

# SECTION 3 - MANHATTAN COMMUNITY PROFILE

## INTRODUCTION

Manhattan is poised to be one of the fastest growing communities in Kansas during the next five years. Manhattan is the home of Kansas State University with over 20,000 students and 4,000 full-time employees. Fort Riley, which houses over 12,000 soldiers and employs over 3,400 civil service employees is also located in the Manhattan area. ***Manhattan serves a three county, 139,000 population for education, trade, health care, entertainment, and communication.*** The following profile provides population and economic characteristics and housing inventory in Manhattan, Kansas. Changes which occur with both the student and Fort Riley population bases, and the impact these changes have on the existing and future population of the City of Manhattan, are reflected in the following demographic analysis.

## POPULATION & ECONOMIC PROFILE

### Population Trends & Projection

The analysis and projection of demographic variables are at the base of all major planning decisions. These variables assist in the understanding of changes which have and are occurring in a particular planning area.

**Table 3.1** identifies **population trends and projections** for Riley County, Manhattan and area communities. Between 1990 and 2000, the Riley County population has remained constant. During the next five years, however, the population in Riley County is projected to increase by an additional 1.4 percent annually.

Of the seven communities in the Manhattan area, four will have populations which are expected to increase during the next five years: Manhattan, Ogden, St. George and Wamego.

The City of Manhattan is expected to increase in population an estimated 20.4 percent, or 8,775 additional persons from 1990 to 2000. **By 2005, the community of Manhattan is expected to have a population of 56,000.**

### **Leonardville**

The Leonardville population in 1990 was 374 persons and has decreased to an estimated 320 persons in 2000. This decline is expected to continue to an expected 305 persons residing in the community in 2005, an 18 percent decrease from 1990.

### **Ogden**

The Ogden population has grown steadily since 1990. A population increase projection of 16 percent from 1990 to 2000 shows an additional 241 persons in the community during the past decade.

### **Randolph**

The Randolph population has declined 10 percent since 1990 to 115 persons. This decline should continue during the next five years, with an estimated population of 109 by 2005.

### **Riley**

Riley had a population increase from 1980 to 1990 to 804 persons, but declined to 715 persons in 2000. An increase in population is expected by 2005, an additional 28 persons.

### **St. George**

The St. George population has increased by 969 people between 1980 and 2000. Population estimates between 2000 and 2005 project a population increase of 6.2 percent, or an increase of an additional 28 people.

### **Wamego**

The Wamego population increased an estimated 422 persons to 4,128 since 1990, an 11.4 percent increase. An additional 272 persons are expected to reside in the community by 2005, keeping pace with the current growth rate, spurred by the town's strategic location between Manhattan and Topeka.

**65+ years population**

Riley County and each community, except Riley, will have a population increase in the age group 65+ years by 2005. **The City of Manhattan is estimated to increase by 19 percent in this age category by 2005.**

**TABLE 3.1  
POPULATION TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS  
MANHATTAN, RILEY COUNTY, KANSAS AND SELECTED AREAS  
1980-2005**

<b>Total Population</b>	<b><u>1980</u></b>	<b><u>1990</u></b>	<b><u>1998**</u></b>	<b><u>2000</u></b>	<b><u>2002</u></b>	<b><u>2005</u></b>	<b>% Change 2000-2005</b>
Riley County	63,505	67,139	63,615	67,965	69,773	72,414	+6.5%
<b>Manhattan</b>	<b>32,482</b>	<b>43,081*</b>	<b>41,318</b>	<b>51,856</b>	<b>53,660</b>	<b>56,367</b>	<b>+8.7%</b>
Leonardville	437	374	322	320	315	305	-4.6%
Ogden	1,804	1,494	1,705	1,735	1,810	1,935	+11.5%
Randolph	131	129	118	115	112	109	-5.2%
Riley	779	804	720	715	710	705	-1.4%
St. George	309	397	434	446	460	474	+6.2%
Wamego	3,159	3,706	4,074	4,128	4,242	4,400	+6.5%

