

728.1
:308
F22
Pittsburgh

1969

Analysis of the
**PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA
HOUSING MARKET**

as of September 1, 1969

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEB 1 0 1970

LIBRARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410

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

January 1970

ANALYSIS OF THE
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA
HOUSING MARKET
AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1969

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

728.1
:308
F22
Pittsburgh
1969

FHA Housing Market Analysis
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as of September 1, 1969

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 Field Market Analysis Service 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
Field Market Analysis Service
Washington, D. C.

FHA HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS - PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA
AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1969^{1/}

The Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area (HMA), which includes the counties of Allegheny, Beaver, Washington, and Westmoreland, is coterminous with the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) as defined by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget. The Pittsburgh economy, historically based on the production of durable goods, made a sharp recovery during the mid-1960's following several years of recession that spanned most of the late 1950's and early 1960's. The rate of employment growth in the HMA has slowed since 1966, however, and most of the employment growth in the last three years has been in nonmanufacturing, principally in trade, services, and government.

The rapid employment growth in the HMA over the 1964-1966 period had a strong impact on the local housing market. Following a comparatively low level of residential construction in 1966 because of restrictions in the mortgage market, the number of units authorized by building permits exceeded 10,000 in both 1967 and 1968^{2/}, and authorizations continued at a rate of nearly 10,000 annually in the first six

^{1/} Data presented in this analysis are supplementary to a previous FHA analysis as of July 1, 1967.

^{2/} If only non-subsidized housing is considered, authorizations averaged about 9,400 units yearly.

months of 1969. Since the rate of economic growth in the HMA had decelerated since 1966, the level of residential construction was slightly greater than household growth during 1967 and 1968 and the number of available vacancies in the HMA rose somewhat. Despite the moderate increase in the supply of available housing in recent years, over-all vacancy ratios of 1.1 percent in the sales inventory and 4.6 percent in the rental inventory indicate that the Pittsburgh housing market had a reasonable balance between demand and supply in September 1969.

Anticipated Housing Demand

The demand for new nonsubsidized housing in the Pittsburgh HMA during the September 1969 to September 1971 forecast period takes into consideration the prospective household growth and inventory losses resulting from demolitions, code enforcement, and relocation because of highway construction. Barring unanticipated changes in the economic, demographic, and housing factors discussed later in this report, it is judged that the optimum demand-supply balance would be achieved in the housing market if 5,000 nonsubsidized units were supplied as sales housing and 4,000 units as rental housing. The distribution of the nonsubsidized sales demand by price range and rental demand by unit size and price is presented in table I.

The following table presents the estimated annual demand for nonsubsidized housing in the HMA and constituent counties during the next two years. In some instances, the demand figures shown below have been adjusted downward slightly to reflect either an excess number of vacant standard units or an excess number of units under construction.

Estimated Annual Demand for New Nonsubsidized Housing
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
September 1, 1969 to September 1, 1971

<u>Area</u>	<u>Sales housing</u>	<u>Rental housing</u>	<u>Total</u>
City of Pittsburgh	200	850	1,050
Remainder of county	3,450	2,550	6,000
Allegheny County	3,650	3,400	7,050
Beaver County	300	225	525
Washington County	300	200	500
Westmoreland County	750	175	925
HMA total	5,000	4,000	9,000

The demand for new nonsubsidized housing during the September 1969-September 1971 forecast period is slightly lower than the average volume of new nonsubsidized construction in the HMA during 1967 and 1968. However, a reduced rate of employment growth is expected in the HMA during 1970 and 1971 as compared with trends in the recent past, and it does not appear that the post-1966 level of new construction could be maintained without leading to a further increase in vacancy. The estimates of demand shown above are not predictions of short-term levels of construction activity; rather, they are intended as a guide in establishing a level of construction in the HMA which could provide a stable long-run housing market situation.

In assessing the housing situation in the Pittsburgh area, short-run changes in the economic situation should be watched carefully. Historically, the local economy has been highly susceptible to cyclical changes in national business conditions. Thus, a slight recession or even significant slowdown in the economy nationally could result in a declining level of employment locally as occurred during much of the late 1950's and early 1960's. Such a development could give impetus to out-migration from the HMA and have a decided effect on the housing market in a very short period of time. It is also important to note that the demand estimates are based on a comparatively high allowance for demolitions which are dependent, in part, upon the rapidity with which urban renewal programs and plans for highway construction are implemented. The absorption of new rental housing, both subsidized and unsubsidized, should be observed closely, therefore, and appropriate adjustments made as market conditions suggest.

Occupancy Potential for Subsidized Housing

Federal assistance in financing costs for new housing for low- or moderate-income families may be provided through four different programs administered by FHA--monthly rent-supplement payments, principally in rental projects financed with market-interest-rate mortgages insured under Section 221(d)(3); partial payments for interest for home mortgages insured primarily under Section 235; partial payment for interest for project mortgages insured under Section 236; and below-market-interest-rate financing for project mortgages insured under Section 221(d)(3).

Household eligibility for federal subsidy programs is determined for the most part by evidence that household or family income is below established limits. Some families may be alternatively eligible for assistance under one or more of these programs or under other assistance programs using federal or state support. Since the potential for each program is estimated separately, there is no attempt to eliminate the overlaps among program estimates. Accordingly, the occupancy potentials discussed for various programs are not additive. Furthermore, future approvals under each program should take into account any intervening approvals under other programs which serve the same

requirements. The potentials^{1/} discussed in the following paragraphs reflect estimates adjusted for housing provided or under construction under alternative FHA or other programs.

The annual occupancy potentials for subsidized housing in FHA programs discussed below are based upon 1969 incomes, on the occupancy of substandard housing, on estimates of the elderly population, on September 1, 1969 income limits, and on available market experience.^{2/} The occupancy potentials by size of units required are shown in table II.

Section 221(d)(3)BMIR. If federal funds were available, a total of about 2,275 units of Section 221(d)(3) housing probably could be absorbed in the HMA during the next year.^{3/} About 80 percent of the families eligible under this program also are eligible under Sections 235 and 236. As of September 1969 there were four Section 221(d)(3)BMIR projects in the HMA containing a total of 473 units, including two projects of 195 units just completed in August 1969. An additional three projects containing 802 units were under construction and scheduled to be completed by September 1970. The potential for occupancy under the Section 221(d)(3) program has been adjusted to reflect the large number of units just completed and under construction.

