

728.1
:308
F22
Chapel
Hill,
N.C.
1970

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

OCT 13 1970

LIBRARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410

Analysis of the
**CHAPEL HILL,
NORTH CAROLINA
HOUSING MARKET**

as of April 1, 1970

**A Report by the
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20411**

September 1970

FHA Housing Market Analysis
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, as of April 1, 1970

Foreword

This analysis has been prepared for the assistance and guidance of the Federal Housing Administration in its operations. The factual information, findings, and conclusions may be useful also to builders, mortgagees, and others concerned with local housing problems and trends. The analysis does not purport to make determinations with respect to the acceptability of any particular mortgage insurance proposals that may be under consideration in the subject locality.

The factual framework for this analysis was developed by the Economic and Market Analysis Division as thoroughly as possible on the basis of information available on the "as of" date from both local and national sources. Of course, estimates and judgments made on the basis of information available on the "as of" date may be modified considerably by subsequent market developments.

The prospective demand or occupancy potentials expressed in the analysis are based upon an evaluation of the factors available on the "as of" date. They cannot be construed as forecasts of building activity; rather, they express the prospective housing production which would maintain a reasonable balance in demand-supply relationships under conditions analyzed for the "as of" date.

Department of Housing and Urban Development
Federal Housing Administration
Economic and Market Analysis Division
Washington, D. C.

FHA HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS - CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA
AS OF APRIL 1, 1970

The Chapel Hill Housing Market Area (HMA) is defined as Orange County, North Carolina. The HMA is located in central North Carolina about eight miles southwest of Durham and 25 miles west of Raleigh. The estimated population of the HMA was about 59,000 persons in April 1970, including a student population of 18,450 at the University of North Carolina.^{1/}

Expanding employment in the area and growing enrollment at the University of North Carolina resulted in fairly rapid population growth in the Chapel Hill HMA throughout the 1960's. Since 1965, employment gains in manufacturing industries in the area and a faster rate of student household formation resulted in high levels of housing demand. Although a large number of housing units have been placed on the market since 1965, demand has remained strong and vacancy rates were at reasonably low levels in April 1970.

Anticipated Housing Demand

In the Chapel Hill HMA, an average annual demand for 500 new nonsubsidized housing units is anticipated for the two-year period ending April 1, 1972. The main sources of this demand are the projected increase in households and replacement needs generated by the loss of dwelling units from the housing inventory. After considering current housing market factors--acceptable levels of vacancy, available dormitory space, and current construction volume--construction to meet the projected annual demand for 500 units should consist of 225 single-family houses, 175 units in multifamily structures, and 100 mobile homes. Qualitative distributions of demand for single-family houses by price classes and for multifamily units by gross monthly rents are shown in table I.

^{1/} Includes all full-time degree-credit students and their dependents.

Whether or not as many as 225 single-family houses can be marketed annually during the next two years will depend, in large part, on the availability and price of mortgage money and, in part, on the ability of builders to produce in the lower sales price ranges.

Occupancy Potential for Subsidized Housing

Federal assistance in financing costs for new housing for low- or moderate-income families may be provided through a number of different programs administered by FHA: monthly rent supplements in rental projects financed under Section 221(d)(3); partial payment of interest on home mortgages insured under Section 235; partial interest payment on project mortgages insured under Section 236; and federal assistance to local housing authorities for low-rent public housing.

The estimated occupancy potentials for subsidized housing are designed to determine, for each program, (1) the number of families and individuals who can be served under the program and (2) the proportion of these households that can reasonably be expected to seek new subsidized housing during the forecast period. Household eligibility for the Section 235 and Section 236 programs is determined primarily by evidence that household or family income is below established limits but sufficient to pay the minimum achievable rent or monthly payment for the specified program. Insofar as the income requirement is concerned, all families and individuals with income below the income limits are assumed to be eligible for public housing and rent supplement; there may be other requirements for eligibility, particularly the requirement that current living quarters be substandard for families to be eligible for rent supplements. Some families may be alternatively eligible for assistance under more than one of these programs or under other assistance programs using federal or state support. The total occupancy potential for federally assisted housing approximates the sum of the potentials for public housing and Section 236 housing. For the Chapel Hill HMA, the total occupancy potential is estimated to be 225 units annually (see table II). Future approvals under each program should take into account any intervening approvals under other programs which serve the same families and individuals.