\*Revised 1990 Census  
\*\*U.S. Census Estimate

<b><u>65+ Years:</u></b>	<b><u>1980</u></b>	<b><u>1990</u></b>	<b><u>2000</u></b>	<b><u>2002</u></b>	<b><u>2005</u></b>	<b>% Change 2000-2005</b>
Riley County	3,487	4,255	4,884	5,055	5,352	+9.6%
<b>Manhattan</b>	<b>2,470</b>	<b>3,050</b>	<b>3,929</b>	<b>4,264</b>	<b>4,657</b>	<b>+19.0%</b>
Leonardville	158	122	118	124	128	+8.4%
Ogden	67	61	72	80	87	+20.8%
Randolph	32	31	34	37	39	+14.7%
Riley	159	133	128	124	120	-6.2%
St. George	31	39	48	51	57	+18.7%
Wamego	576	608	667	719	754	+13.0%

Source: Census of Population, 1980, 1990  
Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

**Growth options**

**Table 3.2** presents several **population growth options** for the City of Manhattan. These annual growth options range from 1.7 to 2.8 percent during the next five years. Any of several population and/or economic occurrences in the community could affect the population in Manhattan by 2005.

The Housing Steering Committee felt the 1.7 percent annual growth represented the most conservative option, while the 2.8 percent option, although not considered too liberal, was felt to be obtainable. For housing planning purposes, the ***Steering Committee directed the Consultant to utilize the 1.7 percent annual growth option.***

<b>TABLE 3.2 POPULATION GROWTH OPTIONS MANHATTAN, KANSAS 1980-2005</b>					
<b><u>Year</u></b>	<b><u>Population</u></b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Annual</b>	
		<b><u>Change</u></b>	<b><u>Percent</u></b>	<b><u>Change</u></b>	<b><u>Percent</u></b>
<b>1980</b>	32,482	---	---	---	---
<b>1990</b>	43,081	+10,599	+32.6%	+1,060	+3.26%
<b>2000</b>	51,856	+8,775	+20.3%	+975	+2.20%
<b>2005(1)</b>	<b>56,367</b>	<b>+4,511</b>	<b>+8.7%</b>	<b>+902</b>	<b>+1.70%</b>
<b>2005(2)</b>	<b>57,560</b>	<b>+5,704</b>	<b>+11.0%</b>	<b>+1,140</b>	<b>+2.20%</b>
<b>2005(3)</b>	<b>59,115</b>	<b>+7,259</b>	<b>+14.0%</b>	<b>+1,452</b>	<b>+2.80%</b>
<b>(1) 1.7% Annual Growth</b>					
<b>(2) 2.2% Annual Growth</b>					
<b>(3) 2.8% Annual Growth</b>					
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980, 1990 Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000					

**Age distribution**

**Table 3.3** reviews the population **age distribution** for Manhattan, Kansas. The number of persons in the age category 19 to 34 years equals an estimated 46 percent of the total population in both 2000 and 2005. This is due to the large college student and military population in Manhattan. This also demonstrates that Manhattan is attractive to young families, offering employment opportunities to make a decent living.

**The number of persons 62+ years of age is expected to increase over 80 percent from 1980 to 2005.** Median age in Manhattan will be an estimated 26.75 by 2005, compared to 25 years in 1990.

<b>TABLE 3.3</b>						
<b>POPULATION AGE DISTRIBUTION</b>						
<b>MANHATTAN, KANSAS</b>						
<b>1980-2005</b>						
<b><u>Age Group</u></b>	<b><u>1980</u></b>	<b><u>1990*</u></b>	<b><u>1980-1990</u></b>	<b><u>2000</u></b>	<b><u>2005</u></b>	<b><u>2000-2005</u></b>
			<b><u>Change</u></b>			<b><u>Change</u></b>
18 and Under	7,311	9,427	+2,116	11,627	12,470	+843
19 - 34	16,067	20,321	+4,254	25,100	26,920	+1,820
35 - 54	4,679	8,123	+3,444	8,377	8,985	+608
55 - 61	1,454	1,326	-128	2,224	2,615	+391
62 - 74	1,857	2,328	+471	2,593	3,119	+526
75 - 84	798	1,110	+312	1,447	1,675	+228
<b><u>85+</u></b>	<b><u>316</u></b>	<b><u>446</u></b>	<b><u>+130</u></b>	<b><u>488</u></b>	<b><u>583</u></b>	<b><u>+95</u></b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>32,482</b>	<b>43,081</b>	<b>+10,599</b>	<b>51,856</b>	<b>56,367</b>	<b>+4,511</b>
Median Age	24.4	25.0	+0.6	26.5	26.75	+0.25

\*Adjusted for 1990 Census correction.

