

Memo: To Town Council and CRC

From: Cathy Schoen

Subject: Comments on the CRC Draft “Comprehensive Housing Plan”, Council Agenda 8/23/21

I appreciate the hours and multiple revisions by members of CRC to bring the draft Housing Plan to the version presented for the August 23, 2021 Council meeting. I think it is considerably improved from an initial version I saw months ago. And I appreciate the addition of some data.

However, I have significant concerns with the draft and the recommendations. In the memo that follows, I describe my concerns and provide recommendations for revisions. I have also provided some data tables and suggestions for improving the data section of the report.

My concerns and recommended changes focus on

- **Failure to highlight and discuss the Impact of UMass enrollment growth on the Amherst Housing Market**
- **Ignores the fact that Amherst is already comparatively densely populated – reasons for zoning**
- **Silence on streets, sidewalks, transit and public infrastructure**
- **Need to revise Goals and Discussion**
 - Missing Goal: Recommend adding a new Goal focused on UMass
 - Goals 1 and 2 are not clear, wordy, often overlap with other goals, and include some misleading or unsubstantiated statements. These need to be re-written
 - Goal 3 Health and Safety of Existing Housing needs to be stronger and discuss the concerns regarding deterioration of rental housing and weak current oversight
 - Goal 4 Climate Change is laudable. Could be stronger with examples
 - Goal 5 Affordable Housing Should be moved up to be Goal 3 with some of the text discussion of AMI standards under Goal 2 moved to this affordability goal. Affordability needs to be a top-level goal.
- **Potential Policy List Needs substantial revision.** List of Policies is biased, not analytic, often conflicting, and implies endorsement. The list needs to be shorter and more descriptive. And discuss the interaction. See below for suggestions
 - These are far too detailed and imply the Council endorses all of the lists. There is a clear bias to simply building more on every piece of land we have zoned for residential. The lists should be much shorter and less prescriptive
 - There is no analysis of topography of Amherst and the fact that Amherst is already quite dense if one looks at residential land acreage. And many residential areas include lots that are often wet flood prone and may abut farmland where more building coverage would put the farm at risk
 - The lists also fail to recognize the conflicts – climate and resiliency require green space. We do not have design standards for streetscapes for sidewalks, bikes, open spaced. Regulatory standards help enforce the building code – if we strengthen the code for green buildings, this will require building standards.

- The theme of deregulate across the board is problematic and should be dropped. OK to identify undue red tape or delays, especially if staffing related. But we likely need to tighten inspections of rentals and examine permitting fees.

A. Lack of Emphasis on UMass regarding Housing Dynamics, Current Amherst Density, and Topography

➤ **Failure to Emphasize the Impact of UMass Enrollment Growth on the Amherst Housing Market – Missing the “elephant in the room”**

The introduction description of the housing market challenges fails to highlight and emphasize the impact on UMass enrollment growth on the Amherst Housing Market, including the impact on the diversity, price, and availability of existing houses throughout Amherst neighborhoods.

As illustrated by Table 1, from 2000 to 2020, UMass enrollment has grown by about 10,000 students yet on-campus housing availability has not kept pace. Indeed, there has recently been a decline in beds on on-campus from 2010 to 2020/21, with the closure of Lincoln Center graduate/UG apartments and North Village family apartments. of rooms on campus.

This growth and the sheer size of UMass in small Town Amherst has had an impact that would be less the case if UMass were located in large metropolitan area with much large acreage and square miles for housing for the rest of the population. UMass enrollment of 31,000 is in fact far larger than the total non-UMass Amherst population.

Given Amherst’s relatively limited acreage available for residential properties, the spill over impact of the rapid UMass growth without on-campus housing has increased the price of homes and reduced the availability and diversity of housing stock available for families and the Amherst working population. Homes that were formerly “starter” homes for people moving to Amherst have been purchased by investors and converted to student housing.

