

# **Cashiers Affordable Housing Task Force**

## **Cashiers Area Employee Survey Results**

**December 29, 2008**



**Compiled by:**

Kristy Carter  
Community Development Planner  
NC Department of Commerce  
Division of Community Assistance  
Western Regional Office  
31 College Place, Building B  
Asheville, NC 28801  
Phone: 828.251.6914  
Email: [kcarter@nccommerce.com](mailto:kcarter@nccommerce.com)  
Web: [www.nccommerce.com/wro](http://www.nccommerce.com/wro)

## **Background**

In the summer and fall of 2007, the Community Fund of Cashiers, an affiliate of the Community Foundation of WNC, conducted an assessment of needs of the Cashiers community. Dr. Anthony Hickey from Western Carolina University guided the Community Fund's needs assessment process. According to Dr. Hickey's report, the needs assessment "included interviews with service providers, community leaders as well as a survey of the population of Cashiers."<sup>1</sup> The report identifies the community's top three concerns expressed by interviewees and survey respondents. The three concerns were control of growth and development, availability of affordable housing, and lack of leadership. A small working group was established to further address each area of concern. This is how the Cashiers Affordable Housing Task Force, for whom this report is written, was formed.

## **Workforce Housing Defined**

As with any other profession, field of study, or area of business, the affordable housing world has a jargon of its own. Some people use the words "affordable", "subsidized", and "workforce housing" interchangeably, while others think each word has its own meaning. In this report, the term *affordable workforce housing* will be used to describe the type of project desired in the Cahiers area. According to HousingPolicy.org, "workforce housing is housing for the occupations needed in every community, including teachers, nurses, police officers, fire fighters and many other critical workers."<sup>2</sup> The word *affordable* is to be interpreted as a standard and not a type of housing. This report follows the federal government's standard of affordability, which states that housing is affordable if a family spends no more than thirty percent (30%) of its income on housing costs, including utilities. Therefore, when we talk about affordable workforce housing, we are describing a housing unit in which the police officer that patrols the community resides without spending more than thirty percent of her income to do so.

## **The Big Question: Does an Adequate Applicant Pool Exist?**

When planning an affordable workforce housing development, an adequate pool of potential residents must be identified. The availability of an adequate applicant pool is typically quantified in a formal housing market analysis. A market analysis defines a market area and evaluates income, employment, household size, housing tenure, and other trends to estimate demand for an affordable housing project. Market studies also estimate the number of families in the market area that may meet the qualifications required to live in the affordable workforce housing project. The information contained in this report is not intended to replace a full market study. The purpose of this report is to evaluate survey data to make some initial assumptions as to whether an affordable workforce housing project would be successful in the Cashiers area.

## **Cashiers Area Employee Survey**

The Cashiers Housing Task Force surveyed full-time Cahiers Area Employees (CAEs). The survey methodology used was not scientific and should not be interpreted to be a representative sample of workers in the area. Members of the Task Force distributed surveys to a list of area businesses where managers distributed the surveys to employees who were asked, but not required, to complete the

---

<sup>1</sup> (Hickey, 2007)

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.housingpolicy.org/getting\\_started/what.html](http://www.housingpolicy.org/getting_started/what.html)

survey. Task Force members collected the surveys and the data was compiled by staff from the NC Division of Community Assistance, Western Regional Office.

It is well known that seasonal employees are an integral component of the Cashiers economy; however, only full- time workers were targeted<sup>3</sup>. Year-round employees are more likely to take advantage of workforce housing opportunities. Additionally, seasonal employees receive lower wages and may not qualify for the type of housing that would be appropriate for the Cashiers area.

**EMPLOYMENT STATUS**

	# of CAEs	% of Total
Full Time	120	81.6%
Full Time/Seasonal	2	1.4%
Part Time	14	9.5%
Part Time/Seasonal	1	0.7%
No Answer	10	6.8%

Employees from over fourteen employers were surveyed. The places of employment surveyed include the following:

- Blue Ridge School
- Cashiers Cleaners
- Cedar Creek
- Chattooga Club
- High Hampton
- Ingles
- Cashiers Community Library
- Macon Bank
- Other<sup>4</sup>
- Summit Charter School
- Trillium
- US Post Office
- Wachovia Bank
- Wade Hampton

A total of **147** surveys were completed and returned<sup>5</sup>. The following charts analyze data obtained from the surveys and other sources.