Source: Census of Population, 1980, 1990  
Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

## Household Tenure

**Table 3.4** provides trends and projections of **tenure of household** for Manhattan and Riley County. In Manhattan and Riley County a high percentage of rental households has been apparent since 1980. During the period 2000 to 2005, the number of rental households in Manhattan will continue to increase an estimated 1,220 households.

**Owner households, although expected to decline slightly in the percentage of total households between 2000 and 2005, will increase an estimated 594 households by 2005 to 19,588.**

	<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Households</u>	<u>Owner</u>		<u>Renter</u>	
			<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<b>Manhattan</b>	1980	12,823	6,075	47.4%	6,748	52.6%
	1990	15,295	6,775	44.3%	8,520	55.7%
	2000	17,774	7,358	41.4%	10,416	58.6%
	<b>2002</b>	<b>18,505</b>	<b>7,568</b>	<b>40.9%</b>	<b>10,937</b>	<b>59.1%</b>
	<b>2005</b>	<b>19,588</b>	<b>7,952</b>	<b>40.6%</b>	<b>11,636</b>	<b>59.4%</b>
<b>Riley County</b>	1980	19,269	8,751	45.4%	10,518	54.6%
	1990	21,280	9,393	44.1%	11,887	55.9%
	2000	21,822	9,383	43.0%	12,439	57.0%
	<b>2002</b>	<b>22,656</b>	<b>9,674</b>	<b>42.7%</b>	<b>12,982</b>	<b>57.3%</b>
	<b>2005</b>	<b>23,800</b>	<b>10,091</b>	<b>42.4%</b>	<b>13,709</b>	<b>57.6%</b>

Source: Census of Population and Housing, STF-3A, 1990  
Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

## Household Income Trends & Projections

**Table 3.5** profiles the trends and projections of **household income** in Manhattan, Kansas. The number of households with annual incomes of less than \$25,000 will continue to decline by 2005. Households with incomes of \$50,000+ will increase an estimated 28.9 percent during the five-year period 2000 to 2005.

Median income in Manhattan is currently an estimated \$42,000. **By 2005, median income is projected to be \$61,520.**

It is estimated, *by 2005, about 59 percent of all households in Manhattan will be at 80 percent of median income or less, a classification of low- to moderate income.* An estimated 60 percent of these households will be students, with the remaining household populations being single parent families and older adults.

<u>Income Group</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>% of Change 2000-2005</u>
Less than \$10,000	3,599	3,311	2,913	-12.0%
\$10,000 - \$24,999	3,297	3,132	2,693	-14.0%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	3,426	4,847	5,937	+22.5%
\$35,000 - \$49,999	2,046	2,895	3,547	+22.6%
\$50,000 and Over	2,351	2,915	3,760	+28.9%
<b>Total (Specified)</b>	<b>14,719</b>	<b>17,100</b>	<b>18,850</b>	<b>+10.2%</b>
<b>Median Income</b>	<b>\$21,531</b>	<b>\$42,800</b>	<b>\$61,520</b>	<b>+43.7%</b>

Source: Census of Population, 1990  
Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

## Local Employment Activities

The following statistical and narrative discussion provides an Economic Profile of Manhattan. Included in this analysis is a review of relevant labor force data, annual employment trends, commuter data and the identification of major employees.

The two dominant employers in Manhattan, in terms of number of employees, are Kansas State University with 3,836 full-time employees and Fort Riley Civilian Personnel Advisory Center with 3,451 full-time employees. These two employers are expected to impact the future growth of Manhattan in terms of housing and economic development.

Data suggests that both the City of Manhattan and Riley County have excellent employment activities. The job market is strong, which is evident through the large population increases and growth in median income. With 76.6 percent of the local population working in Manhattan, the community must continue to offer many employment opportunities in order to continue to attract younger families. The third top employer in Manhattan is the Manhattan/ Ogden Unified School District #383, with 1,053 full-time employees. Other major employers are the Mercy Health Center, Sykes Enterprises, a customer support service center for computer software and hardware, and Kansas Farm Bureau. Manhattan has made a conscious effort to enhance the potential for job creation in the local economy, particularly during the past 10 years.

### *Employment data, Manhattan*

**Table 3.6** identifies the most current and projected **employment data** available for Manhattan, Kansas. The unemployment rate has fluctuated between 3.9 and 4.3 percent during the period 1990 to 1998. During this period, the number of employed persons increased by 2,031.