The annual occupancy potentials^{1/} for subsidized housing discussed below are based upon 1970 incomes, the occupancy of substandard housing, estimates of the elderly population, income limits in effect on April 1, 1970, and on available market experience.^{2/}

^{1/} The occupancy potentials referred to in this analysis have been developed to reflect the capacity of the market in view of existing vacancy. The successful attainment of the calculated market for subsidized housing may well depend upon construction in suitable accessible locations, as well as upon the distribution of rents and selling prices over the complete range attainable for housing under the specified programs.

^{2/} Families with incomes inadequate to purchase or rent nonsubsidized housing generally are eligible for one form or another of subsidized housing. However, little or no housing has been provided under most of the subsidized programs, and absorption rates remain to be tested.

Sales Housing under Section 235. Sales housing can be provided for low-to moderate-income families under the provisions of Section 235. Utilizing exception income limits, there is an occupancy potential for about 65 units annually over the next two years. If regular income limits are used, the potential would be about the same. To date, there has been no utilization of the Section 235 program in the HMA.

Rental Housing under the Public Housing and Rent-Supplement Programs. These two programs serve essentially the same low-income households. The principal differences arise from the manner in which net income is computed for each program and other eligibility requirements. The annual occupancy potential for public housing is an estimated 130 units for families and 30 units for the elderly. Less than 10 percent of the families and about 30 percent of the elderly also are eligible for housing under Section 236 (see table II). In the case of the more restrictive rent supplement program, the potential for families would be somewhat less than under public housing, but the market for elderly accommodations would remain comparatively unchanged. As of April 1970, the stock of public housing in the Chapel Hill HMA totaled 66 units and there were 44 additional units under construction, all for families.

Rental Units under Section 236.^{1/} Moderately-priced rental units can be provided under Section 236. Using exception income limits, there is an annual occupancy potential for 65 units of Section 236 housing for families, and 20 units for elderly households and individuals. Based on regular income limits, these potentials would be reduced by approximately 10 percent and 25 percent, respectively. About 15 percent of the families and about 60 percent of the elderly are alternatively eligible for public housing. It should be noted that in terms of eligibility, the Section 236 potential for families and the Section 235 potential draw from essentially the same population and are, therefore, not additive. To date, neither the Section 221(d)(3) BMIR program nor Section 236 program has been utilized in the Chapel Hill HMA.

Sales Market

Over the last four years, increasing construction and financing costs coupled with a marked rise in land values have pushed the price of new sales housing beyond the financial capabilities of many prospective home buyers in the Chapel Hill area. Single-family construction volume remained at about the same level from 1966 through 1969, although the rate of household formation was increasing through the period.

^{1/} Interest reduction payments may also be made with respect to cooperative housing projects. Occupancy requirements under Section 236, however, are identical for both tenants and cooperative owner-occupants.

Nearly all of the new homes sold over the last twelve months have been priced above \$25,000. Most of the new homes were priced between \$29,500 and \$40,000 and were marketed on a speculative basis in tract developments in the eastern part of Chapel Hill. Early in 1970, the one percent rise in interest rates boosted the cost to the home buyer sufficiently to push a number of these homes into a rather thin sector of market demand. As a result, a slight excess of unsold homes in the \$35,000 to \$40,000 range existed in January 1970. The excess inventory dissipated in about two months and reasonable supply-demand balance existed in all price classes of the new home market in April 1970. During the latter half of the 1960's, demand for homes in the upper price classes has increased and production of custom-built units in the \$40,000 to \$60,000 price range has represented a significant part of single-family construction in the last three years.

Much of the demand for sales housing has shifted from the new home market to the existing home market since 1965. Currently, demand is strongest between \$24,000 and \$33,000, but listings of good quality existing homes in this range are scarce because rising mortgage costs have slowed the rate of turnover of the used inventory. In April 1970, the market for existing homes in the Chapel Hill HMA was tight.