<sup>3</sup> While year-round employees were the target of this survey, three of the 147 survey respondents indicated that they were seasonal employees.

<sup>4</sup> Nine surveys were returned in which the place of employment was not identified.

<sup>5</sup> The number of surveys distributed was not recorded.

## Employee Commuting Patterns

Cashiers area employees (CAEs) commute from a variety of locations in North Carolina and South Carolina to reach their place of employment. The following chart details zip code areas where survey respondents currently live.

### WHERE IS THE POSTAL ZIP CODE WHERE YOU CURRENTLY LIVE?

County [% of Total CAEs]	Town/Area	Miles (One Way to Cashiers)	Time (h.mm)	Zip	# of CAEs	% of Total
<b>Buncombe [2.0%]</b>	Arden	51	1.19	28704	1	1%
	Asheville	62	1.32	28805	2	1%
<b>Haywood [0.7%]</b>	Waynesville	55	1.29	28785	1	1%
<b>Henderson [0.7%]</b>	Edneyville	58	1.13	28727	1	1%
<b>Jackson [63.9%]</b>	Cashiers	-----	-----	28717	41	28%
	Cullowhee	17	0.40	28723	24	16%
	Glennville	7.1	0.16	28736	12	8%
	Sylva	26	0.55	28779	13	9%
	Tuckasegee	22	0.55	28783	4	3%
<b>Macon [10.2%]</b>	Franklin (1)	35	0.45	28734	10	6.8%
	Franklin (2)	29	0.40	28744	1	0.7%
	Highlands	12	0.17	28741	4	2.7%
<b>Oconee, SC [2.7%]</b>	Mountain Home	25	0.51	29664	1	0.7%
	Salem	27	0.47	29676	1	0.7%
	Seneca	45	1.33	29678	2	1.4%
<b>Transylvania [19.7%]</b>	Brevard	27	0.35	28712	5	3.4%
	Lake Toxaway	16	0.21	28747	8	5.4%
	Rosman	25	0.34	28772	5	3.4%
	Sapphire	9	0.15	28774	11	7.5%

**Source:** Affordable Housing Task Force Survey  
Google Maps (Driving Distance and Time)

Of the 147 CAEs surveyed, twenty-eight percent (28%) live in the 28717 (Cashiers) zip code. Of those CAEs that drive from a zip code other than 28717, twenty-four percent (24%) drive less than thirty minutes to reach their place of employment, whereas forty-four percent (44%) drive thirty to sixty minutes and five percent (5%) drive more than sixty minutes.

**Travel Time and Applicant Pool Implications:** In the absence of other factors, workers commuting long distances to reach their place of employment are good candidates for workforce housing projects. The following chart details the driving time of CAEs and whether or not these employees would move to the Cashiers area. In each driving distance category, the percentage of employees that would move to Cashiers is greater than those who would not. While the survey data does not lead to a direct correlation between driving distance and a desire to move to the Cashiers area, it does appear that those driving into Cashiers to work would add to an adequate applicant pool.

**WOULD YOU MOVE HERE?: BASED ON TRAVEL TIME**

Travel Time	% of CAEs	Yes	No	Maybe	No Answer	Unknown
60 minutes +	5%	57%	43%	0%	0%	0%
30-60 minutes	44%	44%	28%	14%	11%	3%
Less than 30 min	24%	49%	23%	9%	20%	0%
Live in Cashiers Zip	28%					

Note: Percentages in the outlined section are based on the number of CAEs in the travel time category, not the total number of employees in the survey.

Source: Affordable Housing Task Force Survey

**Housing Tenure**

Housing tenure is another factor used to identify an adequate pool of applicants. Housing tenure “primarily refers to whether one owns or rents one’s home.<sup>6</sup>” Workforce housing units can be targeted toward renters and/or future homeowners. When units are targeted toward renters, the applicant pool is generated from current renters or homeowners living with one or more housing problems<sup>7</sup>. The applicant pool for homeownership units is developed from current renter households that would meet the stringent qualifications required for homeownership. While not true in all cases, many homeownership units rely on funding sources targeted toward first-time homebuyers. Therefore, it can be difficult for current homeowners, even those with housing problems, to be in the applicant pool.