An estimated 21,430 employed persons currently (2000) reside in Manhattan. **By 2005, an estimated gain of 1,145 employed persons could occur in the community**, primarily due to both new and expanding industry and business in Manhattan. The unemployment rate in Manhattan could be as low as 3.4 percent by 2005.

**TABLE 3.6  
EMPLOYMENT DATA  
MANHATTAN, KANSAS  
1990-2005**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Employed Persons</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>% Unemployed</u>
1990	18,739	---	3.9%
1991	18,344	-395	4.7%
1992	19,189	+845	3.7%
1993	19,053	-136	4.0%
1994	18,835	-218	4.3%
1995	19,652	+817	4.0%
1996	19,725	+73	4.1%
1997	20,040	+315	3.8%
1998	20,770	+730	3.7%
<b>2000</b>	<b>21,430</b>	<b>+660</b>	<b>3.5%</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>22,575</b>	<b>+1,145</b>	<b>3.4%</b>

Source: Kansas Department of Human Resources,  
Labor Market Information Services, 2000  
Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

**Work force**

**Table 3.7** identifies **work force by employment type** in Riley County from 1990 to 1999. The table provides trends for non-farm employment only, since farm employment data is unavailable. The highest employment category, during the documented years, have been services or non-manufacturing, retail and government. This trend is expected to continue during the next five years.

**TABLE 3.7  
WORK FORCE EMPLOYMENT BY TYPE  
RILEY COUNTY, KANSAS  
1990-1999**

<u>Work Force</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>% of Change 1990-1995</u>	<u>% of Change 1995-1999</u>
<b>Non-Farm Employment (Wage and Salary)</b>	<b>24,000</b>	<b>26,550</b>	<b>29,450</b>	<b>+10.6%</b>	<b>+10.9%</b>
Manufacturing	575	650	925	+13.0%	+42.3%
Durable	100	100	100	0.0%	0.0%
Non-Durable	475	550	825	+15.8%	+50.0%
Non-Manufacturing	22,475	24,800	27,000	+10.3%	+9.7%
Construction & Mining	950	1,100	1,325	+15.8%	+20.5%
Trans., Comm., Utilities**	475	400	300	-15.8%	-25.0%
Trade	5,150	5,550	6,225	-7.8%	+12.2%
Retail	4,525	4,950	5,600	+9.4%	+13.1%
Wholesale	625	600	625	-0.4%	+4.0%
Fin, Ins. & Real Estate***	1,400	1,400	1,625	0.0%	+16.1%
Services	5,000	6,325	6,550	+26.5%	+3.6%
Government*	10,450	11,125	12,500	+6.5%	+12.4%
Federal					
State					
Local					

\*Data Not available because of disclosure suppression

\*\*Transportation, communication & Public Utilities

\*\*\*Financial, Insurance & Real Estate

Source: Kansas Department of Human Resources, Labor Market, Information, 2000  
Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

**Labor force, Manhattan**

**Table 3.8** identifies **labor force and employment** trends and projections for Manhattan, Kansas. The number of employed persons increased by approximately 14 percent between 1990 and 2000 and is projected to increase by an estimated 5 percent by 2005.

<b>TABLE 3.8</b>				
<b>CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE AND EMPLOYMENT</b>				
<b>TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS</b>				
<b>MANHATTAN, KANSAS</b>				
<b>1980-2005</b>				
	<u>1980</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2005</u>
<b>Civilian Labor Force</b>	14,434	19,504	22,180	23,340
<b>Unemployment</b>	476	765	750	765
<b>Rate of Unemployment</b>	3.3%	3.9%	3.5%	3.4%
<b>Employment</b>	13,958	18,739	21,430	22,575
	<u>Change in Total Employment</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Annual</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>% Annual</u>
<b>1980-1990</b>	+4,781	+478	+34.0%	+3.4%
<b>1990-2000</b>	+2,691	+269	+14.0%	+1.4%
<b>2000-2005</b>	<b>+1,145</b>	<b>+229</b>	<b>+5.0%</b>	<b>+1.0%</b>
Source: Kansas Department of Human Resources, Labor Market Information, 2000 Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000				

## MANHATTAN HOUSING PROFILE

The **Housing Profile** section of this Housing Study identifies the existing housing characteristics of Manhattan, Kansas and provides a benchmark to determine the future housing needs of the community. *The principle housing goal of any community should be to provide safe, decent and sanitary housing for every family and individual resident.*

### A Survey of Housing Conditions

An analysis of housing conditions of single and multifamily structures was a vital component of the Housing Manhattan Study. The conditions survey process utilized the Kansas State Department of Commerce and Housing criteria for housing condition analysis. Requirements of this survey process include a four point approach that rates individual structures as: 1) Standard, 2) Moderately Deteriorated, 3) Severely Deteriorated, or 4) Dilapidated. Varying degrees of deterioration are evident in each of the four categories. “Standard” buildings are free of major structural defects, “Moderately Deteriorated” allows only one to two major defects, “Severely Deteriorated” structures have three to four major defects, while “Dilapidated” structures have one or more major defects, but are not cost-effective to rehabilitate.