Rent-Supplement. There is an estimated occupancy potential for 3,580 units annually under rent-supplement in the Pittsburgh HMA, including 1,915 for families and 1,665 for elderly couples and individuals. Approximately 10 percent of the families and 20 percent of the elderly also are eligible for accommodations built under Section 236. In general, families in the HMA eligible for rent supplements also are eligible for public low-rent housing. In September 1969 there were approximately 15,850 public low-rent housing units in the HMA, including 2,000 units

^{1/} The occupancy potentials referred to in this analysis have been calculated to reflect the capacity of the market in view of existing vacancy strength or weakness. The successful attainment of the calculated potential for subsidized housing may well depend upon construction in suitable accessible locations, as well as upon the distribution of rents and sales prices over the complete range attainable for housing under 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 some of the subsidized programs and absorption rates remain to be tested.

^{3/} At the present time, funds for allocations are available only from recaptures resulting from reductions, withdrawals, and cancellations of outstanding allocations.

designed for elderly occupancy. An additional 1,100 units (775 elderly) were under construction. Local public housing authorities in the HMA report that the number of vacancies in projects under their jurisdiction is negligible. As of September 1, 1969, 116 units in the HMA were receiving rent-supplement payments, and fund reservations have been made for rent-supplements for up to 198 units in the Section 221(d)(3) units to be completed in the next year.

Section 235, Sales Housing. Sales housing can be provided for low- to moderate-income families in the HMA under Section 235. As of September 1969 approximately 25 new houses in the HMA had been processed under Section 235; most of these were in Westmoreland County. All of the families in the potential for Section 235 housing are included in the potential for the Section 236 program discussed below. Most of these families also have incomes within the Section 221(d)(3) range. Under exception income limits there is an occupancy potential for about 1,700 houses a year. Using regular income limits, the potential would be reduced to 20 percent of this total. However, prevailing land, construction, and development costs will preclude the construction of new houses that can be sold within the mortgage limits in effect under this program at the present time in most areas of HMA (especially Allegheny County).

Section 236, Rental Housing. In the Pittsburgh area, the annual occupancy potential is estimated at 1,900 units for families and 1,000 units for elderly couples and individuals under this section. Approximately 10 percent of the families and 30 percent of the elderly also are eligible for rent-supplement housing. The potential would be reduced to 20 percent of the indicated total for families and 75 percent of the total for elderly households if regular income limits were used. As of September 1969 no housing had been provided under Section 236, but three projects of 280 units had been built under Section 202, housing for the elderly. One Section 236 project of 152 units was under construction in the HMA in September 1969.

Submarket Occupancy Potential

The occupancy potentials shown in table II may be distributed among the constituent HMA counties according to the pattern presented in the following table.

Percentage Distribution of the Occupancy Potential
for Subsidized Rental Housing by Submarket
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area

<u>Area</u>	<u>Rent Supplement</u>	<u>Sections 235 and 236</u>	<u>Elderly^{a/}</u>
Allegheny County	72	71	68
Beaver County	6	7	8
Washington County	9	9	10
Westmoreland County	<u>13</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>
HMA total	100	100	100

a/ Includes those eligible under Section 236 and public housing (which includes rent supplement).

The Sales Market

Despite widely varying economic conditions, the over-all sales vacancy ratio in the Pittsburgh HMA has changed little since the beginning of the decade. There was a declining level of employment in the area during the late 1950's and early 1960's, but the sales vacancy ratio increased only slightly between 1960 and 1965, from 1.0 percent to 1.2 percent. Between 1965 and 1967, a period of rapid employment growth, the vacancy rate dropped again to 1.0 percent. In the past two years the vacancy rate has risen to 1.1 percent; however, in September 1969 all submarkets in the HMA were judged to have a reasonable balance between demand and supply. The sales vacancy ratio in 1969 was highest in the city of Pittsburgh, but many of the vacancies are in older units of marginal quality.

The sales market in the Pittsburgh HMA has been characterized by rapid increases in the sales price of new homes. Informed local sources estimate that construction costs in the four-county area have risen at a rate of more than 10 percent a year in the last three years. In addition to rising costs associated with land, labor, materials, and financing, Pittsburgh area builders are constructing larger units. Detached homes with four or more bedrooms have accounted for more than one-half of all completions in recent years. With the exception of a few homes built in the outlying counties, new houses selling below \$17,500 have virtually disappeared from the market. Information obtained from local builders and other sources suggests that about two-fifths of all houses being constructed in the HMA at the present time are priced at \$30,000 and above. Despite the problems in the sales market related to increasing costs and sales prices, new units are readily marketed. Approximately three-fourths of the sales units built in the HMA since 1965 were sold prior to the start of construction. In addition, surveys taken in early 1969 by the FHA and other private groups indicate that fewer than five percent of the sales houses built speculatively in the HMA during 1968 were unsold in January 1969.

Single-family construction in the city of Pittsburgh is somewhat limited; the lack of buildable land precludes large-scale subdivision development, and most of the new sales housing in the city is limited to scattered sites. Most of the single-family construction in recent years has been in the suburban areas of Allegheny County. Two-thirds of the single-family permits issued in the HMA between January 1966 and June 1969 were in suburban Allegheny County. In January 1969 the FHA surveyed over 100 subdivisions in which five or more houses had been completed during 1968. In general, subdivisions in southern Allegheny County contained a higher proportion of units priced at \$30,000 and above than in other suburban localities. These include several large developments in Bethel Park Borough and Upper St. Clair Township. New construction in the \$22,500-\$30,000 price range was significant in the eastern Pittsburgh suburbs during 1968, principally in the Plum Borough, Monroeville, and Murrysville areas. Although lower-priced units have accounted for a decreasing proportion of the total construction volume in recent years, a number of developments west of Pittsburgh in Oakdale Borough, Robinson Township, and Moon Township provided a number of new units in 1968 priced between \$17,500 and \$22,500. Subdivision activity in the outlying counties of Beaver, Washington, and Westmoreland is quite limited. Much of the new construction in these areas is done on a contract basis for individuals or is located in small subdivisions of fewer than five homes. A number of the units in the small subdivisions are sold from model homes, and the number of unsold new homes in the outlying counties in 1969 was judged to be insignificant.

The Rental Market

Despite record levels of multifamily construction in the HMA since 1964 and a declining rate of employment growth in 1967 and 1968 as compared with the mid-1960's, there has been only a slight increase in the rental vacancy ratio in the HMA, from 4.4 percent in July 1967 to an estimated 4.6 percent in September 1969. On an over-all basis, rental vacancy rates in the HMA were lower in 1969 than in the first half of the decade, a period during which there was a much lower level of apartment construction. With a few exceptions, primarily in Westmoreland County, new rental accommodations in the HMA are successfully marketed in a short period of time. In the city of Pittsburgh rental vacancies are disproportionately concentrated in the older, less competitive units. Despite an increasing number of demolitions for urban renewal programs and highway construction, the older units tend to remain vacant because out-migration from the city has accelerated since the mid-1960's. Rental vacancy rates in the outlying counties are a little higher than warranted, based on past and prospective household growth, but the bulk of the inventory in those areas consists of old single-family structures which have been transferred to rental use. Typically, small, well-located projects of up to 75 units are satisfactorily absorbed in most Beaver, Washington, and Westmoreland County localities.