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.nlihc.org/detail/article.cfm?article\\_id=5226&id=23](http://www.nlihc.org/detail/article.cfm?article_id=5226&id=23)

<sup>7</sup> Housing problems are typically defined as cost burdened, physically inadequate housing, and crowded housing. For homeowners, housing problems can also be maintenance, remodeling and repair costs. Elderly and disabled homeowners face housing problems when they need modifications to their homes (i.e. ramps).

Of the CAEs surveyed, thirty-four percent (34%) were renters, and six percent (6%) had unique living situations, such as living with family members. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the CAEs were homeowners.

**DO YOU OWN OR RENT YOUR HOME?**

Own	85	57.8%
Rent	52	35.4%
Other	9	6.1%
No Answer	1	0.7%

Source: Affordable Housing Task Force Survey

Sixty percent (60%) of CAEs that are renters said they would move to Cashiers if moderately priced housing were available. Interestingly, nineteen percent (19%) of homeowners said they would move to the area. It is important to note that there was a design flaw in the question that addressed whether one would move to Cashiers if moderately priced housing were available. This question was only asked to those who lived outside of the 28717 (Cashiers) zip code. In hindsight, there should have been two questions; one to ask if the employee would move to Cashiers if moderately priced housing were available and one to ask renters in the 28717 zip code if they would purchase a moderately priced home. As a result, we cannot answer whether those who are currently renting in the 28717 zip would take advantage of affordable workforce housing.

**WOULD YOU MOVE HERE?: BY HOUSING TENURE**

		Yes	No	Maybe	No Answer	Unknown	Cashiers Zip
Own	57.8%	19%	26%	8%	14%	2%	31%
Rent	35.4%	60%	12%	10%	4%	0%	15%
Other	6.1%	22%	11%	0%	0%	0%	67%
No Answer	0.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Source: Affordable Housing Task Force Survey

**Housing Tenure and Applicant Pool Implications:** For reasons stated above, current homeowners are less likely to be eligible for workforce housing projects. Therefore, current renters and those living in a unique situation are the main applicants in the pool. Survey results indicate that the majority of renters would move to the Cashiers area—a positive factor in developing an adequate applicant pool.

While the percent of renters willing to move to Cashiers lends support to an applicant pool, it should be assumed that some of these renters would not immediately qualify for homeownership due to income restrictions and other factors and will therefore remain as renters. Cashiers, for reasons detailed below, cannot support a multi-family rental project at this time. Therefore, the supply of units that would be made available to CAEs will fall very short of the demand.

## Household Size

In a formal housing market analysis, household size and related trends are used to determine what size units are needed to meet the needs of the applicant pool. In the affordable housing world, size is determined by the number of bedrooms in a unit, rather than the unit's square footage.

### HOW MANY ADULTS CURRENTLY LIVE IN YOUR HOME?

Adults	# of CAEs	% of CAEs	Own	Rent	Other	No Answer
One	30	20.4%	17	12	1	0
Two	92	62.6%	60	29	2	1
Three	14	9.5%	6	3	5	0
Four	4	2.7%	1	2	1	0
Five	3	2.0%	1	2	0	0
Six	4	2.7%	0	4	0	0

Source: Affordable Housing Task Force Survey

Sixty-three percent (63%) of CAEs live in a two-person home. Only thirty-nine percent (39%) of all CAEs have children in the home and most, fifty-two percent (51.7%), of these families have one child. Another thirty-three percent (32.8%) have two children.

### ADULTS RESPONDENTS WITH CHILDREN IN THE HOME

# of CAEs with Children	% of Total CAEs	Own	Rent	Other	No Answer
58	39%	42	12	4	0

Source: Affordable Housing Task Force Survey

### NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE HOME

Number of Children	# of CAEs	% of CAEs with Children in Home	Own	Rent	Other	No Answer
One	30	51.7%	21	6	0	0
Two	19	32.8%	15	4	0	0
Three	6	10.3%	4	1	0	0
Four	2	3.4%	2	0	0	0
Five	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0
Six	1	1.7%	0	1	0	0

Source: Affordable Housing Task Force Survey

**Household Size and Applicant Pool Implications:** One implication drawn from household size is the housing unit size needed to meet the needs of the applicant pool. More than half of the households surveyed are one and two person households. This indicates a need for one and two bedroom units. Additionally, the writer of this report completed a housing market analysis in February 2008 for a potential workforce housing project in Highlands, North Carolina. The market area for the Highlands

project included the United States Census Tract that contains the 28717 zip code. Results from the Highlands market analysis indicate that one and two-bedroom units best meet the demands of the area. One bedroom units are appropriate for multi-family housing, but not single-family. Since multi-family is currently not an option, the primary focus of a workforce housing project should be one that offers two-bedroom units.

