. In fact, home ownership in the $50,000 - $75,000 income range is 72%, and it is even higher in the $25,000 - $50,000 range, at 74.0%. Thus, homeownership within the City among those households able to afford to purchase housing is in fact comparable to the rest of the state and nation.

The lower rate of home ownership may also reflect the relatively expensive housing market in Pikeville. Housing costs more than in other areas for several reasons: the availability of land that for residential development has always been limited by the geography of the area, driving land prices up; actual construction costs are also relatively expensive, a result of the need to extend utility services, the slightly higher price of raw materials; and the basic supply and demand relationships, have all served to make the limited number of houses even more valuable on the market. The relatively expensive housing market has also led to significant rent overburden: within the City, 497 of the 2,690 units, or 17.36%, were determined to require 35% or more of household income from 2000 Census data.

Pikeville also continues to battle some substandard conditions and in 2000, a total of 74 units within the City were considered substandard: 43 lacked plumbing and 31 were deemed overcrowded. While the total decreased from 1990, the number lacking plumbing actually increased from 24 to 43. While this may simply reflect a more accurate reporting on the 2000 census forms, it should nonetheless be carefully examined.

TABLE 3-5

PIKE COUNTY SUBSTANDARD UNITS, 1970 - 2000

YEAR	LACK PLUMBING	OVERCROWDED	TOTAL
1970	6,896	3,105	8,042
1980	2,567	1,324	3,891
1990	624	666	1,207
2000	712	494	1,206

Source: U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 1970 - 2000

TABLE 3-6

PIKEVILLE SUBSTANDARD UNITS, 1970 - 2000

YEAR	LACK PLUMBING	OVERCROWDED	TOTAL
1970	165	141	263
1980	151	47	198
1990	24	53	77
2000	43	31	74

Source: U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 1970 – 2000

\

Housing in Pikeville in context: Pikeville is unique regarding its housing characteristics compared to nearby communities. At 57.8% Pikeville has a lower percentage of family households than the County (73.8%, down from 80.2% in 1990), Coal Run Village (66.7% families) or Elkhorn City (67.7%). The type of families is also notable: 41% of City households are married families, lower than the 46.0% rate for Pike County; and 14.5% of households are female-headed families with no husband present, higher than the 11.4% rate for the County. In addition, the number of single-person households is significantly higher in the City than the County, at 39% in the City compared to 24.1% in the County.

TABLE 3-7

PIKE COUNTY

HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1999 BY TENURE

	OWN	%	RENT	%	TOTAL	RENT OVERBURDEN
Total Units:	21,739	78.7%	5,873	21.3%	27,612	1,604
Less than $5,000	1,308	59.6%	886	40.4%	2,194	
$5,000 - $9,999	2,235	61.2%	1,419	38.8%	3,654	
$10,000 - $14,999	2,501	76.3%	778	23.7%	3,279	
$15,000 - $19,999	2,178	77.4%	637	22.6%	2,815	
$20,000 - $24,999	1,971	79.7%	503	20.3%	2,474	
$25,000 - $34,999	2,882	80.8%	683	19.2%	3,565	
$35,000 - $49,999	3,466	88.9%	431	11.1%	3,897	
$50,000 - $74,999	3,155	88.7%	402	11.3%	3,557	
$75,000 - $99,999	1,118	93.9%	72	6.1%	1,190	
$100,000 - $149,999	505	92.0%	44	8.0%	549	
$150,000 or more	420	95.9%	18	4.1%	438	
Median Household Income	$26,946		$14,068		$23,700	
Mean Household Income	$38,135		$20,782		$34,444	

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 2000

Pikeville also has an overall lower rate of ownership (43.0%) than Pike Co. (70.3%), Coal Run Village (75.4%), or Elkhorn City (61.9%), and even when comparing single-person households Pikeville has a lower rate of ownership (48.9%) than the County (68.6%). These lower rates reflect the reality of the population demographics of the City – there is a higher rate of households on fixed incomes within the City limits than in other parts of Pike County. Also, when comparing City housing to other parts of the county, the question of quality should not be overlooked. Although the City has a lower rate of ownership among households earning less $25,000 or less annually (22.5%), than the county (70.7%), it is possible that some of those units owned in the County are much less desirable and perhaps even substandard than the leased units within the City. This is supported by the higher rate of substandard dwellings in the County: data classifies 4.4% of dwellings in Pike County as substandard, but only 2.7% of dwellings within the City are such. And, the Kentucky Housing Corporation's *Kentucky Housing Needs Assessment: Phase II* study ranks Pike County as the third worst in the state for housing conditions. Finally, as noted above, the rate of home ownership is actually quite good among the portions of the population that should be able to afford to purchase housing – those with income from earnings around the mean of $56,366.