The soundness of the Pittsburgh rental market in 1969 is reflected in a variety of data compiled by the FHA and by private sources. A survey of FHA-insured projects conducted annually shows a steady decline in vacancy from more than 10 percent in 1963 to less than two percent in March 1969. Another survey conducted by the FHA in Allegheny County in August 1969 covered approximately 11,700 units in projects that, for the most part, were less than five years old. In the city of Pittsburgh the occupancy ratio was 86 percent in projects completed less than eighteen months and 97 percent in the older projects. Comparable occupancy experience in suburban Allegheny County was 90 percent in projects less than eighteen months old and 99 percent in the older projects. A number of the newer projects surveyed were rented prior to completion, and in most other instances a satisfactory level of occupancy was reached within 90 days after completion. The occupancy ratios in both Pittsburgh and suburban Allegheny County would have been somewhat higher if two high-rise, high-rent projects which had been in operation only two months prior to the date of the survey had been excluded from the survey results.

Apartment construction in Beaver, Washington, and Westmoreland Counties is limited. Although the vacancy rates in these counties appear to be moderately high for areas of slow population growth, many vacant units are substandard or are old single-family dwellings of marginal quality that have been converted to multiple use. A survey of new rental accommodations built in these counties in recent years indicates that new units are readily absorbed if they are in moderate-sized, well-located projects. In the last few years several 20 to 75-unit apartment projects have been marketed successfully in the Beaver Falls area of Beaver County, in the Greenburg and Hempfield Township areas of Westmoreland County, and in the Washington community in Washington County. By comparison, a large apartment complex in western Westmoreland County has yet to attain a satisfactory level of occupancy because the last stages were completed at a rate far in excess of the absorptive capacity of the market.

Monthly gross rents in the newer apartment developments in the HMA vary widely depending on location and structural type. In Pittsburgh, monthly gross rents in the newer high-rise developments average about \$175 for efficiencies, \$230 for one-bedroom units, \$275 for two-bedroom units, and \$435 for three-bedroom accommodations. Monthly gross rents in the newer elevator projects in suburban Allegheny County are somewhat lower at about \$145 for efficiencies, \$185 for one-bedroom units, \$240 for two-bedroom units, and \$395 for three-bedroom units. Monthly charges in the newest garden apartments in Allegheny County are somewhat lower, averaging about \$125 for efficiencies, \$150 for one-bedroom units, and \$175 for two-bedroom units. The lowest monthly rents for garden apartments in the HMA in 1969 were townhouse apartments in Westmoreland County renting for \$135 a month for one-bedroom units and \$155 for two-bedroom units, plus electricity.

Economic, Demographic, and Housing Factors

The anticipated demand for an average of 9,000 new nonsubsidized housing units annually in the Pittsburgh HMA during the September 1969-1971 period is predicated on the following findings and assumptions regarding employment, income, demographic factors, and housing trends.

Employment. As shown in table III, the rate of employment growth in the Pittsburgh HMA has slowed since 1966. Increases in nonagricultural wage and salary employment totaled 17,300 between 1966 and 1967 and 10,600 between 1967 and 1968. For the twelve-month period August 1968 through July 1969, wage and salary employment was 7,700 above the average for the twelve-month period ending July 1968. The gains in wage and salary employment since 1966 compare with an average increase of 24,900 a year between 1964 and 1966. The rapid economic growth during the mid-1960's marked the end of a recession period in the Pittsburgh area that spanned the late 1950's and early 1960's. Between 1957 and 1963 wage and salary employment in the HMA declined by an average of over 16,000 jobs annually.

The manufacturing sector of the Pittsburgh economy was characterized during the mid-1960's by fairly large employment gains in the primary metals and fabricated metals industries. Since 1966, the over-all level of manufacturing employment has dropped, with a decline in employment of 7,000 in primary metals being the primary employment loss. In only one manufacturing industry (electrical machinery) has there been an increase in employment during 1967 and 1968 that was significantly greater than in the preceding two-year period. Employment growth in trade, services and government has accounted for over 96 percent of the total increase in wage and salary employment in the HMA since 1966.

The rate of unemployment in the HMA averaged 2.7 percent during the August 1968-July 1969 period. The rate of unemployment in the HMA declined from 8.0 percent to 3.0 percent during the rapid employment growth of the mid-1960's. Although employment growth in the Pittsburgh area has decelerated in recent years, the rate of unemployment has remained at 3.1 percent or below since 1966.

Because of the highly industrialized nature of the Pittsburgh economy, year-to-year changes in the level of manufacturing employment have been quite volatile. Several of the leading industries are producers of capital goods and as such are highly susceptible to rapid changes in economic prospects. With a few exceptions, notably 1964-1966, there has been a long-run decline in manufacturing employment in the Pittsburgh area over the past two decades. For example, the level of manufacturing employment in the HMA during the last year or so was approximately 80,000 below the post-1950 peak of 368,500 in 1953. Because the rate of economic expansion nationally during the foreseeable future is expected to be below the levels of the mid-1960's, the decline in manufacturing employment that began in 1966 is expected

to continue through 1970 and 1971, perhaps by as much as 2,000 a year. The establishment of the Chrysler assembly plant in suburban New Stanton might have reversed the downward trend in manufacturing employment during the forecast period, but completion of that facility has been delayed until at least 1972. When fully operative, about 4,500 workers will be employed at this facility. Past trends suggest that increases in nonmanufacturing employment of 11,000 annually during the next two years would be a reasonable expectation. As in the past, almost all of the increase in nonmanufacturing employment is expected in trade, services and government. On balance, foreseeable economic prospects for the Pittsburgh area suggest that increases in wage and salary employment averaging 9,000 a year during the September 1969-September 1971 period would be a reasonable expectation.

Incomes. The median annual income of all families in the Pittsburgh HMA, after deduction of federal income tax, was estimated at \$8,025 in September 1969, and the median after-tax income of all tenant households of two persons or more was \$6,700. The highest median annual after-tax income in the HMA is in suburban Allegheny County (\$8,725), and the lowest (\$7,275) is in Washington County. See table IV for detailed distributions by income of all families and renter households in the HMA for 1967 and 1969.

Population. The rapideconomic gains in the Pittsburgh area since 1965 as compared with the first half of the decade are reflected in population growth. Between July 1965 and July 1967 the HMA population increased by an average of 21,100 a year, as compared with annual increments of 11,800 between 1960 and 1965 (see table V). Although a little below 1965-1967 experience, the average annual population gain of 14,950 between July 1967 and September 1969 was well above the annual rate of population growth in the first half of the decade. Most of the population growth in the HMA continues to be in suburban Allegheny County. Since the mid-1960's Westmoreland County has accounted for an increasing proportion of the population growth in the HMA outside Allegheny County.