The number of children in households does not greatly affect unit size because of the households with children, seventy-two percent (72%) currently live in owner occupied housing. Only twenty-one percent (21%) of households with children are in rental housing.

**Household Income**

The majority of funding sources available to build affordable workforce housing use Area Median Income (AMI)<sup>8</sup> to determine household eligibility and selection. US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) estimates the median family income for an area each year and adjusts that amount for family size so that family incomes may be expressed as a percentage of the AMI. These percentages of AMI have been divided by HUD into income categories. Some housing funding sources, such as the low income housing tax credit program, target extremely low and very low income households, while other programs target households in the moderate income category. Workforce and homeownership programs are more likely to target households in the low and moderate income range.

<b>HUD INCOME CATEGORIES</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Income Range</b>
Extremely Low Income	< 30% of AMI
Very Low Income	31% - 50% of AMI
Low Income	51% - 80% of AMI
Moderate Income	81% - 120% of AMI

The following chart reports the 2008 Area Median Income for Jackson County, North Carolina. Since we have determined the most needed unit sizes are one and two bedroom units, we can assume that the most common household size served will be two to three persons. If households in the 80-120% income bracket are the target population, housing units will have to be affordable to households with annual incomes between \$31,150 and \$52,596. Using the affordability standard (no more than thirty percent (30%) of income spent on housing costs), the affordable monthly housing costs for households should be between \$779<sup>9</sup> for a two person household at eighty percent (80%) of AMI to \$1,315 for a three person household at 120% of AMI.

<sup>8</sup> Area Median Income is the point at which half the households in an area make less and half make more. The median annual income figures are adjusted for family size and calculated annually by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for every regional area in the country.

<sup>9</sup> Formula: Annual Household Income/12 Months X 30% = Monthly Housing Allowance

**FY 2008 Income Limit: Jackson County, North Carolina**

Median Income: \$48,700	% of Area Income	Household Income By Family Size							
		1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6 Person	7 Person	8 Person
	30%	\$10,200	\$11,700	\$13,150	\$14,600	\$15,750	\$16,950	\$18,100	\$19,250
	50%	\$17,050	\$19,500	\$21,900	\$24,350	\$26,300	\$28,250	\$30,200	\$32,150
	80%	\$27,250	\$31,150	\$35,050	\$38,950	\$42,050	\$45,200	\$48,300	\$51,400
	120%	\$40,908	\$46,752	\$52,596	\$58,440	\$63,115	\$67,790	\$72,465	\$83,312

Source: HUDUser.org, FFY 2008 Income Limits Documentation System, [www.huduser.org/datasets/il/i12008/st.odt](http://www.huduser.org/datasets/il/i12008/st.odt)

When designing a workforce housing project, one must pay close attention to the AMI, as it is a determining factor of who is and is not eligible for a housing unit. For example, imagine that a two bedroom single-family home was constructed for a three-person family. The funding source’s program regulations require that the house go to a family at eighty percent (80%) of area median income. There are two families waiting to move into workforce housing. The first family has an annual household income of \$42,000. The second family’s income is \$34,000. Based on Jackson County’s AMI, the second family would meet the income qualification where the first family would not because they are above eighty percent (80%) of the AMI.

**Household Income and Applicant Pool Implications:** The income ranges used on the survey do not directly correlate with the AMI ranges, however, some conclusions can be drawn from the data. The amount of subsidy needed to keep a project affordable is directly connected to the cost of land and improvements—higher land and improvement costs equal a greater amount of subsidy needed. Due to its geography, the attractiveness of the area, and other factors, residential development in Cashiers is very expensive. It is reasonable to expect the per unit development cost of affordable units will be higher in Cashiers than other areas of Jackson County. Therefore, workforce housing projects in Cashiers will need deep subsidies to remain affordable. At this time, it seems that the most appropriate income range to target is the 80-120% income range.

