

# Housing

## *Introduction*

Housing constitutes a valuable community resource and a significant private investment in the local economy. The continued viability of the City of Pleasant Hope and opportunities for future economic growth are dependent in part on the availability and quality of housing. Changes instituted in the 2010 Census have limited the availability of housing data. Available 2010 data is provided here; however, current information on certain housing characteristics, such as housing types and valuation, is derived from the American Community Survey five year estimates as released.

## *Housing Characteristics*

Pleasant Hope experienced its greatest increase in housing units in the 1990s decade, with the number of units increasing from 169 in 1990 to 229 in 2000 (35.5% increase). The 2010 Census recorded 275 housing units in Pleasant Hope, an increase of 47 units, or 20.6 percent over the 2000s decade. As shown in Table 4-1, 65.4 percent of the city's occupied housing stock was owner-occupied in 2010, a slightly lower percentage than that of Polk County and Missouri. Correspondingly, Pleasant Hope had a higher percentage of renter-occupied housing units in 2010 than Polk County or Missouri.

**Table 4-1: Housing Occupancy and Tenure, 2000 – 2010**

Housing Units	2000		2010			
	Pleasant Hope		Pleasant Hope		Polk Co.	Missouri
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Percent of Total	Percent of Total
Total Housing Units	229	100.0	275	100.0	100.0	100.0
Occupied Housing Units	209	91.3	243	88.4	87.8	87.6
Owner-Occupied Units	137	59.8	159	65.4	70.9	68.8
Renter-Occupied Units	72	31.4	84	34.6	29.1	31.2
Vacant Units	20	8.7	32	11.6	12.2	12.4

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000, Summary File 1; Census 2010, Summary File 1.

In 2000, over 84 percent of Pleasant Hope's housing units were single family units, in comparison to 91.3 percent of the county's housing stock and 79.7 percent of the state's. Pleasant Hope has a significantly higher percentage of single family detached housing units and a substantially lower percentage of single family, mobile home units than does Polk County or Missouri. Although data on housing unit characteristics is not available from the 2010 Census, most residential construction in the city over the past decade has been the development of single family subdivisions.

**Table 4-2: Housing Units in Structure, 2000**

Housing Units	Pleasant Hope		Polk Co.	Missouri
	Number	Percent	Percent	Percent
Total Units	232	100.0	100.0	100.0
1, detached	181	78.0	70.6	68.8
1, attached	2	0.9	0.7	2.7
2	12	5.2	2.4	3.9
3 or 4	27	11.6	2.8	5.1
5 to 9	0	0.0	1.7	3.8
10 to 19	0	0.0	1.0	3.2
20 to 49	0	0.0	0.4	1.8
50 or more	0	0.0	0.2	2.3
Mobile Home	10	4.3	20.0	8.2
Other	0	0.0	0.2	0.3

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000, Summary File 3.

Table 4-3 summarizes housing valuation in 2000. As noted, the median value of all owner-occupied housing in Pleasant Hope, \$76,400, was slightly less than that of Polk County and nearly 14 percent less than the median value for owner-occupied housing statewide.

**Table 4-3: Housing Valuation, 2000**

	Pleasant Hope	Polk Co.	Missouri
Median Value Owner-Occupied Housing	\$76,400	\$77,600	\$86,900
Median Value Occupied Mobile Homes	\$55,000	\$38,000	\$26,300
Median Gross Rent	\$465	\$391	\$484

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000, Summary File 3.

### ***Housing Condition Analysis***

During the spring of 2008, an exterior housing condition survey was conducted for Pleasant Hope by Missouri State University students. The conditions of individual properties are not identified in this analysis. Rather, the survey was undertaken to determine any significant concentrations of deteriorated housing and the possible need for any housing rehabilitation or maintenance programs in the community.

### **Survey Methodology**

The survey involved assessment of external structural conditions. The survey was conducted from the sidewalk or the street and surveyors did not enter on private property. To minimize surveyor bias, the survey instrument assigned point values to each structural element based on the condition of the particular element. Each element was rated on a scale from 0-3, with a rating of “0” meaning that there was no visible deficiency and “3” indicating a critical deficiency or problem. Each element was also assigned a weighted value from 1-3, based on the relative importance of the element to the overall condition of the structure. For example, elements which are more critical, such as foundations, walls and roofs, were given a weighted value of “3” whereas less critical components, such as paint, were assigned a weighted value of “1”. The deficiency rating of each element was multiplied by the weighted value and all scores were added to arrive at a total point value for each structure.

Housing condition was ranked into four categories and each structure was classified in one of these categories, dependent on total points: Standard, Minor Rehabilitation, Substandard-Major Rehabilitation, and Dilapidated (see Appendix A for the Housing Condition Survey instrument).

The survey does have limitations. The surveyors did not enter private property and only those conditions that could be readily observed from the public right-of-way were evaluated. Therefore, any external features screened from street view were not recorded. Also, while it was presumed that external conditions would generally reflect internal conditions, it is probable that some of the housing units would require a greater

level of repair or rehabilitation on internal systems, such as plumbing and electrical, than could be considered in the external conditions survey.

### Survey Results

The city was divided into 14 survey block areas which are displayed in Figure 4-1. The summary results of the housing conditions survey are presented in Table 4-4. A total of 215 housing units were evaluated and of these units, 72 percent were ranked in the Standard category and 15.8 percent of units were ranked as in need of Minor Repair. Housing units ranked as Substandard or in need of major repair accounted for 8.3 percent of total units surveyed while 8 housing units (3.7%) were considered to be in dilapidated condition and not economically viable for rehabilitation.

**Table 4-4: Housing Conditions, 2008**

Survey Block Number	Number of Units Surveyed	Structural Condition			
		Standard	Minor Repair	Substandard	Dilapidated
1	2	2			
2	20	14	5	1	
3	12	9	1	2	
4	22	6	7	6	3
5	40	19	13	4	4
6	11	11			
7	0				
8	8	5		3	
9	5	1	4		
10	8	4	1	2	1
11	23	20	3		
12	27	27			
13	28	28			
14	9	9			
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>8</b>

Source: Field Survey, Community Planning Practicum, Missouri State University, Spring 2008.

Overall, the survey indicated that the majority of the housing stock in Pleasant Hope is in good condition. This would also include housing units in need of routine maintenance. The greatest concentrations of structures in need of repair or major rehabilitation, as well as housing considered dilapidated, were more generally concentrated in and around the older downtown area of the city.

As noted, this survey was intended only to identify overall housing conditions and any concentrations of deteriorating housing within the city. Actual condition of structures that could only be determined through on-site building inspection might indicate more substantial problems or more housing in need of repair or rehabilitation.

The survey also included evaluation of housing site conditions, such as trash on the property or lack of landscaping maintenance. While these elements are not structural conditions, they do contribute to the overall view of the condition of the property, aesthetics, and attractiveness of the neighborhood or city as a place to invest and live. It is recommended that the city encourage housing maintenance, including cleanup of properties as may be warranted.

Figure 4-1: Housing Survey Areas