TABLE 3-8

PIKEVILLE

HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1999 BY TENURE

	OWN	%	RENT	%	TOTAL	RENT OVERBURDEN
Total Units:	1,288	47.9%	1,402	52.1%	2,690	497
Less than $5,000	27	9.9%	245	90.1%	272	
$5,000 - $9,999	67	14.0%	410	86.0%	477	
$10,000 - $14,999	86	27.0%	233	73.0%	319	
$15,000 - $19,999	65	35.3%	119	64.7%	184	
$20,000 - $24,999	77	42.8%	103	57.2%	180	
$25,000 - $34,999	122	55.0%	100	45.0%	222	
$35,000 - $49,999	226	76.1%	71	23.9%	297	
$50,000 - $74,999	219	72.0%	85	28.0%	304	
$75,000 - $99,999	162	92.6%	13	7.4%	175	
$100,000 - $149,999	90	85.7%	15	14.3%	105	
$150,000 or more	147	94.8%	8	5.2%	155	
Median Household Income					$22,026	

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 2000

The City is impacted by housing characteristics of the County in other ways as well: the number of available rental properties in Pike County declined during the 1990s and the number of vacant structures increased to 10.7%. This may be putting additional stress on the City as dislocated persons from the County migrate to the City, a phenomenon that is most likely among lower income households. While Pikeville had only a 9.3% vacancy rate, this is not enough to absorb the migration from the County projected to be 45% over the decade. In addition, Pikeville and Pike County are both plagued by high rent overburden rates – the Kentucky Housing Authority ranked Pike County as the thirteenth least affordable based on a calculated rent overburden of 30% or more of income in housing costs burdens for households with incomes $20,000 or below.

The City of Pikeville is comparable to Pike County is two areas with regard to housing: the age of the housing stock and the declining future demands for housing. In 1990 61.2% of structures in the County were 20 years old or newer, while in 2000 that figure dropped to 44.7%. Within the City, in 1990 58.8% of the housing stock was 20 years old or newer, while 2000 report only 42.4% in that range. Projected future demand for affordable housing in Pikeville and Pike County are comparable despite the huge differences in size: in Pike county the demand is projected to be 390 in 2010 and 280 in 2020; in Pikeville the projections for the same years are 237 and 179.

Future Needs of Housing and Housing Development:

Overall, the City of Pikeville is experiencing several notable trends based on data over the last 15 years: the number of single-householders is increasing, reflecting an increase in seniors living within the City, as well as a small increase in the number of single students and young adults; the number of families is decreasing slightly, although the number of female-headed families seems to be increasing; the rate of homeownership is also low, especially regarding low-income properties; the percentage of substandard and rent overburdened households remains relatively high; and the availability of housing in the middle-income price range ($125,000 - $175,000) is limited. Pikeville is unique within Pike County and the region and is not representative of either, with significantly higher rates of single householders, non-family households and renters, as well as a higher proportion of female-headed families and householders overall.

Quality housing in all price ranges is critical to maintain the quality of life, beauty and well being of the city. Projected housing demands are based on calculations of population, number of households, tenure by persons per household unit, number of households experiencing rent overburden (who spend 30% or more of their income on

TABLE 3-9

PIKE COUNTY

HOUSING DEMAND

	2010	2020
New Households	376	-122
3 - 5 person households	40.6%	40.6%
New Households containing 3 - 5 persons per unit	153	-50
Migration from Substandard Units (1206 * 20%)	241	241
Migration from Units Experiencing Rent Overburden (1604 * 20%)	321	321
Vacancy Factor 10%	72	52
Total Housing Market Demand	787	564
Households Earning Under Median Income	49.5%	49.5%
Affordable Housing Market Demand	390	280