Rental Market

The demand for new multifamily housing in the Chapel Hill HMA has been largely dependent on growth in the number of student households. Reflecting an increasing rate of student household formation, multifamily construction generally increased through the 1960's and reached a high level of 761 units authorized by building permits in 1968. Student enrollment, which had grown by an average of about 840 students a year from fall 1960 to fall 1968, only increased by 160 from fall 1968 to fall 1969. Consequently, only 13 multifamily units were authorized in 1969 as local contractors, aware of the large number of units nearing completion, delayed plans for production beyond that for which they had taken out permits pending absorption experience of the units which had been authorized. Despite the decline in enrollment growth, demand pressure generated during the 1964 through 1968 period was strong and the new units built during 1968 and 1969 were absorbed during 1969 and early 1970^{1/} without seriously affecting occupancy levels in the older segment of the rental inventory. The Chapel Hill rental market was strong in April 1970; the renter vacancy ratio was a low 2.5 percent.

^{1/} It should be noted that 151 of the units authorized in 1968 were not started until early 1970.

New multifamily units completed in recent years have been almost exclusively one- and two-bedroom garden style units with rents as low as economically feasible so they would be attractive to students. Currently, rents in these newer projects range from \$130 to \$150 for a one-bedroom unit and from \$140 to \$170 for a two-bedroom unit (excluding utilities) and owners reported virtually total occupancy in April 1970. The older segment of the rental inventory, which also had very few vacancies, consists mainly of duplex, triplex, and fourplex structures constructed in the late 1950's and early 1960's with rents for acceptable units as low as \$85.00 a month for a one-bedroom unit (excluding utilities). The older units are in scattered locations in the central part of Chapel Hill, while most of the newer, larger projects are located on the route 54 bypass or on the eastern fringe of the city.

Economic, Demographic, and Housing Factors

The projected demand for new nonsubsidized housing in the Chapel Hill HMA is based on the current conditions and trends discussed in the economic, demographic, and housing sections which follow.

Economic Factors. Economic growth of the Chapel Hill HMA has been derived primarily from expansion of the University of North Carolina. The University has provided a large proportion of the new job opportunities in the area during the 1960's. In addition, the 80 percent increase in student enrollment^{1/} from 8,592 in fall 1960 to 15,505 in fall 1969 stimulated substantial employment growth in the consumption-oriented industries in the area. The impact of the University is manifest in the fact that 56 percent of all nonagricultural wage and salary workers in the Chapel Hill HMA in 1969 were government workers, a very large proportion of whom were employed by the University. In 1969, nonagricultural wage and salary employment averaged 15,450 jobs. Nonmanufacturing activities accounted for 14,100 workers (91.3 percent of the total) and manufacturing accounted for only 1,350 workers.

Manufacturing employment grew from 1,110 in 1962 to 1,350 in 1969. Most of the growth occurred in the 1965-1969 period with employment increases occurring in the "other manufacturing" and the "printing" categories. Several light industries have located on new sites along Interstate 85 and account for many of the new jobs added in "other manufacturing" from 1965 to 1969. Steady growth in the printing industry provided 60 additional jobs in the 1965-1969 period. Employment in the textile industry, which accounts

^{1/} Includes all full time degree-credit students. See table IV for 1960-1969 series on student enrollment growth.

for over 52 percent of all employment in manufacturing, declined from 745 workers in 1965 to 550 in 1967, then increased to 710 workers in 1969.

Nonmanufacturing employment expanded by 4,610 workers in the 1962-1969 period, representing 95 percent of the growth in nonagricultural wage and salary employment during those years. Government employment, which includes university employment gains, provided 2,785 new jobs from 1962 to 1969; an average of about 400 a year. Nearly all nonmanufacturing employment categories recorded consistent gains over the 1962-1969 period. Principal contributors, in addition to government, were the trade and service industries with increases of 820 and 370 jobs, respectively. In addition, construction employment increased by 415 jobs, most of it occurring between 1967 and 1969.

Nonagricultural wage and salary employment is expected to increase by about 500 jobs annually during the two-year period from April 1970 to April 1972. Further development of prime industrial land along Interstate 85 is expected to continue to attract manufacturing firms into the area and additions of about 75 jobs a year are expected in manufacturing. It is anticipated that nonmanufacturing will grow by about 425 jobs a year during the forecast period, a decline from the 1962-1969 average of about 660 annually. A projected decline in the rate of student enrollment growth is expected to result in slower growth throughout the nonmanufacturing sector. Also, a drop in construction employment is anticipated as several projects are nearing completion.