The market dynamics have resulted in multiple negative impacts on housing supply and affordability.

- The price of homes has escalated. Families and the working population face stiff competition with investors wishing to purchase and convert properties to rentals.
- Investors with resources have been able to buy up small or modest-sized homes and convert these to rentals with 4 or more non-related adults charging rent by the bed.
 - Realtors, aware that investors are willing and able to buy homes, can place the homes quickly often with little notice to others that might be interested.
 - The homes produce substantial income rented by the bed.
- Deterioration of housing stock: Weak incentives for investors in non-owner-occupied properties often results in failure to invest in the upkeep of the homes, leading to a deterioration of the property and likely health and safety concerns for tenants.
 - Current rental property registration/inspection regulations provide relatively weak incentives to maintain properties.

- A resident in District 1 who initially sought to rent a home, told me that she and daughter found that “Amherst has many slum lords”
- In some areas of town, streets and neighborhoods are near “tipping” points as multiple homes convert to rentals. The wholesale conversion of neighborhoods with narrow streets and small yards abutting each other, often bring concerns about noise, car traffic, trash/litter on top of concerns about the deterioration health and safety of the converted properties.

UMass, of course, is a major source of economic vitality for Amherst. But at the same time, a campus with 31,000 students (undergraduate and graduate) in a town of under 40,000 people - likely under 20,000 non-students - is undermining the affordability and diversity of homes. In effect, the student population growth without growth of housing on campus, is displacing and pricing low- and moderate-income families out of our housing market place.

Reflecting high value Amherst has historically placed on open-space and farms and the fact that Colleges and UMass own 16 percent of our acreage, Amherst has a relatively small share of acreages that are residential (about 23% based on the Master Plan). Moreover, many of the residential lots in R-O and R-LD include water-logged properties, abut farmland, or other topographical barriers to denser development.

As a policy paper from the Council, we need to present a much clearer picture of what has been happening. The introduction should, at a minimum, highlight the impact of UMass on the housing supply. Remove the quote from the Master Plan and provide a paragraph that highlights the loss of owner-occupied homes to rental.

Laying this foundation at the outset is important because it will help inform goals and potential policy options.

In sum, part of the question of how to assure a more diversified and affordable mix of housing over the next decade, cannot ignore the impact of UMass and needs to make UMass part of the solution. We need to be very careful about how we grow and use our land – we need to balance environment, the mix of farm-land, need for green out-door space in residential neighborhoods, historic resources, and consider our infrastructure (roads, sidewalks, bus transit) and public services.

The paper instead seems to conclude that more rapid densification in all areas of Amherst will somehow bring with it modest priced and a diverse range of more affordable housing.

We know that rapid growth has costs and consequences. A strategic housing policy needs to be balanced and informed by analysis and a vision of Amherst a decade from now. This includes making UMass a real partner in taking the pressure off existing housing stock by expanding the live-on-campus capacity or renovating/building on existing student apartment complexes.

Table 1: UMass Student Population Growth					

	2000	2007	2010	2015	2020
Under Graduate	17,664	20,113	21,373	22,748	24,233
Graduate	4,057	5,759	6,196	5,468	7,409
Total	21,721	25,872	27,569	29,269	31,842
Students Living on Campus					
Beds			14,300		13,000
Percent on campus			52%		41%
<i>Sources</i>					
Enrollment:	UMass Amherst Fall Enrollment Fact Sheets, Various Years.				
Bed Capacity on Campus:					
2010	2010 Live on Campus. UMass/Town of Amherst Housing and Economic Development Plan, U3 Advisors December 2014				
2020	UMass website:				

➤ **Density: Amherst is already quite dense measure by residents per acre or square mile. Residential Acreage Topography Needs to Be Considered**

As table 2 illustrates, compared to Northampton, Amherst is already quite “dense” measured by total population per acre. It is also denser than surrounding towns we often think of as more urban, such as Hartford based on data presented in figure 5 in [TownCharts](#).