TABLE 3-10

PIKEVILLE

HOUSING DEMAND

	2010	2020
New Households	-131	-155
3 - 5 person households	23.8%	23.8%
New Households containing 3 - 5 persons per unit	-31	-37
Migration from Substandard Units (74 * 20%)	15	15
Migration from Units Experiencing Rent Overburden (497 * 20%)	99	99
Units Migrating From Pike County (45% of Demanding Units)	354	254
Vacancy Factor 10%	44	33
Total Housing Market Demand	481	364
Households Earning Under Median Income	49.2%	49.2%
Affordable Housing Market Demand	237	179

housing), migration due to substandard or rent overburden, and the vacancy factor. These calculations follow the same model used in the 1993 Comprehensive Plan Update. Projections for 2010 and 2020 indicate that the overall demand will increase by 481 in 2010, and the affordable housing demand will increase by 237. The affordable housing market addresses the needs of those households whose income ranges at or below the median income for a family of four, $22,026. This increase is despite the projected decreased demand for new households (-131) as well as a projected decline in households with 3-4 persons. A large part of the increased demand is assumed to be a result of migration from the County into the City, requiring 45% of the demanding units. Additional housing demand is projected to be from 20% of those living in substandard conditions who will seek better housing and 20% of those experiencing rent overburden who will move to more affordable housing. These projections follow the model from the 1993 plan update but indicate a significant decline in the projected figures for affordable housing demand for 2010: the 1993 plan projected total demand would be 865 in 2010, while the current projection (using the same model) projects only 481 in 2010, and only 364 in 2020; the 1939 plan projected the demand for affordable housing would be 546 in 2010, while the current projection is only 237, and decreases further to 179 in 2020.

Currently housing availability at the middle-income level is most in demand and least available. Real Estate agents report that there are very few listings for housing within this price range, in general. This means that young professionals and families are least able to secure satisfactory housing within the city limits. There are many more options available for those seeking to spend $200,000 or more than there are for those looking between the $110,000 and $180,000 ranges. In addition, what is available is not comparable in dwelling size, parcel size or quality to houses within the same range in other places. Thus, people relocating to Pikeville find that they are unable to purchase a new home that is comparable to ones for the same price in the place they have come from.

The dearth of available houses in this range may be attributed to a number of factors: First, the availability of usable land within the City is limited and what is available tends to be very expensive to purchase and prepare for residential development. Second, development within the city is expensive and in order to make enough profit to make building worthwhile, developers tend to build larger and more expensive homes rather than mid-size, mid-priced ones. Those houses within this range that are most desirable are presently occupied and not available for purchase. Further, it is unlikely that they will be available for purchase in the near future as they are owned by middle age families who are well established and settled within the City and are unlikely to move over the next decade. Third, annexation to increase land area for the City has focused on identifying potential areas for industrial, commercial or retail development rather than

residential development. Finally, redevelopment within the City has focused more on low-income housing than middle-income housing opportunities

The City should support the development of residential mid-price areas in several ways: ensuring the extension of utilities to newly annexed areas and/or new developments; providing incentives for developers (i.e. connecting utilities); designating and zoning land for residential purposes; and considering the availability of middle income housing when considering areas for annexation. Incentives for developers, if possible, would be very beneficial and might include partial or full provision of roads and utilities to areas for development of housing in this price range, tax incentives, or provision of utilizes at reduced rates during the construction period. Unfortunately, assistance for developers or homebuyers at this price range is not available through the Kentucky Housing Corporation or other state or federal programs.

There is an adequate amount of low-income housing available within the City, however, the quality, safety, aesthetic appeal and accessibility of housing within this range should constantly be monitored and re-examined, including the availability of some units for purchase for lower income households. This will become even more critical as the population of the city and county age and the demand for low-end affordable housing within City limits for a senior population on a fixed income increases. Additional options for elderly residents including assisted living such as Cedar Creek Assisted Living will likely be necessary. Also, there is an increasing need for affordable, accessible, appealing, and quality lower-middle priced housing for students, both undergraduate students at Pikeville College and Graduate Students at the School of Osteopathic Medicine. The affordability of home ownership should also be examined since most of the housing at this level is rental. The recently redeveloped Kentucky Avenue apartments and townhouses are an example of the high quality and aesthetically appealing development of lower-income housing that can occur.

Low-income housing serves several segments of the population, all of whom have very different needs. Low-income housing, particularly publicly financed housing, serves persons receiving federal or state public assistance and persons employed at minimum wage jobs, often serving the needs of young families, and single women and children. In addition, publicly subsidized housing also serves persons who are disabled and the elderly, often in specialized units targeting those populations. Finally, lower-income housing also serves a growing student population at Pikeville College, Big Sandy Technical and Community College, and the Pikeville College School of Osteopathic Medicine.