The 1970 median income, after deduction of federal income tax, of all families in the Chapel Hill HMA is \$6,700, and the median after-tax income of two- or more-person renter households is \$5,700.^{1/} In 1959, the median income, after deduction of federal income tax, of all families in the HMA was \$4,100, and the median after-tax income of renter households of two or more persons was \$3,500. Detailed distributions of all families and of renter households in the Chapel Hill HMA by income classes for 1959 and 1970 are presented in table V.

Demographic Factors. The population of the Chapel Hill HMA reached 59,000 persons in April 1970, including 21,250 in the city of Chapel Hill and 37,750 in the remainder of Orange County (see table VI). A relatively constant level of net natural increase (resident births minus resident deaths) coupled with substantial in-migration, has resulted in population increases of 1,600 persons a year, on the average, since 1960. In-migration has consisted mainly of students, instructors, and professional people associated with medical facilities in the area. In addition, Chapel Hill is an attractive area to retired people and a significant number have located there in recent years.

^{1/} Includes student households.

During the ten-year period ending April 1970, the nonstudent population in the HMA grew by an average of 740 persons annually to a total of 40,550; it is expected to increase by an average of 875 persons annually over the next two years. The projected growth is based primarily on projected increases in local employment, but also assumes continued in-migration of retired persons. The student population grew by an average of 860 persons annually in the 1960-1970 period to a total of 18,450 persons in April 1970. Anticipated growth of the student population should average about 525 persons annually during the forecast period, considerably below the past annual growth. This is attributable mainly to the intention of the University of North Carolina to reduce enrollment growth over the next few years.

In April 1970, there were about 15,200 households in the Chapel Hill HMA, including 11,250 nonstudent households and 3,950 student households (see table VI). Nonstudent household growth is expected to average about 300 a year over the next two years, somewhat above the 1960-1970 average of 240 a year. The growth of student households, however, is expected to fall from the 1960-1970 average of 200 a year to 125 a year over the forecast period. The primary factor in this decline is the projected reduction in annual enrollment growth; however, a recent tightening of regulations regarding student occupancy of on-campus housing may further slow the formation of student households in the future.

Housing Factors. The housing inventory in the Chapel Hill HMA totaled about 15,850 units on April 1, 1970, including 8,625 owner-occupied units, 6,575 renter-occupied units, and 650 vacant housing units. The increase in the housing inventory of about 4,425 units since 1960 resulted from the construction of 4,050 housing units, the addition of 1,000 trailers, and the loss of about 625 units^{1/} through demolitions and other causes. There were about 300 units under construction in April 1970, of which 85 were single-family homes and 215 were units in multifamily structures. Of the multifamily units under construction, 44 were in a low-rent public housing project in Chapel Hill,

The volume of private residential construction, as measured by building permits,^{2/} has fluctuated widely over the last nine years. As can be seen in table VII, multifamily construction accounts for most of the year-to-year variation in building activity in the HMA. Absorption of new multifamily accommodations is dependent largely on growth of the student population; however, periodic increases in the supply of University-owned or privately-owned dormitory space has occasioned considerably fluctuation in demand for multifamily units. The number of multifamily units authorized for construction rose from 40 units in 1962 to 346 units in 1964; but dropped to 156 and 177 units in 1965 and 1966, respectively, as dormitory space for nearly 1,500 students became available in those years. During the 1965 to 1968 period, enrollment increases remained at relatively high levels, a

^{1/} This includes 107 units of University-controlled housing for married students demolished since 1966.

^{2/} An estimated 550 housing units have been built outside permit-issuing places since 1960.

rising proportion of which were graduate students. Despite the entry of more dormitory space in 1967 (970 beds), demand remained strong and authorizations for multifamily units increased to 312 and 761 units, respectively, in 1967 and 1968. Local builders, aware of a projected slowdown in enrollment growth and an increase in dormitory vacancy,^{1/} nearly ceased activity in 1969; only 13 multifamily units were authorized in 1969. During the 1960 decade, single-family construction declined as a proportion of total residential construction volume. Single-family authorizations, which had reached 289 and 284 units in 1964 and 1965, respectively, did not exceed 174 units annually in the post-1965 period.