### Structural survey ratings

Structures were given one of four ratings: standard, moderately deteriorated, severely deteriorated or dilapidated. Structures rated as severely deteriorated would require substantial rehabilitation, while structures rated dilapidated would require removal. Moderately deteriorated structures would need moderate rehabilitation. The following defines the different housing conditions.

1. **STANDARD CONDITION:** *Units that are in standard condition are units that are free of major structural defects, are equipped with adequate plumbing facilities and project an appearance that enhances the surrounding neighborhood.*
- < **SUBSTANDARD CONDITION:** *This category includes both deteriorated and dilapidated units.*

- < **DETERIORATED CONDITION:** Deteriorated units are those which have *one or more major structural defects, but could be repaired for a reasonable cost.* Major defects include: 1) unit requires complete electrical rewiring (not reviewed), 2) a complete new roof is required, 3) the plumbing system requires extensive repair or none exists, 4) major repair of exterior structural elements (e.g., walls, sills, floor joists, rafters, large porches, etc.) is required, 5) major repair of unstable or deteriorated foundation walls is necessary, or 6) complete replacement of the exterior siding is necessary. Degree of deterioration is either moderate or severe, according to the number of major defects, as noted below.
- 2. MODERATELY DETERIORATED:** *Units that have one or two major defects and could be improved to a standard condition at a reasonable cost.*
- 3. SEVERELY DETERIORATED:** *Units that have three or more major defects and could be completed to a standard condition at a reasonable cost.*
- 4. DILAPIDATED CONDITION:** *Units that have one or more of the defects listed in “deteriorated units,” but could not be repaired to a standard condition for less than a reasonable amount. These units should not receive rehabilitation assistance, except as a last resort. In most cases, dilapidated structures should be demolished and replaced.*

A total of 9,749 residential structures were evaluated as part of the Manhattan housing conditions survey. Residential buildings, or structures, were evaluated on an individual basis within the corporate limits of the City of Manhattan. Results of the survey process were tabulated on a block by block method which averaged the individual ratings of each block as one of the four categories. The results of the survey are depicted in **Illustration 2**.

The majority of residential properties in Manhattan (8,310 structures) are in good or “standard” condition. However, concentrations of “moderately” and “severely” deteriorated blocks exist east of Manhattan Avenue in the oldest portions of the City. Secondary areas with concentrations of “moderately” deteriorated properties are in various locations throughout the community.

Structures identified as “dilapidated” accounted for only 0.1 percent (12 structures) of the total 9,749 buildings. Single family houses comprised 82.4 percent of the total structures, while multifamily amounts to 2.8 percent and mobile home 8.8 percent. The largest number of “severely” deteriorated structures, 108 single family dwellings, equaled 1.4 percent of the total 8,035 single family structures. Mobile homes accounted for 47 of the “severely” deteriorated structures, and equaled 5.5 percent of the total 854 mobile homes surveyed. Individual results are tabulated in **Table 3.9**.

**TABLE 3.9  
HOUSING STRUCTURAL CONDITIONS SURVEY  
MANHATTAN, KANSAS  
2000**

<u>Structure</u>	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Moderately Deteriorated</u>	<u>Severely Deteriorated</u>	<u>Dilapidated</u>	<u>Total</u>
Single Family	7,307 (90.9%)	611 (7.6%)	108 (1.4%)	9 (0.1%)	8,035 (82.4%)
Two-Family	476 (81.6%)	97 (16.7%)	8 (1.4%)	2 (0.3%)	583 (6.0%)
Multifamily	191 (69.0%)	74 (26.0%)	11 (4.0%)	1 (0.3%)	277 (2.8%)
<u>Mobile Home</u>	<u>336 (39.3%)</u>	<u>471 (55.2%)</u>	<u>47 (5.5%)</u>	<u>0 (0.0%)</u>	<u>854 (8.8%)</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,310 (85.2%)</b>	<b>1,253 (12.9%)</b>	<b>174 (1.8%)</b>	<b>12 (0.1%)</b>	<b>9,749 (100.0%)</b>