Amherst is even “denser” if the population is adjusted to remove students living on campus (UMass, Amherst and Hampshire) and acreage is adjusted to remove land owned by high education, conservation/permanent farm and public.

Table 2: AMHERST DENSITY COMPARED TO NORTHAMPTON

Estimates of Residential Density: Aggregate and Adjusted for Land Use					
	Amherst			Northampton	Notes:
Total Population	39,751	Estimate 2019		28,500	Estimate 2019
Acreage	17,765	27.6 square miles		22,879	37.75 square miles
Density A: Total population by total acreage	2.24			1.25	
Students Living on Campus					
UMass	14,000			3,000	Smith
Amherst	1,800				
Hampshire	800				

Estimated Residents Not on Campus	23,151			25,500	
Alternative Measures of Density: Population Not on Campus Divided by Residential Acreage					
Total Acres	17,765			22,879	
Conservation+ APR	5,806	33%		5,720	25% protected 2017
Other Farm CH 61	2,311				
Parks/Commons					
Private Trusts + Schools	380				
Subtotal Protected	6,186	34.8%		5,720	
<u>Higher Education Acreage</u>					
UMass	1,200			147	Smith
Amherst	1,000				
Hampshire	800				
Subtotal Higher Ed	3,000	16.9%		147	
Net Residential Acreage Calculated: Total Minus Protected or Higher Ed	8,579			17,012	Calculated
Residential Acreage from Reports	4,086	Master plan 23%		12,604	NOHO Report
Density B: population not on campus divided by calculated net	2.70			1.50	
Density C; Population not on campus by residential in reports	5.67			2.02	residential or "developable"

Sources:

Amherst: 2017 OSRP Update Land Plan 2017. Table 11

<https://www.amherstma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/53436/2017-OSRP-Final-Version>

Northampton: The City of Northampton's Open space, recreation and multi-use trails plan (including agriculture) 2011–2018

<https://www.northamptonma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/923/Open-Space-Plan-AS-approved-EOEEA-June-23-2011?bidId=>

Residential area and developable acreage in reports likely subtract non-protected farms/forests.

As a comprehensive housing policy paper, it is critical that the paper acknowledge at the outset the rationale for current zoning in terms of topography and abutting areas. One of the reasons homes and residential land is expensive in Amherst is that as much as 75 percent of the acreage is currently farmland (APR and unprotected), conservations/open space, or owned by colleges and UMass.

The resulting scarcity of “buildable” acreage that is not already developed and over-flow of UMass students into existing housing stock requires a focus on what might be possible if we seek to achieve housing affordability, diversity, and climate action goals.

The paper should highlight, rather than ignore, that Amherst has been quite innovative and in recent years seen an array of diverse housing developments.

- Amherst has seen relatively rapid development of several multi-unit housing projects, including many with affordable units.
- Some but not all of these have included ample open green space for residents to gather and to allow for water to continue to be absorbed in green areas
- We are home to several innovative co-housing and mixed housing developments.

Working with the planning department, it might be possible to identify some acreage where **there may be are opportunities for clusters of smaller homes or a mix of town-houses and homes with shared open space.** Or areas which could be re-developed.

We need an informed strategic careful approach to achieve long-held values of equity, affordability and sustainability.

➤ **Silence on roads, sidewalks, transit and public infrastructure**

The current draft pays lip service to creating more walkable, less car-dependent housing, but then fails to address what currently exists in Amherst. Other than a few main streets, most of the streets – even primary streets – lack side walks and safe places to bike. Most are not within a short distance of bus stops. And many areas rely on septic tanks, lack sewers, and have **Goal**

We will need investment in roads, sidewalks, bike lanes and more to make the vision of more walkable possible. These are public tax-payer costs.