The lower rate of population growth in the Pittsburgh HMA during 1967 and 1968 as compared with the 1964-1966 period resulted, in part, from a decline in the number of in-migrants. A declining birth rate also has been responsible for the lower rate of population growth in recent years. For example, the net natural increase in the Pittsburgh HMA (resident births less resident deaths) was nearly 26,400 in 1960 but less than 10,250 in 1968. During 1970 and 1971 the projected level of employment growth in the HMA is expected to remain below the increases of the mid-1960's, and the birth rate in the area is expected to continue to decline. Based on these factors, the population is expected to increase by an average of 14,000 persons yearly to an HMA total of 2,570,000 by September 1971. See table V for population trends in major submarkets in the HMA since 1960.

Households. As of September 1, 1969, there were an estimated 765,300 households (occupied housing units) in the Pittsburgh area, an increase of an average of 6,700 households a year since July 1967. As shown in table V, this was well above the annual rate of growth during the 1960-1965 period, but somewhat below the 1965-1967 increment, a period of rapid employment growth. Nearly four-fifths of the household growth in the HMA since 1960 has occurred in suburban Allegheny County. A combination of comparatively low levels of new construction, demolition activity, and out-migration has led to a modest decline in the number of households in the city of Pittsburgh since 1960.

Based on anticipated population increases and on a small change in the average size of households, it is estimated that household growth in the HMA will average 6,650 a year during the next two years and reach a total of 778,600 by September 1971. Most of the increase in the number of households in the HMA during 1970 and 1971 is expected in suburban Allegheny County; a continued decline in the number of households is forecast for the city of Pittsburgh. The delayed completion of the Chrysler Corporation facility in New Stanton has caused postponement of announced plans for new residential construction and, as a result, household growth in Westmoreland County during the forecast period is expected to be below 1965-1969 experience. In comparison, new construction planned for Washington County in the near future likely will result in an increase in household growth somewhat above the 1967-1969 trend. See table V for changes in the number of households in the Pittsburgh area during the April 1960-September 1971 period.

Housing Inventory. As of September 1, 1969, there were approximately 800,500 housing units in the Pittsburgh HMA, an increase of 16,500 units since July 1, 1967, or 7,625 a year. As shown in table VI, this is just a little below the July 1965-July 1967 increase of 7,700 a year, but is well above the average increase in the housing inventory in the first half of the 1960 decade (5,300 a year). Over three-fourths of the increase in the housing supply between 1967 and 1969 was in suburban Allegheny County. The housing supply in the city of Pittsburgh has changed little in recent years, with new residential construction being offset by an almost equal number of units removed from the inventory through demolition and other causes. In the remainder of the HMA the bulk of new construction in recent years has been in Westmoreland County.

Restrictions in the mortgage market precipitated a decline in new residential construction in the HMA in 1966 when fewer than 8,200 units were authorized by building permits (see table VII). Although the mortgage market nationally continues to be hampered by rising interest rates, demand pressures in the Pittsburgh area arising from the rapid employment growth of the mid-1960's have sustained a comparatively high level of new residential construction in the HMA in the last two years. Over 10,750 housing units were authorized by building permits in 1967, a post-1960 high, while an estimated 10,200 were authorized during 1968. An estimate of the number of units autho-

rized during the first half of 1969 indicates only a slight decline from the 1967-1968 level. About 2,200 units of subsidized housing are included in these totals; the average annual volume of nonsubsidized housing was about 9,400 units a year. With the exception of a few housing units built in the rural areas of the HMA, all residential construction is in areas which require building permits. In September 1969 an estimated 1,600 single-family houses and 4,000 units in multi-family structures were under construction in the HMA, with Allegheny County accounting for over 70 percent of the total.

As measured by building permits, the annual volume of new single-family construction in the HMA has fluctuated between 5,000 and 6,000 units since 1960, with high and low points being established in 1965 and 1966. However, building permit authorizations for single-family units totaled nearly 5,500 in 1967 and have been issued at an annual rate of over 5,000 a year since then. About two-thirds of the single-family construction volume in the HMA in recent years has been in suburban Allegheny County. In comparison, the number of units authorized in multifamily structures has risen steadily during the decade, from fewer than 1,950 in 1960 to nearly 3,750 in 1965. Since 1965 multifamily construction as measured by building permits has averaged 4,525 units yearly. Since 1965 roughly two-thirds of the multifamily construction in the HMA has been in suburban Allegheny County, while the city of Pittsburgh accounted for about one-fifth of the multifamily total. Since 1966 nearly one-half of the housing units completed in the HMA have been in multifamily structures.

Vacancy. There has been a comparatively high level of new residential construction in the HMA in spite of a downturn in new residential building during 1966 because of a tight mortgage market. Concurrent with this, there has been a declining rate of employment growth in the HMA. The combination of a high level of new residential construction and a lower level of in-migration led to a moderate increase in vacancy in the Pittsburgh area between July 1967 and September 1969. Based on a July 1969 postal vacancy survey and on other vacancy information, there were an estimated 18,400 vacant units in the HMA available for sale or rent in September 1969, an over-all vacancy rate of 2.4 percent. This total included 5,500 units available for sale and 12,850 vacant and available for rent, equaling vacancy ratios of 1.1 percent and 4.6 percent, respectively. The housing inventory in mid-1967 had a sales vacancy ratio of 4.4 percent (11,950 vacancies). Vacancy trends in submarket areas for selected dates between April 1960 and September 1969 are shown in table VIII.

Households. As of September 1, 1969, there were an estimated 765,300 households (occupied housing units) in the Pittsburgh area, an increase of an average of 6,700 households a year since July 1967. As shown in table V, this was well above the annual rate of growth during the 1960-1965 period, but somewhat below the 1965-1967 increment, a period of rapid employment growth. Nearly four-fifths of the household growth in the HMA since 1960 has occurred in suburban Allegheny County. A combination of comparatively low levels of new construction, demolition activity, and out-migration has led to a modest decline in the number of households in the city of Pittsburgh since 1960.

Based on anticipated population increases and on a small change in the average size of households, it is estimated that household growth in the HMA will average 6,650 a year during the next two years and reach a total of 778,600 by September 1971. Most of the increase in the number of households in the HMA during 1970 and 1971 is expected in suburban Allegheny County; a continued decline in the number of households is forecast for the city of Pittsburgh. The delayed completion of the Chrysler Corporation facility in New Stanton has caused postponement of announced plans for new residential construction and, as a result, household growth in Westmoreland County during the forecast period is expected to be below 1965-1969 experience. In comparison, new construction planned for Washington County in the near future likely will result in an increase in household growth somewhat above the 1967-1969 trend. See table V for changes in the number of households in the Pittsburgh area during the April 1960-September 1971 period.