Source: Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

### **Housing Subareas**

Concentrations of deteriorating dwellings can be identified as "Subareas" in the Housing Conditions Map, **Illustration 2**. Three distinct areas are located east of Manhattan Avenue, two in south-central Manhattan and one in the northeast portion of the community. A variety of dwelling types, styles and ages of structures are situated in these subareas. Intensive development throughout the history of Manhattan has left few vacant lots within any of these Subareas.

The need for rehabilitation of housing units within each of the Subareas is a primary issue which may involve public/private partnerships to make financial incentives available. Levels of deterioration currently exhibited in the Subareas indicate that private re-investment alone has not been sufficient to maintain or rehabilitate these neighborhoods. The following discussion provides more in depth analysis of each of the Subareas.

**Subarea 1:** The residential neighborhood located south of Downtown Manhattan, generally between Houston Street and Fort Riley Boulevard, from 4th to 9th Streets contains a variety of land use types. A total of 97 residential structures exist in Subarea 1, the majority of which (59, or 60 percent) are in good or standard condition, while 38 buildings are either moderately or severely deteriorated.

Small scale apartment buildings, three to six units, are located in close proximity to 6th Street. Commercial uses are concentrated at the Fort Riley Boulevard and 5th Street intersection and north to Colorado Street. Public/Quasi-Public uses including the Riley County Jail and adjacent church complex at the northwest corner of Subarea 1.

**Subarea 2:** The region north of Downtown Manhattan, generally located between Osage and Moro Streets, includes a concentration of residential properties. Commercial land uses are located along the eastern edge of Subarea 2 at 3rd Street and at the northwest portion along Anderson Avenue. Aggieville is excluded from the Subarea, however, high concentrations of multifamily land uses in the western portion of Subarea 2 are a result of the proximity of this commercial area, as well as Kansas State University. A few of the multifamily uses to the north of City Park along Fremont Street are Fraternity and Sorority houses. Private apartment buildings ranging in size from 12 to 24 units are concentrated west of 11th Street. Multifamily uses to the east of 11th Street include smaller scale apartments, four to six units, and several single family dwellings that have been converted to apartment use.

A total of 331 residential buildings are included in Subarea 2, of which 183 (or 55 percent) are deteriorated. Severely deteriorated structures amount to 9 percent (or 30 structures), while moderately deteriorated equals 153 structures (or 46 percent) of the total. A few single family dwellings were identified as dilapidated in Subarea 2. Dilapidated implies that the structure is not economically feasible to rehabilitate. These dwellings should be replaced with appropriated single family or smaller scale multifamily residential uses.

**Subarea 3:** The area generally located between Vattier Street and Claflin Road, east of Kansas State University from Manhattan Avenue east to 3rd Street, includes the area identified as Subarea 3. Commercial uses, in contrast to Subareas 1 and 2, are limited to only a half block area along the west side of 3rd Street. The majority of the Subarea is composed of single family dwellings and a limited amount of multifamily structures, which are concentrated in the western portion of the Subarea in close proximity to Kansas State University. Many single family dwellings in this area have been converted to multifamily structures.

**HOUSING CONDITIONS MAP  
MANHATTAN, KANSAS**

**ILLUSTRATION 2**

*“Housing Manhattan: Planning For The Future”*

Section 3

3-16

A total of 409 residential structures are included in Subarea 3. The majority of these structures 215 (or 52 percent) are in standard condition. Moderately deteriorated structures identified during the housing conditions survey total 149 buildings (or 46 percent). Subarea 3 contains the largest number of structures of any Subarea rated either severely deteriorated or dilapidated, 42 (10 percent) and 3 (2 percent) respectively. Although severely deteriorated and dilapidated structures are present in all portions of Subarea 3, the region between 8th Street and Manhattan Avenue has the highest concentration of deteriorated structures.

Subareas 1,2 and 3 are all impacted by their close proximity to the Kansas State University campus and Downtown Manhattan. Many of these residential neighborhoods have experienced an evolution from owner occupied single family dwellings to renter occupied homes and houses converted to apartment houses. Many small scale apartment buildings have either been constructed on vacant lots or have replaced demolished single family dwellings. Large percentages of unkept rental properties have resulted in the overall deterioration of these residential neighborhoods. Absentee landlords, deferred maintenance and the fact that the majority of the single family dwellings are approximately 75 to 90 years of age contribute to the deteriorating conditions in these eastern Manhattan neighborhoods.