There were about 240 vacant housing units available in the HMA as of April 1, 1970. About 70 were for sale and 170 were for rent, indicating homeowner and renter vacancy rates of 0.8 and 2.5 percent, respectively. Of the 240 available vacancies, about 65 sales units and 120 rental units were nondilapidated and had all plumbing facilities. Current vacancy rates are slightly below those recorded in April 1960, when the homeowner vacancy rate was 0.9 percent and the renter vacancy rate was 3.8 percent.

^{1/} An estimated 450 dormitory beds were vacant on April 1, 1970.

Table I

Estimated Annual Demand for New, Nonsubsidized Housing
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, HMA
April 1970 to April 1972

A. Single-family homes

<u>Sales price</u>	<u>Number of units</u>	<u>Percent of total</u>
Under \$20,000	50	22
\$20,000 - 24,999	50	22
25,000 - 29,999	45	20
30,000 - 34,999	40	18
35,000 - 39,999	20	9
40,000 and over	<u>20</u>	<u>9</u>
Total	225	100

B. Multifamily units

<u>Gross monthly rents^{a/}</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	<u>One bedroom</u>	<u>Two bedrooms</u>	<u>Three or more bedrooms</u>
Under \$130	5	-	-	-
\$130 - 149	5	30	-	-
150 - 169	-	20	40	-
170 - 189	-	10	25	5
190 - 209	-	-	15	10
210 and over	-	-	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	<u>10</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>20</u>

a/ Gross rent is shelter rent plus the cost of utilities.

Table II

Estimated Annual Occupancy Potential for Subsidized Rental Housing
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, HMA
April 1970 to April 1972

A. Families

	<u>Section 236a/ exclusively</u>	<u>Eligible for both programs</u>	<u>Public housing exclusively</u>	<u>Total for both programs</u>
One bedroom	5	-	10	15
Two bedrooms	25	-	45	70
Three bedrooms	15	5	35	55
Four or more bedrooms	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>45</u>
Total	55	<u>10^{c/}</u>	<u>120^{c/}</u>	185

B. Elderly

Efficiency	5	5	10	20
One bedroom	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>
Total	<u>10^{b/}</u>	<u>10^{d/}</u>	<u>20^{d/}</u>	<u>40</u>

a/ Estimates are based upon exception income limits.

b/ Applications and commitments under Section 202 are being converted to Section 236.

c/ Approximately one-third of these families also are eligible under the rent-supplement program.

d/ All of the elderly couples and individuals also are eligible for rent-supplement payments.

Table III

Labor Force Trends
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, HMA
1962-1969
(Annual averages)

<u>Component</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Civilian work force	<u>15,110</u>	<u>15,200</u>	<u>15,620</u>	<u>17,750</u>	<u>18,210</u>	<u>19,200</u>	<u>19,100</u>	<u>19,215</u>
Unemployment	600	620	560	560	520	460	580	575
Percent unemployed	4.0	4.1	3.6	3.2	2.9	2.4	3.0	3.0
Employment Total	<u>14,510</u>	<u>14,580</u>	<u>15,060</u>	<u>17,190</u>	<u>17,690</u>	<u>18,740</u>	<u>18,520</u>	<u>18,640</u>
Nonag. wage & salary	<u>10,600</u>	<u>10,620</u>	<u>11,080</u>	<u>13,150</u>	<u>13,840</u>	<u>14,880</u>	<u>15,240</u>	<u>15,450</u>
Manufacturing	<u>1,110</u>	<u>1,050</u>	<u>1,020</u>	<u>1,140</u>	<u>1,050</u>	<u>1,050</u>	<u>1,120</u>	<u>1,350</u>
Textiles	640	610	625	745	620	550	570	710
Lumber & wood	195	175	110	115	140	115	50	100
Printing	70	60	70	70	75	90	105	130
Other manufacturing	205	205	215	210	215	295	395	410
Nonmanufacturing	<u>9,490</u>	<u>9,570</u>	<u>10,060</u>	<u>12,010</u>	<u>12,790</u>	<u>13,830</u>	<u>14,120</u>	<u>14,100</u>
Construction	420	430	520	520	480	480	730	835
Trans., comm., & pub. util.	100	100	110	110	120	140	160	145
Trade	1,470	1,510	1,720	1,760	1,920	2,080	2,220	2,290
Fin., ins., & real est.	460	490	530	530	610	710	640	635
Service	1,100	1,080	1,130	1,260	1,340	1,380	1,410	1,470
Government	5,900	5,900	6,000	7,780	8,270	8,990	8,910	8,685
Other nonmanufacturing	40	60	50	50	50	50	50	40
Other nonagricultural ^{a/}	1,930	1,920	2,120	2,400	2,340	2,400	1,970	1,940
Agricultural employment	1,980	2,040	1,860	1,640	1,510	1,460	1,310	1,250