The following chart looks at income reported by CAEs and the 80-120% Jackson County AMI eligibility range (meaning a household would have to fall in this range to qualify for housing assistance). Forty-two percent (43%) of the CAEs surveyed fall into the range of eligibility. Twenty percent (20%) have incomes that are too low to qualify and thirty-six percent (36%) have incomes that are too high. The households in the range of eligibility are in the applicant pool. It is to these households that would first be eligible for housing projects.

## AFFORDABILITY RANGES

Household Size	Reported Income												80-120% Eligibility Range		
	\$10,000-25,000		\$26,000-35,000		\$36,000-45,000		\$46,000-55,000		\$56,000-65,000		\$66,000-75,000			\$Over 75,000	
One	3	2%	8	6%	9	6%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	\$27,250-40,908
Two	9	6%	4	3%	9	6%	6	4%	6	4%	2	1%	16	11%	\$31,150-46,752
Three	6	4%	3	2%	4	3%	7	5%	1	1%	0	0%	10	7%	\$35,050-52,596
Four	5	4%	0	0%	3	2%	0	0%	2	1%	3	2%	7	5%	\$38,950-58,440
Five	1	1%	2	1%	2	1%	2	1%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	\$42,050-63,115
Six+	2	1%	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%	0	0%	1	1%	\$45,200-67,790
		20% Income Too Low		42% Income in Range						36% Income Too High		<i>Numbers may not add to 100% due to rounding.</i>			

### Resident Choice

The last applicant pool factor to evaluate is whether or not CAEs would want to live in the Cashiers area if moderately priced housing were available. The results from the survey are mixed. Only thirty-three percent (33%) gave a definitive yes and twenty-eight percent (27.9%) currently live in the 28717 zip code area and we don't know what they want. About forty percent (40%) of the respondents said they would not or do not know if they would live in the area. Since a strong inclination in either direction is not expressed, credence should be placed on the eligibility factors addressed above. Whether CAEs really want to live in the area should be explored more fully.

### IF YOU CURRENTLY DON'T LIVE IN CASHIERS, WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN LIVING HERE IF MORE MODERATELY PRICED HOUSING WERE AVAILABLE?

*Note: According to question #1, 106 individuals did not live in the Cashiers zip-code.*

	# of CAEs	% of Total	Rent	Own	Other	No Answer
Currently Live in Cashiers Zip	41	27.9%	8	26	6	1
Depends/Maybe	12	8.2%	5	7	0	0
No	29	19.7%	6	22	1	0
No Answer	14	9.5%	2	12	0	0
Unknown	2	1.4%	0	2	0	0
Yes	49	33.3%	31	16	2	0

### Conclusions and Recommendations

It is the opinion of the writer of this report that the survey data demonstrate that a qualified pool of applicants for a workforce housing project can be justified, but not without concerns. Since this survey was first conducted, economic conditions have continued to decline. This has changed circumstances for many households. It is also a concern that whatever steps are taken need to be done on a very small scale. When housing projects are conducted on a small scale, the per unit development cost has the

potential to make what was intended to be affordable, unaffordable. **Therefore, it is recommended that the Housing Task Force work with local employers and a non-profit housing agency to conduct some type of homebuyer education or awareness program at least once before making the final decision to move forward with a project.** The goal of this step is to more deeply gauge the demand for housing in the area from the people who would live in the workforce housing. This could take the form of a formal homebuyer education course, a housing fair where area housing resource providers share information, or some other type of event that allows for area employees to learn about workforce housing and the task for to better understand worker needs.