Housing Inventory. As of September 1, 1969, there were approximately 800,500 housing units in the Pittsburgh HMA, an increase of 16,500 units since July 1, 1967, or 7,625 a year. As shown in table VI, this is just a little below the July 1965-July 1967 increase of 7,700 a year, but is well above the average increase in the housing inventory in the first half of the 1960 decade (5,300 a year). Over three-fourths of the increase in the housing supply between 1967 and 1969 was in suburban Allegheny County. The housing supply in the city of Pittsburgh has changed little in recent years, with new residential construction being offset by an almost equal number of units removed from the inventory through demolition and other causes. In the remainder of the HMA the bulk of new construction in recent years has been in Westmoreland County.

Restrictions in the mortgage market precipitated a decline in new residential construction in the HMA in 1966 when fewer than 8,200 units were authorized by building permits (see table VII). Although the mortgage market nationally continues to be hampered by rising interest rates, demand pressures in the Pittsburgh area arising from the rapid employment growth of the mid-1960's have sustained a comparatively high level of new residential construction in the HMA in the last two years. Over 10,750 housing units were authorized by building permits in 1967, a post-1960 high, while an estimated 10,200 were authorized during 1968. An estimate of the number of units autho-

rized during the first half of 1969 indicates only a slight decline from the 1967-1968 level. About 2,200 units of subsidized housing are included in these totals; the average annual volume of nonsubsidized housing was about 9,400 units a year. With the exception of a few housing units built in the rural areas of the HMA, all residential construction is in areas which require building permits. In September 1969 an estimated 1,600 single-family houses and 4,000 units in multi-family structures were under construction in the HMA, with Allegheny County accounting for over 70 percent of the total.

As measured by building permits, the annual volume of new single-family construction in the HMA has fluctuated between 5,000 and 6,000 units since 1960, with high and low points being established in 1965 and 1966. However, building permit authorizations for single-family units totaled nearly 5,500 in 1967 and have been issued at an annual rate of over 5,000 a year since then. About two-thirds of the single-family construction volume in the HMA in recent years has been in suburban Allegheny County. In comparison, the number of units authorized in multifamily structures has risen steadily during the decade, from fewer than 1,950 in 1960 to nearly 3,750 in 1965. Since 1965 multifamily construction as measured by building permits has averaged 4,525 units yearly. Since 1965 roughly two-thirds of the multifamily construction in the HMA has been in suburban Allegheny County, while the city of Pittsburgh accounted for about one-fifth of the multifamily total. Since 1966 nearly one-half of the housing units completed in the HMA have been in multifamily structures.

Vacancy. There has been a comparatively high level of new residential construction in the HMA in spite of a downturn in new residential building during 1966 because of a tight mortgage market. Concurrent with this, there has been a declining rate of employment growth in the HMA. The combination of a high level of new residential construction and a lower level of in-migration led to a moderate increase in vacancy in the Pittsburgh area between July 1967 and September 1969. Based on a July 1969 postal vacancy survey and on other vacancy information, there were an estimated 18,400 vacant units in the HMA available for sale or rent in September 1969, an over-all vacancy rate of 2.4 percent. This total included 5,500 units available for sale and 12,850 vacant and available for rent, equaling vacancy ratios of 1.1 percent and 4.6 percent, respectively. The housing inventory in mid-1967 had a sales vacancy ratio of 4.4 percent (11,950 vacancies). Vacancy trends in submarket areas for selected dates between April 1960 and September 1969 are shown in table VIII.

Households. As of September 1, 1969, there were an estimated 765,300 households (occupied housing units) in the Pittsburgh area, an increase of an average of 6,700 households a year since July 1967. As shown in table V, this was well above the annual rate of growth during the 1960-1965 period, but somewhat below the 1965-1967 increment, a period of rapid employment growth. Nearly four-fifths of the household growth in the HMA since 1960 has occurred in suburban Allegheny County. A combination of comparatively low levels of new construction, demolition activity, and out-migration has led to a modest decline in the number of households in the city of Pittsburgh since 1960.

Based on anticipated population increases and on a small change in the average size of households, it is estimated that household growth in the HMA will average 6,650 a year during the next two years and reach a total of 778,600 by September 1971. Most of the increase in the number of households in the HMA during 1970 and 1971 is expected in suburban Allegheny County; a continued decline in the number of households is forecast for the city of Pittsburgh. The delayed completion of the Chrysler Corporation facility in New Stanton has caused postponement of announced plans for new residential construction and, as a result, household growth in Westmoreland County during the forecast period is expected to be below 1965-1969 experience. In comparison, new construction planned for Washington County in the near future likely will result in an increase in household growth somewhat above the 1967-1969 trend. See table V for changes in the number of households in the Pittsburgh area during the April 1960-September 1971 period.

Housing Inventory. As of September 1, 1969, there were approximately 800,500 housing units in the Pittsburgh HMA, an increase of 16,500 units since July 1, 1967, or 7,625 a year. As shown in table VI, this is just a little below the July 1965-July 1967 increase of 7,700 a year, but is well above the average increase in the housing inventory in the first half of the 1960 decade (5,300 a year). Over three-fourths of the increase in the housing supply between 1967 and 1969 was in suburban Allegheny County. The housing supply in the city of Pittsburgh has changed little in recent years, with new residential construction being offset by an almost equal number of units removed from the inventory through demolition and other causes. In the remainder of the HMA the bulk of new construction in recent years has been in Westmoreland County.

Restrictions in the mortgage market precipitated a decline in new residential construction in the HMA in 1966 when fewer than 8,200 units were authorized by building permits (see table VII). Although the mortgage market nationally continues to be hampered by rising interest rates, demand pressures in the Pittsburgh area arising from the rapid employment growth of the mid-1960's have sustained a comparatively high level of new residential construction in the HMA in the last two years. Over 10,750 housing units were authorized by building permits in 1967, a post-1960 high, while an estimated 10,200 were authorized during 1968. An estimate of the number of units autho-

rized during the first half of 1969 indicates only a slight decline from the 1967-1968 level. About 2,200 units of subsidized housing are included in these totals; the average annual volume of nonsubsidized housing was about 9,400 units a year. With the exception of a few housing units built in the rural areas of the HMA, all residential construction is in areas which require building permits. In September 1969 an estimated 1,600 single-family houses and 4,000 units in multi-family structures were under construction in the HMA, with Allegheny County accounting for over 70 percent of the total.