One possibility is to include “linkage” fees in our zoning bylaws that have new developments contribute directly to such capital expenses with funds earmarked for specific purposes. This could include fire and police in addition to transit and parking. (see below policy list)

B. Revise Goals

I recommend adding one new goal and reworking the existing 5 goals.

NEW GOAL: Work with UMass and our Representatives in Boston to Expand UMass On Campus Housing by at least 2,000 units and reinstatement requirement for freshman to live on campus (unless commuting from home)

UMass has recently closed their Lincoln Avenue and Village Park Apartments removing nearly 400 units (some family multiple bedroom) from the campus housing supply. They intend to build around units for around 900 students (mix of undergraduate and graduate) but these will not be open until 2022/2023.

This expansion is welcome but is not sufficient. Given the impact on the Town housing supply and scarcity of affordable housing for faculty as well as the broader UMass workforce, the Town needs to publicly pressure on UMass to do more.

Steps to achieve this goal could include actions such as:

- UMass used to require freshmen to live on campus unless commuting from home. Reinstating this policy and investment in capacity would provide some relief.
- Town pressure could include public demands to secure UMass payments that provide funds to subsidize housing elsewhere in Amherst and support public services. Such as:
 - Pursuing a case publicly for payment in lieu of taxes on a share of the value of the buildings and extensive acreage owned by UMass that is not currently taxed. The State currently pays such “PILOT” payments on state owned conservation land. Why not University property?
 - Challenging the non-profit/public status of some non-educational activities located on campus. This could
- The State Legislature would need to support and address such housing concerns to provide resources to the University.
- A policy paper that focuses on the impact of a 31,000-student campus on Amherst’s residential housing market could publicize the impact and concerns. This would highlight the issue and avoid having it fly “under the radar” screen.

Comments on existing Goals:

Goal 1: Pathways to Homeownership, Integrated Communities, and Diversity of Housing Types

This is a laudable goal, but the discussion fails to note that Amherst used to have a more diverse range of diverse homes and range of incomes and fails to analyze the barriers to production of diverse types of homes. We have lost “starter” homes in multiple neighborhoods as well as homes, including homes that were formerly owned by people of color and our working population.

- Affordability. It is not clear what could be done about “more integrated” communities. Are there continuing barriers based on race? Is income and the high cost of home-ownership the primary barrier? Need to say more. One of blocks in North Amherst used to be mainly black-owned homes. Now almost all are investor owned rentals.
- No mention of Habitat for Humanity and the Amherst Community Land Trust and ways to promote ownership, diversity, and integration.
- The goal discussion concludes with a call for greater density. Same is Goal 2. This is repetitive. There is no evidence presented that we have barriers that prevent diversity of sizes and mix now. And no mention of the economics of the market place and costs of building. See what is happening in Northampton. Developers are buying up modest homes and building more mansion-like high end homes with increased density and loss of green space.
- The emphasis on increasing supply in all neighborhoods ignores the fact that some parts of Amherst were zoned for lower density to preserve water quality, wetlands, floodplains, important streams, farms and farmland, climate resilient green spaces, historic and architecturally significant areas.
- As stated above, providing a diverse range of housing types will not address the main problems with the Amherst housing situation: the increase in UMass enrollment without housing the additional students and the dominance of rental LLCs in the housing market and resulting skyrocketing rents often for substandard housing. The Town of Amherst cannot build or zone its way out to this situation.

Goals 1 and Goal 2 call for an increase of supply in home-ownership and rentals, with a diversity of stock and affordability in both areas. However, there is little analysis what has been happening, little evidence that there are barriers now to starter homes, owner-occupied duplexes and no discussion of economics of the housing and building market. New housing, given construction costs is expensive – with high rents unless shared per bed.

The two goals need to be more distinct or merged into one goal.

Goal 2: The goals says it is focused on “rental” and affordability. Yet, the discussion tends to discuss home ownership not just rental and has sentences that call out for analysis or deletion. It also seems to over-lap with Goal 5. If it remains as a separate goal it needs to be reworked and edited. This could include a focus on affordability and more analysis of what this means for “moderate” income.