^{a/} Includes self-employed, unpaid family workers, and domestic workers.

Source: Employment Security Commission of North Carolina.

Table IV

Trend of Student Enrollment at the
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, HMA
Fall 1960 - Fall 1969

<u>Year</u>	<u>Student enrollment^{a/}</u>	<u>Change from previous year</u>
Fall 1960	8,592	-
Fall 1961	9,082	490
Fall 1962	9,604	522
Fall 1963	10,887	1,283
Fall 1964	11,303	416
Fall 1965	12,419	1,116
Fall 1966	13,352	933
Fall 1967	14,720	1,368
Fall 1968	15,345	625
Fall 1969	15,505	160

a/ Includes all full time degree-credit students.

Source: University of North Carolina.

Table V

Percentage Distribution of All Families and Renter Households
by Estimated Annual Income After Deduction of Federal Income Tax
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, HMA

<u>Annual income</u>	<u>1959</u>		<u>1970</u>	
	<u>All families</u>	<u>Renter households^{a/}</u>	<u>All families</u>	<u>Renter households^{a/}</u>
Under \$2,000	17	22	8	11
\$2,000 - 2,999	14	19	7	10
3,000 - 3,999	16	16	8	11
4,000 - 4,999	13	13	10	12
5,000 - 5,999	10	10	11	9
6,000 - 6,999	8	5	8	9
7,000 - 7,999	5	3	7	7
8,000 - 8,999	3	2	6	6
9,000 - 9,999	3	2	6	4
10,000 - 12,499	5	4	10	8
12,500 - 14,999	4	3	6	5
15,000 and over	2	1	13	8
Total	100	100	100	100
Median	\$4,100	\$3,500	\$6,700	\$5,700

^{a/} Excludes one-person renter households.

Source: Estimated by Housing Market Analyst.

Table VI

Demographic Trends
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, HMA
1960-1972

	<u>April</u> <u>1960</u>	<u>April</u> <u>1970</u>	<u>April</u> <u>1972</u>	<u>Average annual change</u>			
				<u>1960-1970</u>		<u>1970-1972</u>	
				<u>Number^{a/}</u>	<u>Percent^{b/}</u>	<u>Number^{a/}</u>	<u>Percent^{b/}</u>
<u>Geographic components</u>							
Total population ^{c/}	<u>42,970</u>	<u>59,000</u>	<u>61,800</u>	<u>1,600</u>	3.1	<u>1,400</u>	2.4
Chapel Hill	<u>12,573</u>	<u>21,250</u>	<u>22,300</u>	<u>870</u>	5.2	<u>525</u>	2.5
Remainder of Orange County	<u>30,397</u>	<u>37,750</u>	<u>39,500</u>	<u>730</u>	2.2	<u>875</u>	2.3
Total households ^{c/}	<u>10,763</u>	<u>15,200</u>	<u>16,050</u>	<u>440</u>	3.5	<u>425</u>	2.8
Chapel Hill	<u>2,656</u>	<u>4,550</u>	<u>4,850</u>	<u>190</u>	5.3	<u>150</u>	3.3
Remainder of Orange County	<u>8,107</u>	<u>10,650</u>	<u>11,200</u>	<u>250</u>	2.7	<u>275</u>	2.6
<u>Demographic components</u>							
Total population	<u>42,970</u>	<u>59,000</u>	<u>61,800</u>	<u>1,600</u>	3.1	<u>1,400</u>	2.4
Nonstudent	<u>33,170</u>	<u>40,550</u>	<u>42,300</u>	<u>740</u>	2.0	<u>875</u>	2.2
Student ^{d/}	<u>9,800</u>	<u>18,450</u>	<u>19,500</u>	<u>860</u>	6.3	<u>525</u>	2.8
Total households	<u>10,763</u>	<u>15,200</u>	<u>16,050</u>	<u>440</u>	3.5	<u>425</u>	2.8
Nonstudent	<u>8,813</u>	<u>11,250</u>	<u>11,850</u>	<u>240</u>	2.5	<u>300</u>	2.0
Student	<u>1,950</u>	<u>3,950</u>	<u>4,200</u>	<u>200</u>	7.1	<u>125</u>	3.2

a/ Rounded.