As measured by building permits, the annual volume of new single-family construction in the HMA has fluctuated between 5,000 and 6,000 units since 1960, with high and low points being established in 1965 and 1966. However, building permit authorizations for single-family units totaled nearly 5,500 in 1967 and have been issued at an annual rate of over 5,000 a year since then. About two-thirds of the single-family construction volume in the HMA in recent years has been in suburban Allegheny County. In comparison, the number of units authorized in multifamily structures has risen steadily during the decade, from fewer than 1,950 in 1960 to nearly 3,750 in 1965. Since 1965 multifamily construction as measured by building permits has averaged 4,525 units yearly. Since 1965 roughly two-thirds of the multifamily construction in the HMA has been in suburban Allegheny County, while the city of Pittsburgh accounted for about one-fifth of the multifamily total. Since 1966 nearly one-half of the housing units completed in the HMA have been in multifamily structures.

Vacancy. There has been a comparatively high level of new residential construction in the HMA in spite of a downturn in new residential building during 1966 because of a tight mortgage market. Concurrent with this, there has been a declining rate of employment growth in the HMA. The combination of a high level of new residential construction and a lower level of in-migration led to a moderate increase in vacancy in the Pittsburgh area between July 1967 and September 1969. Based on a July 1969 postal vacancy survey and on other vacancy information, there were an estimated 18,400 vacant units in the HMA available for sale or rent in September 1969, an over-all vacancy rate of 2.4 percent. This total included 5,500 units available for sale and 12,850 vacant and available for rent, equaling vacancy ratios of 1.1 percent and 4.6 percent, respectively. The housing inventory in mid-1967 had a sales vacancy ratio of 4.4 percent (11,950 vacancies). Vacancy trends in submarket areas for selected dates between April 1960 and September 1969 are shown in table VIII.

There was an increase in vacancy in all submarket areas of the HMA between 1967 and 1969, with the city of Pittsburgh accounting for the largest numerical gain. A comparison of the most recent postal vacancy surveys and conversations with informed local persons indicates that the increase in vacancy in Pittsburgh in the last two years has occurred mainly in areas which contain a comparatively high proportion of older units, many of which undoubtedly are substandard. Although demolition activity in Pittsburgh has accelerated in recent years and has removed a number of older units from the housing supply, the out-migration of families from the city to the suburbs has accelerated since the mid-1960's and has enabled many Pittsburgh residents to upgrade their living accommodations by vacating some of the older, less desirable housing in the city.

Table I

Estimated Annual Demand for New Sales Housing
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
September 1, 1969 to September 1, 1971

<u>Sales price</u>	<u>Number of units</u>	<u>Percentage distribution</u>
Under \$20,000	550	11
\$20,000 - 22,499	450	9
22,500 - 24,999	400	8
25,000 - 29,999	1,550	31
30,000 - 34,999	950	19
35,000 and over	<u>1,100</u>	<u>22</u>
Total	5,000	100

Estimated Annual Demand for New Rental Housing
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
September 1, 1969 to September 1, 1971

<u>Monthly gross rent^{a/}</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	<u>One bedroom</u>	<u>Two bedrooms</u>	<u>Three or more bedrooms</u>
\$125 - \$139	125	-	-	-
140 - 154	60	-	-	-
155 - 169	30	770	-	-
170 - 184	15	300	-	-
185 - 199	5	225	675	-
200 - 214	-	85	460	-
215 - 229	-	60	300	150
230 - 244	-	35	190	100
245 - 259	-	15	110	80
260 - 274	-	-	80	45
275 and over	-	-	<u>55</u>	<u>30</u>
Total	<u>235</u>	<u>1,490</u>	<u>1,870</u>	<u>405</u>

^{a/} Gross rent is shelter rent plus the cost of all utilities.

Table II

Estimated Annual Occupancy Potential
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
September 1, 1969 to September 1, 1971

A. Subsidized Sales Housing, Section 235

<u>Eligible family size</u>	<u>Number of units^{a/}</u>
Four persons or less	865
Five persons or more	<u>835</u>
Total	1,700

B. Privately-Financed Subsidized Rental Housing

<u>Size of unit</u>	<u>Number of units</u>			
	<u>Rent-Supplement</u>		<u>Section 236</u>	
	<u>Families</u>	<u>Elderly</u>	<u>Families</u>	<u>Elderly</u>
Efficiency	-	1,415	-	545
One bedroom	335	250	205	455
Two bedrooms	855	-	865	-
Three bedrooms	485	-	505	-
Four or more bedrooms	<u>240</u>	-	<u>325</u>	-
Total	1,915	1,665	1,900	1,000

a/ All of the families eligible for Section 235 housing are also eligible for the Section 236 program, and most are eligible for Section 221(d)(3) housing. These estimates are based upon exception income limits; the use of regular income limits will decrease these family potentials by about 80 per-cent.

Table III

Work Force and Employment Trends
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
Annual Averages, 1966-1968
(in thousands)

<u>Work force components</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Twelve-month period ending:</u>	
				<u>July 31, 1968</u>	<u>July 31, 1969</u>
Total civilian work force	933.9	950.9	955.8	953.5	960.8
Unemployment	27.6	29.7	27.0	26.4	26.4
Percent of work force	3.0%	3.1%	2.8%	2.8%	2.7%
Total employment	904.1	918.3	926.4	925.7	932.0
Agricultural	8.1	8.1	7.9	8.0	7.9
Nonagricultural	896.0	910.2	918.5	917.7	924.2
Wage and salary	822.6	839.9	850.5	848.7	856.4
Manufacturing	293.0	290.7	289.5	291.9	288.8
Durable goods	248.0	244.9	242.8	245.4	242.0
Lumber, wood, furniture and fixtures	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7
Stone, clay, and glass products	20.3	19.3	19.2	18.9	19.6
Primary metals	131.0	125.5	124.0	126.5	122.3
Fabricated metal products	27.3	27.2	26.8	27.2	26.4
Nonelectrical machinery	19.5	20.4	19.9	20.2	19.9
Electrical machinery	29.3	31.8	32.2	32.2	32.2
Transportation equipment	7.9	7.3	6.6	6.8	6.8
Instruments and related products	5.5	5.7	5.9	5.8	6.2
Miscellaneous manufactures	4.4	5.1	5.6	5.3	5.9
Nondurable goods	45.0	45.9	46.8	46.5	46.8
Food products	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.8	17.7
Apparel	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2
Paper products	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	4.0
Printing and publishing	7.8	8.3	8.7	8.6	8.8
Chemical products	7.6	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8
Oil and coal products	1.7	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.0
Other nondurable goods	2.9	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.5
Nonmanufacturing	529.5	549.1	561.0	556.8	567.6
Mining	8.9	9.1	8.4	8.8	8.6
Contract construction	39.7	41.6	41.7	42.5	41.4
Transportation	35.2	35.2	35.8	35.5	35.6
Public utilities	21.5	21.9	22.4	22.4	22.4
Wholesale and retail trade	161.0	162.8	166.0	164.7	166.4
Finance, insurance, and real estate	34.1	35.5	36.4	36.2	37.0
Services	136.0	143.7	148.9	146.2	153.0
Government	93.2	99.3	101.4	100.6	103.4
All other nonagricultural employment ^{a/}	73.4	70.3	68.0	69.0	67.8
Persons involved in labor-management disputes	2.2	3.0	2.3	1.4	2.4

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

Note: In some instances, detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security.