The discussion includes some misleading or vague statements and fails to analyze barriers.

- The first paragraph states we have had “decades of below average housing production.” Below what average? Compared to what towns? Not clear that this is true, and we have recently seen significant increases – adding about 1,000 units. See Table at end of this document based on the Planning Department reports.
- There is no analysis of why we have not seen production of owner-occupied duplexes and triplexes. Or townhouses. Are the barriers in part the cost and limited interest in developers? Except for B-L, duplexes are allowed in most residential areas by either SP or SPR.
 - Is it also space and cost? Most areas already developed meaning there is a home on the property. Without removing the current home there is not sufficient space for a duplex or triplex or town-houses?
- The discussion says we need to “encourage investors and developers to build new housing in Amherst that is affordable to those who live here, no matter what their income. “
 - What does this mean? Surely not financial incentives paid for by taxpayers?
 - Do you mean affordable at 80% AMI?
 - What does it mean no matter what their income? Income is the issue!
- Another sentence says Partnerships with University etc. What does this mean? Here some of the wording appears to be more in line with Goal V.
- Last paragraph calls for density and reduction of regulatory barriers as an overall solution. This is basically the same conclusion as reached by Goal 1.
 - There is no evidence that density will increase diversity or affordability.
- So far there is little evidence that the cause of the gap in housing availability is because zoning bylaws are too restrictive. The 10-year trend in Amherst has been to loosen zoning bylaws. This has led to more units, nearly all them designed to house students at very high rents.

Goal 4: Safe and Secure Environmentally Healthy

This Goal is important and needs further discussion of what is not happening now. We have deteriorating and likely unsafe or unhealthy rental housing but relatively weak tools to enforce building and living standards.

The Goal includes environmentally healthy housing. And objective includes promote environmental health. Neither are defined. What is meant? Is this in part encompassed in Goal 4 (Climate and Resiliency)?

The sentence wording appears to put the burden on residents and tenants to learn about environmental health. This needs to be reworked to be clearer. Energy audits? What about landlords' responsibility?

Goal 5. Affordable Housing

Great goal! But the wording including the objective wording undermine the goal.

- Objective says “Moderately priced market rate housing stock”. What does this mean? What is a “moderate price” market rate? Do you mean priced to be affordable in the income range between 80% and 100% AMI? If yes, perhaps OK
- The affordability goal should be focused on 80% or less AMI and carefully worded. Perhaps move some of what is under Goal 2 to this section. See AMAHT draft.
- Need to include State grants and incentives in the financial sources.
- What does it mean for the Town to have “funding priorities” Does this mean a targeted share of CPA for affordable housing each year?

➤ Measuring Progress Section

- Agree important measure and produce updated reports
- What is the justification for the distribution of the 250 goal in terms of mix under 80% AMI? This is very specific. Average AMI of 50%, at least 10% at 30%. Source
- Why minimum of 850 units above 80% AMI in 5 years. What is the analysis the supports this?
- Rent affordability: why this 50% goals? What is the starting rate? What population? Does it include student rentals? If yes, not clear Town policies make sense.
- Owners cost burdened. Where did this target come from? Not clear what policies could address this. What starting point? Data from Census? Not actionable
- Safe and secure: need a starting point. How will this be measured? What about undetected because we do not inspect regularly?

➤ Implementation Section

This section over-emphasizes changes zoning in all areas of Amherst and calls for increased density. It neglects to discuss the impact and interaction of increasing density on existing residential areas on the environment, climate change, limits due to Amherst’s topography (wet and low-lands) and related goals of climate and affordability.

Most of the zoning recommendations are unsupported and in many cases would undermine the resources that Amherst is going to need in order to cope with the rapidly intensifying impacts of climate change, the social and economic impacts of the still unfolding COVID-19 pandemic, and projected declines in the population of Western Mass, etc. And there is no analysis of interaction nor why developers had not appeared interested in duplex, triplex or townhouses.