Creating an affordable workforce housing program in Cashiers will not be an easy endeavor. While Cashiers is a well defined community, it is not an incorporated town or village and therefore does not have a formal decision making body looking out for the best interests of the community. Many of the tools available to develop affordable housing are accessed through a governing body. Another drawback to Cashiers standing as a community rather than an incorporated town is its inability to develop growth policies. Many towns and cities across the country use zoning and other land use tools to aid in the development of affordable workforce housing. Other areas set incentive policies to entice developers to construct affordable housing units. Cashiers can only have these tools available to them if they closely work with Jackson County. **It is recommended that the Housing Task Force begin a dialogue with Jackson County officials about the community's housing wishes in order to gain support for future workforce housing efforts. It is also recommended that the Task Force work with the community to encourage growth policies that that encourage or support the development of workforce housing (i.e. small minimum lot size, mixed-use development, allowance for high density development).**

Another challenge that is closely connected to the lack of local governmental leadership is control of growth, particularly in the area of water and sewer access. At this time, the limited sewer lines serving the Cashiers area at capacity. According to Mr. Joe Cline<sup>10</sup> with the Tuckasegee Water and Sewer Authority (TWSA), no new units can be added to the current sewer lines unless a project was authorized to do so before capacity was reached. In other words, if the sewer capacity has not been purchased, a project cannot get sewer. Water for the area is another critical concern. Currently there are no public water lines in the Cashiers area. All systems are private, neighborhood/community water systems. Mr. Cline stated that the TWSA has begun to evaluate how more sewer capacity can be brought to the area; however, he also stated that he does not know when more could be added or even if there is potential for expansion.

This lack of water and sewer capacity is a project stopper for any large scale multi-family project. Most affordable multi-family projects are partially financed through the use of Low Income Housing Tax Credits, administered through the NC Housing Finance Agency (HFA). When asked if the HFA will allocate tax credits to a project that is served by a package water and sewer system, Scott Farmer, Director of Residential Development at the HFA, stated that while they do not expressly prohibit this type of project, the agency has never funded a tax credit project with a package system because the cost

---

<sup>10</sup> Telephone conversation between Kristy Carter and Joe Cline, September 2008.

of doing so is prohibitive. ***It is recommended that the Housing Task Force work closely with the TWSA in order to remain abreast of sewer expansion plans.***

Despite these large barriers, all hope is not lost. There are a handful of initiatives in the Cashiers area that could aid in the development of a small number affordable workforce housing units. In the spring of 2008, members of the Cashiers community participated in the Mountain Landscapes Initiative charrette process that led to the development of a draft master plan for the redevelopment of the Cashiers Crossroads (the intersection of Highway 107 and 64). Four primary developers will move forward with their projects when economic times improve. ***It is recommended that the Housing Task Force begin conversations with the developers as soon as possible to determine how affordable workforce units can be included in their overall development plans.*** For example, the Cashiers Community Fund could offer small, low interest loans to developers in exchange for a commitment to develop low income units. The goal is to determine a win/win outcome for the developers and the Task Force.

Another advantage is the support for something to be done in the community. While affordable housing is a hot button issue for many, the needs assessment shows that there is support in the community. ***It is recommended that the Housing Task Force capitalize on this support by keeping the community collaboration spirit that was demonstrated during the charrette process alive by using community members to put pressure on the developers to include workforce housing units in their development plans.***

Many non-profits are struggling to make ends meet with current economic conditions being what they are. ***It is recommended that the Cashiers Community Fund and Housing Task Force begin conversations with area non-profit developers to determine how the Community Fund can financially support a non-profit developers as an incentive to develop a project in Cashiers.*** For example, if an agency does not have funds to purchase land, can Community Fund dollars be used to offset a portion of the cost? Or, can the Community Fund provide small development subsidies (grant or loans), or can the fund underwrite other costs of the non-profit in exchange for the provision of housing activities in the Cashiers area. It is recommended that these conversations start with the Jackson County Chapter of Habitat for Humanity, which owns some land in the Cashiers area (and it is land with allocated sewer capacity). Other agencies to contact include Mountain Projects and the Hinton Rural Life Center. Like the conversations with the developers, it is recommended that the Housing Task Force work with the non-profit developers to determine a win/win outcome for the Cashiers community and the non-profit developer.

The final recommendation for the Housing Task Force is to approach the need for affordable workforce housing with an “We’re in this for the long haul” attitude. The need for affordable housing did not develop overnight, nor will it be fixed overnight. ***It is recommended that the Task Force develop long term solutions, such as land banking (buying land now for use in the future) and remaining aware of infrastructure expansion. It is also recommended that if and when the Community Fund decides to invest funds in housing projects, that it does so in a way that provides for a financial return on the investment in order to keep housing projects going in the future.***