Table IV

Percentage Distribution of All Families and Renter Households
by Estimated Annual Income, After Deduction of Federal Income Tax
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
1967 and 1969

All families

Annual after-tax income	Allegheny County											
	City of Pittsburgh		Remainder of county		Beaver County		Washington County		Westmoreland County		HMA total	
	1967	1969	1967	1969	1967	1969	1967	1969	1967	1969	1967	1969
Under \$4,000	22	17	13	9	15	10	23	17	21	16	17	13
\$4,000 - 4,999	10	8	8	5	10	7	10	8	9	7	9	6
5,000 - 5,999	11	9	11	7	15	10	13	9	13	9	12	9
6,000 - 6,999	11	11	13	9	13	14	12	12	13	11	12	10
7,000 - 7,999	10	11	10	11	11	12	11	11	12	12	11	12
8,000 - 8,999	9	9	8	11	9	10	9	10	8	10	9	10
9,000 - 9,999	7	7	8	8	7	9	5	8	6	8	7	8
10,000 -12,499	10	12	14	16	11	13	10	12	11	13	11	14
12,500 and over	10	16	15	24	9	15	7	13	7	14	12	18
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Median	\$6,625	\$7,450	\$7,550	\$8,725	\$6,775	\$7,775	\$6,350	\$7,275	\$6,575	\$7,525	\$7,000	\$8,025

Renter households ^{a/}

Annual after-tax income	Allegheny County											
	City of Pittsburgh		Remainder of county		Beaver County		Washington County		Westmoreland County		HMA total	
	1967	1969	1967	1969	1967	1969	1967	1969	1967	1969	1967	1969
Under \$4,000	39	34	28	17	34	19	39	25	37	24	35	20
\$4,000 - 4,999	12	10	14	8	14	12	13	10	13	9	11	9
5,000 - 5,999	11	11	11	10	14	12	14	13	14	13	13	11
6,000 - 6,999	10	10	12	12	12	13	12	12	13	13	12	13
7,000 - 7,999	8	8	9	11	9	12	8	12	8	12	8	11
8,000 - 8,999	6	7	8	10	5	9	4	8	5	8	6	9
9,000 - 9,999	5	5	5	7	5	6	5	5	5	6	4	7
10,000 -12,499	4	7	7	12	4	9	2	9	2	9	7	10
12,500 and over	5	8	6	13	3	8	3	6	3	6	4	10
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Median	\$4,950	\$5,575	\$5,775	\$7,250	\$5,200	\$6,475	\$4,850	\$6,075	\$5,025	\$6,275	\$5,350	\$6,700

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

Source: Estimated by Housing Market Analysts.

Table V

Population and Household Changes
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
April 1, 1960 - September 1, 1971

Area	April 1, 1960	July 1, 1965	July 1, 1967	September 1, 1969	September 1, 1971	Average annual changes			
						1960- 1965	1965- 1967	1967- 1969	1969- 1971
<u>Population</u>									
HMA total	2,405,435	2,467,400	2,509,600	2,542,000	2,570,000	11,800	21,100	14,950	14,000
Allegheny County	<u>1,628,587</u>	<u>1,675,400</u>	<u>1,704,700</u>	<u>1,729,000</u>	<u>1,749,800</u>	<u>8,925</u>	<u>14,650</u>	<u>11,200</u>	<u>10,400</u>
City of Pittsburgh	604,332	588,000	582,200	573,000	566,000	-3,100	-2,900	-4,250	-3,500
Remainder of county	1,024,255	1,087,400	1,122,500	1,156,000	1,183,800	12,025	17,550	15,450	13,900
Beaver County	206,948	212,300	215,950	218,400	220,400	1,025	1,825	1,125	1,000
Washington County	217,271	220,300	222,700	223,900	225,600	580	1,200	550	850
Westmoreland County	352,629	359,400	366,250	370,700	374,200	1,300	3,425	2,050	1,750
<u>Households</u>									
HMA total	709,941	733,400	750,800	765,300	778,600	4,475	8,700	6,700	6,650
Allegheny County	<u>483,893</u>	<u>502,600</u>	<u>515,600</u>	<u>527,200</u>	<u>537,400</u>	<u>3,575</u>	<u>6,500</u>	<u>5,350</u>	<u>5,100</u>
City of Pittsburgh	188,336	188,200	189,000	187,900	187,300	- 25	400	- 500	- 300
Remainder of county	295,557	314,400	326,600	339,300	350,100	3,600	6,100	5,850	5,400
Beaver County	59,099	60,850	62,000	62,800	63,550	330	575	370	375
Washington County	64,364	65,350	66,400	66,900	67,800	190	525	230	450
Westmoreland County	102,585	104,600	106,800	108,400	109,850	380	1,100	740	725

Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

Sources: 1960 Censuses of Population and Housing and estimates by Housing Market Analysts.

Table VI

Trend of Household Tenure
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
April 1, 1960 - September 1, 1969

	Allegheny County						
	City of Pittsburgh	Remainder of county	Total	Beaver County	Washington County	Westmoreland County	HMA Total
Occupancy and Tenure							
April 1, 1960							
Total housing inventory	196,168	306,838	503,006	61,755	67,447	108,630	740,838
Total occupied units	188,336	295,557	483,893	59,099	64,364	102,585	709,941
Owner-occupied	91,831	211,420	303,251	43,218	43,966	73,814	464,249
Percent	48.8%	71.5%	62.7%	73.1%	68.3%	72.0%	65.4%
Renter-occupied	96,505	84,137	180,642	15,881	20,398	28,771	245,692
Percent	51.2%	28.5%	37.3%	26.9%	31.7%	28.0%	34.6%
Total vacant units	7,832	11,281	19,113	2,656	3,083	6,045	30,897
July 1, 1965							
Total housing inventory	196,900	327,550	524,450	63,900	68,950	111,300	768,600
Total occupied units	188,200	314,400	502,600	60,850	65,350	104,600	733,400
Owner-occupied	90,600	226,000	316,600	44,050	44,450	75,350	480,500
Percent	48.1%	71.9%	63.0%	72.4%	68.0%	72.0%	65.5%
Renter-occupied	97,600	88,400	186,000	16,800	20,900	29,250	252,900
Percent	51.9%	28.1%	37.0%	27.6%	32.0%	28.0%	34.5%
Total vacant units	8,700	13,150	21,850	3,050	3,600	6,700	35,200
July 1, 1967							
Total housing inventory	197,000	338,500	535,500	65,000	69,800	113,700	784,000
Total occupied units	189,000	326,600	515,600	62,000	66,400	106,800	750,800
Owner-occupied	89,500	235,200	324,700	44,700	45,150	76,300	490,850
Percent	47.4%	72.0%	63.0%	72.1%	68.0%	71.4%	65.4%
Renter-occupied	99,500	91,400	190,900	17,300	21,250	30,500	259,950
Percent	52.6%	28.0%	37.0%	27.9%	32.0%	28.6%	34.6%
Total vacant units	8,000	11,900	19,900	3,000	8,400	6,900	33,200
September 1, 1969							
Total housing inventory	196,600	351,700	548,300	65,950	70,650	115,600	800,500
Total occupied units	187,900	339,300	527,200	62,800	66,900	108,400	765,300
Owner-occupied	88,900	241,600	330,500	45,250	45,600	77,750	499,100
Percent	47.3%	71.2%	62.7%	72.1%	68.2%	71.7%	65.2%
Renter-occupied	99,000	97,700	196,700	17,550	21,300	30,650	266,200
Percent	52.7%	28.8%	37.3%	27.9%	31.8%	28.3%	34.8%
Total vacant units	8,700	12,400	21,100	3,150	3,750	7,200	35,200