Multiuse areas that combine residential, commercial, business and retail within the same area should be increased within the city limits for several reasons. Studies show that such communities not only sustain themselves but also thrive and benefit other segments of the larger community. Multiuse development is also a way to revitalize

once marginal neighborhoods and prevent them from deteriorating into areas of high crime, violence, drug use, poverty or disrepair. Multiuse districts are also appealing to young professionals and young families who like to be able to live, work and shop, or at least two of the three, all within the same area when possible. Multiuse redevelopment can also benefit housing for households with lower than median incomes, and such districts are imperative to serve the needs of people who do not drive and do not have access to other forms of transportation, including the disabled and the elderly, as well as students. One area that has been identified for conversion to multi use development is on Kentucky Avenue, an area that has enjoyed positive redevelopment already and would likely appeal to students, young professionals and people affiliated with the College. Another area for a different type of multiuse development could be the Poor Farm area which could be developed into multi use residential, commercial and industrial, with some lower end housing including housing that targets the elderly and/or disabled (especially if shopping were within the development area).

The availability of high end housing appears to be the most stable, but in order to continue to attract and retain the best professionals in health care, business and education, there must be some additional development of housing within this price range to reflect most current styles and amenities. To satisfy that concern, the development of a limited number of luxury homes with the most current amenities including large kitchens with commercial size appliances, large bathrooms with luxury baths, showers and dressing areas, and recreational facilities including pools, exercise rooms, saunas, hot tubs, screened porches and sun rooms, fireplaces, 3-car garages, etc. on the proposed Golf Course at Marion's Branch is recommended.

Within the City of Pikeville there are several housing options for seniors and disabled persons, including apartments at Myers Towers and Fairview Court, assisted living at Cedar Creek Assisted Living, and several nursing homes. However, as the population ages, there will likely be a need for additional numbers of apartments that are fully accessible to the elderly and disabled, as well as a broader range of types of housing for a range of incomes and abilities. As the population of Pikeville and Pike County, as well as the state and nation, age, it will be critical to provide a variety of housing options for the elderly. Baby boomers are used to fairly luxurious, tasteful and convenient housing, and as they age they will likely seek out convenient, aesthetically appealing housing with the most up-to-date amenities and conveniences. These will include bathrooms that while being stylish are also accessible to the disabled, single story housing, and housing with minimal upkeep required but that has access to or views of some green space or landscaped areas. In addition, this population of aging baby boomers will need a variety of types of housing to choose from and move between as their needs change – this is not a population that will willingly relinquish their independence and quality of life until absolutely necessary, and additional assisted living facilities like Cedar Creek Assisted Living will likely be necessary. A range of housing targeting this population could include single family one-story units; condominiums and attached townhouses;

large and moderate sized apartments; assisted living options including apartments within communities that provide dining services and recreational facilities; and nursing home facilities that enable couples to continue to reside together and appeal to this population's sense of style. In addition, this housing must be accessible to retail, business and medical services frequently utilized by seniors.

The increased availability of housing within the City must also address the varied needs of potential homeowners. There are many potential buyers who seek to move within the city limits to avail themselves of the many services offered within the City including the Pikeville Independent School District. However, there are also an increasing number of potential buyers who may not have any need for access to the School District and for whom living within the district is a disincentive because of the higher tax burden. The City should consider annexing and developing areas to satisfy both needs: some additional development, particularly high end housing, might be more appealing if it were within the Corporate boundaries but not within the School District boundaries; mid-level housing should be divided between areas that are also within the School District (approximately 66%) and those that are beyond it (approximately 33%) to accommodate those buyers who do not have children, or whose children are grown and beyond school age. (See map page 44.)

Housing and Residential Development Goals and Objectives:

Goal: All residents of the City of Pikeville will have affordable, safe, environmentally sound, sanitary and aesthetically satisfactory housing available to meet their needs.

- Increase availability of housing in the $125,000 - $175,000 range for middle-income wage-earning households
  - Allocate land for middle-income residential development including a portion of the residential area at Marion's Branch
  - Provide incentives for developers to be able to afford to work within the City limits to create development within this price range
  - Ensure the provision of roads and underground City utilities to newly annexed and/or developable residential areas

- Maintain a variety of safe, quality, attractive and appealing low-income ($110,000 and below) housing options within the City
  - Complete the housing development on Kentucky Avenue
  - Work with Habitat for Humanity and Kentucky Housing Corporation to follow-up on proposed Habitat for Humanity project for Harmon's Branch and other similar projects for the future
  - Identify areas close to the Pikeville College campus for improvements and/or development of rental and lower priced housing