The detailed, lengthy list implies the Council endorses each of the policies.

We should not be asked to vote on such specific lists at this point. Each item on the list needs analysis and discussion before it goes on an endorsed list.

There is also overlap in categories – many of the “regulatory” are zoning. And some of the regulatory are funding. *Moreover, some of the action items are already on the books. These should be deleted otherwise it implies new policy.* I will send a marked-up version.

I recommend that we delete the extensive lists and instead identify a few generic areas for future analysis and prioritization, with an assessment of how the policies interact.

And adding a section on UMass and some missing areas.

- Work with UMass and State elected appointed officials to resume negotiations and get commitment with funding for substantial increase in housing on campus. Either own or with public private partnerships. Goal of 2,000 – including the planned 1000 – in next 5 years
- Work with realty companies to and State to provide rapid information to availability of houses before provision to LLC. This could include posting as soon as agreement to list a property.
- Provide information and guidance to first time home buyers. This could be a regional entity – collaboration of Amherst Housing Trust and Other towns? Similarly housing non-profits could, with local town support, advertise more widely.

Here are some examples:

- Zoning Bylaws and Regulations (Combine to Avoid overlap): Identify possible amendments or new bylaws that might strengthen our zoning in the following areas:
 - Design guidelines that assure wide sidewalks or walkways, greenspace, public shared use areas, climate resilience and preserve historic and cultural resources. Start at a minimum with streetscape and revising set-backs to enable walkways in the future.
 - Identify provisions and specific acreage (lots) in Amherst that could accommodate small houses or cluster development.
 - Enact climate action building standards and low-impact green space standards for new multi-unit developments.
 - Incentives to net zero: possible height or density or expedited permits for renovation or new developments that will not use fossil fuels.
 - Incentives for creation of additional affordable units: height density.
 - In targeted already developed apartment areas for redevelopment, allow additional floors with set-backs for upper floor for redevelopment to renovate to improve sustainability and more efficient HVAC, address climate change and provide additional units
- Municipal Resources and Policies
 - Identify barriers to home-ownership and state resources, particularly black, indigenous and other people of color who are first time homebuyers
 - Strengthen rental permit and inspections to uphold building health and safety standards. This could include increasing the rental permit cost for those with frequent complaints or violations and requiring an inspection, paid by the owner

for rentals that have health and safety concerns. (There are examples of this).
Make it easy to register a complaint or concern.

- Require space for bikes and provision of charging stations in new multiunit developments (zoning or regulatory?)
- Identify resources to retrofit existing housing stock.
- Produce and update an annual report on housing. Rental units, Owner occupancy and trends. Inventory should include type, ownership and size
- Municipal resources and Funding for Affordable Units (Please note that many listed in the paper already exist. Such as permanent restrictions. Need to delete)
 - Identify State resources and apply for funding
 - Propose expansion of the Community Preservation Act to include sustainability for public and affordable housing, with enhanced match from the State (requires legislation)
 - Ask CPAC and AMAHT to propose a multi-year policy on affordable housing resources
 - Target use of CDBG for rehabilitation of affordable housing (What happens now?)
 - Identify long term resources and strategies to house the homeless
- Partner and Negotiate
 - UMass policy changes as above. Reinstate UMass Town Housing group.
 - Explore possibility of a single portal of entry for rentals information and application for affordable unit pools.
 - Streamline (central entity?) landlord information on affordable unit policy, list and applicant pools.
 - Publicize the Amherst Community Land Trust (say more)

Statistical Support

The data section is a welcome addition. The following comments focus ways to improve:

- Cost burden charts are useful, but I question the choice of other “university” towns. It implies Amherst is similar to these towns. Yet, the UMass student population is a much larger share of total than in Bridgewater, Dartmouth, or Westfield. Thus, the larger number of student aged adults in the Census data likely skews the share with a high percent paid for rent. This is less a concern with the first bank of charts.
 - Note: There is little difference in the bar charts for owner households.
- Provide a table showing a count of single family and non-owner-occupied homes that are currently permitted as rental properties compared to 10 and 20 years ago. Whatever is possible with permitting data. Estimate how many homes have been converted to investor-owned rentals. We need an inventory of the current rental housing stock – with inspections on the living and safety conditions.
- The data in the appendix is often data. Please a table showing housing units permitted in the past 5 to 10 years and estimate total housing

Housing Production.

Please provide more detailed tables for housing stock. It is not clear how this is being measure or the base. The population graph shows total population. The housing graph shows change.

Also, you cannot conclude a “shortage” by comparing unit growth. Everyone who lives in Amherst is living in Amherst thus is “housed.” What has likely been happening is that smaller homes that held 3-person families now house 4 or more students as homes have been converted. This does in fact mean fewer homes available for single workers or working families.

Show this data.

The 2015 Housing Market Study is dated – it misses the development of many of the large multi-unit apartment buildings, including Beacon, downtown and the affordable complexes.

The Market Study data also needs to be update for overall population growth. The Donahue Institute and others have warned of the longer-term impact of the low birth rate and resulting decline in college age population.

The share of renters who cost burdened in Hampshire County likely reflects and large student population who are renters and their incomes. Is there a way to adjust to see if also growing worse more broadly?

Need to be careful in the analysis to not overstate how building more may or may not help for home ownership and affordability. The growing inequality of income with little to no change for those working at or near the minimum wage has had a negative impact throughout the state and county. Lack of savings makes it difficult to have a down payment even for near median incomes.

And new rental housing tends to be more expensive than existing rentals. The paper needs to show the rental prices for the new downtown building, Beacon and University drive. These are

high and likely out of the range of moderate-income couples, families, or single adults. The upward movement plus increase in the number of students who are looking for off campus housing is driving up rents across the board.

Need to say more about the economics of the housing market. Discuss the cost of construction and consequent impact rents or purchase prices if not subsidized.

And climate standards and building standards – plumbing, sprinkler systems, etc. plus sewer systems sidewalks etc. - further raise the cost of new construction. The data section at times appears to assume more housing will mean more affordable housing. Do we have any evidence in any community that this has occurred?

Adding some wording and additional information about recent growth would be helpful. Here is a table developed using PD reports for various years. It includes recently permitted.

What it does not show is the bedroom size of the single family or multi-unit developments. Many of the new developments are renting by the bed, similar to dorms.

Number of Housing Units Add from 2013 through 2020						
	Demolition	Single	ADU	Multi-Unit	Total	NOTES on Larger:
2013	-5	17	5	61	78	Olympia Oaks 42, 17 units 417 West St
2014	-4	8	5	212	221	76 Olympia Pl, 39 Greenleaves, 36 at 57 East Pleasant (Kendrick)
2015	-2	6	3	5	12	
2016	-9	9	5	140	145	133 at One East Pleasant,
2017	-3	13	4	13	27	8 Alpine Commons
2018	-2	13	5	171	187	36 Universtiy Dr. 130 North Square
2019	-2	10	0	149	157	88 Northampton RD (408) 58 Spring St
2020	not updated for 2020			242	242	24 units 462 Main; 45 units 1 University; 57 units 133/143 SE street; 28 units VCDC 132 Northampton road; 88 units 408 Northampton Rd
Total		76	27	993	1069	
Does not include Belchertown town road and other projects not yet permitted						
Umass annouced: 120 units family in Fall 2022 and 800 unit apartment Dorm in Fall 2023(600UG)						
Sources:: 2013-2019 Rob Morra Town of Amherst New Residential Units Permitted 2013-2019 Official Report 2020 Informan provided to Council 3/22/21 on recent building permits						