Sources: 1960 from U.S. Census of Housing.
1965, 1967, and 1969 estimated by Housing Market Analysts.

Table VII

New Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
Annual Totals, 1966-1968

<u>Area</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>First six months</u> <u>1969</u>
HMA total	<u>8,195</u>	<u>10,754</u>	<u>10,200</u>	<u>4,900</u>
Single-family	<u>4,970</u>	<u>5,499</u>	<u>5,200</u>	<u>2,550</u>
Multifamily	<u>3,225</u>	<u>5,255</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>2,350</u>
Allegheny County	<u>6,363</u>	<u>8,446</u>	<u>7,850</u>	<u>3,800</u>
Single-family	<u>3,597</u>	<u>3,777</u>	<u>3,700</u>	<u>1,850</u>
Multifamily	<u>2,766</u>	<u>4,669</u>	<u>4,150</u>	<u>1,950</u>
City of Pittsburgh	<u>1,078</u>	<u>1,830</u>	<u>1,075</u>	<u>190</u>
Single-family	<u>182</u>	<u>373</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>60</u>
Multifamily	<u>896</u>	<u>1,457</u>	<u>925</u>	<u>130</u>
Remainder of county	<u>5,285</u>	<u>6,616</u>	<u>6,775</u>	<u>3,610</u>
Single-family	<u>3,415</u>	<u>3,404</u>	<u>3,550</u>	<u>1,790</u>
Multifamily	<u>1,870</u>	<u>3,212</u>	<u>3,225</u>	<u>1,820</u>
Beaver County	<u>567</u>	<u>491</u>	<u>615</u>	<u>225</u>
Single-family	<u>343</u>	<u>347</u>	<u>325</u>	<u>150</u>
Multifamily	<u>224</u>	<u>144</u>	<u>290</u>	<u>75</u>
Washington County	<u>488</u>	<u>580</u>	<u>430</u>	<u>425</u>
Single-family	<u>389</u>	<u>315</u>	<u>325</u>	<u>200</u>
Multifamily	<u>99</u>	<u>265</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>225</u>
Westmoreland County	<u>777</u>	<u>1,237</u>	<u>1,305</u>	<u>450</u>
Single-family	<u>641</u>	<u>1,060</u>	<u>850</u>	<u>350</u>
Multifamily	<u>136</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>455</u>	<u>100</u>

Sources: 1966 and 1967, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Construction Reports C-40/42.
1968 and 1969 estimated by Housing Market Analyst, based on data from
the U.S. Bureau of the Census and the Pennsylvania Department of Labor & Industry.

Table VIII

Trends in Vacancy
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Housing Market Area
April 1, 1960 - September 1, 1969

	Allegheny County						
	City of	Remainder		Beaver	Washington	Westmoreland	HMA
Vacancy characteristics	Pittsburgh	of county	Total	County	County	County	total
April 1, 1960							
Total vacant units	7,832	11,281	19,113	2,656	3,083	6,045	30,897
Available vacant units	5,225	6,864	12,089	1,281	1,436	2,387	17,193
For sale	655	2,586	3,241	375	385	714	4,715
Homeowner vacancy rate	0.7%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%	1.0%
For rent	4,570	4,278	8,848	906	1,051	1,673	12,478
Rental vacancy rate	4.5%	4.8%	4.7%	5.4%	4.9%	5.5%	4.8%
Other vacant units a/	2,607	4,417	7,024	1,375	1,647	3,658	13,704
July 1, 1965							
Total vacant units	9,700	13,150	21,850	3,050	3,600	6,700	35,200
Available vacant units	5,800	8,050	13,850	1,400	1,650	2,600	19,500
For sale	700	3,150	3,850	450	450	900	5,600
Homeowner vacancy rate	3.8%	1.4%	1.2%	1.0%	1.0%	1.2%	1.2%
For rent	5,100	4,900	10,000	950	1,200	1,700	13,900
Rental vacancy rate	5.0%	5.3%	5.1%	5.4%	5.4%	5.5%	5.2%
Other vacant units a/	2,900	5,100	8,000	1,650	1,950	4,100	15,700
July 1, 1967							
Total vacant units	8,000	11,900	19,900	3,000	3,400	6,900	33,200
Available vacant units	5,100	6,600	11,700	1,300	1,400	2,600	17,000
For sale	1,000	2,500	3,500	350	400	800	5,050
Homeowner vacancy rate	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	0.8%	0.9%	1.0%	1.0%
For rent	4,100	4,100	8,200	950	1,000	1,800	11,950
Rental vacancy rate	4.0%	4.3%	4.1%	5.2%	4.5%	5.6%	4.4%
Other vacant units a/	2,900	5,300	8,200	1,700	2,000	4,300	16,200
September 1, 1969							
Total vacant units	8,700	12,400	21,100	3,150	3,750	7,200	35,200
Available vacant units	5,600	7,000	12,600	1,400	1,700	2,700	18,400
For sale	1,200	2,700	3,900	350	500	800	5,550
Homeowner vacancy rate	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%	0.8%	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%
For rent	4,400	4,300	8,700	1,050	1,200	1,900	12,850
Rental vacancy rate	4.3%	4.2%	4.2%	5.6%	5.3%	5.8%	4.6%
Other vacant units a/	3,100	5,400	8,500	1,750	2,050	4,500	16,800

a/ Includes vacant seasonal units, units held off the market, dilapidated units, and units rented or sold and awaiting occupancy.

Sources. 1960 from U.S. Census of Housing.
1965, 1967, and 1969 estimated by Housing Market Analysts.



DUE DATE

[illegible]

Printed
in USA