b/ Calculated by a formula designed to show the percentage increase on a compound basis.

c/ In 1963, an area of Orange County containing approximately 1,300 persons in 400 households was annexed to the town of Chapel Hill.

d/ Includes students and their dependents.

Sources: 1960 Censuses of Population and Housing; University of North Carolina; and estimates by Housing Market Analyst.

Table VII

Private Residential Construction and Dormitory Spaces Provided^{a/}
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, HMA
1960-1970

	<u>1960^{b/}</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>Through March 1970</u>
Residential construction											
HMA total	<u>75</u>	<u>360</u>	<u>192</u>	<u>324</u>	<u>635</u>	<u>440</u>	<u>326</u>	<u>468</u>	<u>935</u>	<u>178</u>	<u>53</u>
Single-family	<u>63</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>289</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>149</u>	<u>156</u>	<u>174</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>53</u>
Multifamily	<u>12</u>	<u>128</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>169</u>	<u>346</u>	<u>156</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>312</u>	<u>761</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>-</u>
Chapel Hill	<u>59</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>183</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>237</u>	<u>476</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>12</u>
Single-family	<u>51</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>12</u>
Multifamily	<u>8</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>204^{c/}</u>	<u>423^{d/}</u>	<u>5^{e/}</u>	<u>-</u>
Remainder of HMA	<u>16</u>	<u>235</u>	<u>131</u>	<u>214</u>	<u>452</u>	<u>327</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>459</u>	<u>103</u>	<u>41</u>
Single-family	<u>12</u>	<u>144</u>	<u>99</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>223</u>	<u>202</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>123</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>41</u>
Multifamily	<u>4</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>229</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>-</u>
Dormitory space (no. of beds)											
HMA total			<u>1,377</u>			<u>1,488</u>	<u>506</u>	<u>970</u>		<u>432</u>	
University-owned			<u>1,377</u>			<u>1,010</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>970</u>		<u>-</u>	
Privately-owned			<u>-</u>			<u>478</u>	<u>506</u>	<u>-</u>		<u>432</u>	

a/ Includes only units authorized by building permits. Since 1960, an estimated 550 housing units have been started outside permit-issuing places in Orange County.

b/ Complete information for 1960 not available.

c/ Excludes permit for 49 public housing units.

d/ Excludes permit for 11 public housing units.

e/ Excludes permit for 44 public housing units.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, C-40 Construction Reports; Building Inspectors of Chapel Hill, Carrboro, and Hillsborough; University of North Carolina.

Table VIII

Tenure and Occupancy in the Housing Inventory
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, HMA
April 1, 1960 and April 1, 1970

<u>Tenure and occupancy</u>	<u>April 1960</u>	<u>April 1970</u>
Total housing supply	11,418	15,850
Occupied housing units	10,763	15,200
Owner-occupied	6,290	8,625
Percent of all occupied	58.4	56.7
Renter-occupied	4,473	6,575
Percent of all occupied	41.6	43.3
Vacant housing units	655	650
Available vacant	235	240
For sale	58	70
Homeowner vacancy rate	0.9%	0.8%
For rent	177	170
Renter vacancy rate	3.8%	2.5%
Other vacant ^{a/}	420	410

^{a/} Includes seasonal units, vacant dilapidated units, units rented or sold awaiting occupancy, and units held off the market for absentee owners or other reasons.

Sources: 1960 Census of Housing;
1970 estimated by Housing Market Analyst.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

OCT 15 1970

RECEIVED
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410

728.1 :308 F22 Chapel Hill, N.C.
1970

U.S. Federal Housing Administra-
tion
Analysis...

**U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20411**

**OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300**



**POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**