**Subarea 4:** A narrow strip of southern Manhattan, located between Fort Riley Boulevard and the Union Pacific Railroad, from South 14th Street to approximately Westwood Road, is identified as Subarea 4. Mixed land uses are evident throughout Subarea 4. Commercial and residential, including single family and small scale (4-plex) multifamily residential uses, are the predominant land use types. Industrial and public/quasi-public uses are present to a limited extent.

In Subarea 4, the housing condition survey analyzed a total of 34 residential properties, of which only 23 percent (or 8 structures) were rated as in standard condition. Deteriorated categories included 17 structures (or 50 percent) identified as moderately deteriorated, six structures (18 percent) as severely deteriorated and three structures (or nine percent) were found to be dilapidated.

The development of this portion of southern Manhattan was greatly impacted by the Union Pacific Railroad, and later by the completion of the Fort Riley Boulevard (State Highway 18). Mixed and conflicting land uses, limited accessibility due to few frontage roads and the lack of private re-investment has and will continue to limit redevelopment potentials in Subarea 4.

**Subareas 5 and 6:** The remaining two subareas are both mobile home parks. Subarea 5, the Redbud Estates Mobile Home Park, is located in southwest Manhattan, roughly between Seth Child Road (State Highway 113) and the Sunset Cemetery and Sunset Park Zoo. Farm Bureau Road provides access to Seth Child Road from the Redbud Estates area.

Subarea 6, the Blue Valley Mobile Home Park, is located in northeast Manhattan, just east of the Manhattan Country Club and golf course, along the east side of Tuttle Creek Boulevard (Highways 24, 13 and 177), between Allen Road and Griffith Drive. A total of 158 mobile homes are included in Blue Valley, while Redbud Estates contains 375 mobile homes.

Housing conditions in Subarea 5, Redbud Estates, include 349 (or 93 percent) moderately deteriorated, and 26 (or 7 percent) severely deteriorated mobile houses.

Subarea 6 contains a significantly higher percentage of standard condition mobile homes, 78 (or 49 percent) of the total 158 dwellings. Mobile homes found in deteriorating condition include 66 (or 42 percent) as moderately, and 14 (or 9 percent) as severely deteriorating.

***Housing stock profile***

**Table 3.10** identifies **substandard housing** in Manhattan as per the 1990 Census and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The City of Manhattan recorded 91 (or 0.6 percent of the total) housing units lacking complete plumbing and 383 overcrowded units, a total of 474 housing units. ***The community of Manhattan should target up to 20 percent of this total (474), or 95 units, for replacement during the next two- to five years.***

<b>TABLE 3.10</b>	
<b>HOUSING STOCK PROFILE</b>	
<b>DEFINING SUBSTANDARD HOUSING – HUD</b>	
<b>MANHATTAN, KANSAS</b>	
<b>1990</b>	
Total Units	15,295
Units w/ Complete Plumbing	15,204
% of Total	99.4%
Lack Complete Plumbing	91
% of Total	0.6%
Units w/ 1.01+ Persons Per Room	383
% of Total	2.5%
Source: Census of Population and Housing, 1990	
Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000	

### *(Housing) Cost burdened*

Households are considered cost burdened if they expend more than 30 percent of their income for monthly housing costs. ***In the 1990 Census, the latest data available, the City of Manhattan had a total of 5,277 cost burdened households, an estimated 40 percent of all households.*** During the next two- to five years, the community should strive to eliminate up to 20 percent of these cost burdened cases by developing more affordable housing.

The above discussed substandard and cost burdened data is utilized in the determination of **replacement housing** associated with the total housing demand potential in Manhattan during the next two- and five years.

### **Review of Building Trends**

**Table 3.11** identifies the **number of housing units for which building permits were issued** between 1990 and 1999, less demolitions. Also included in the table are the number of units annexed by the City of Manhattan during the same time period.

In 1994, 567 units were annexed by the City. The majority of these units were for Kansas State University married students, the Jardine Apartments, located at Denison and Jardine Streets. The City of Manhattan has seen its largest increase in single family housing units (765) and multifamily housing units (723) during the 1990 to 1999 time period.

In 1993, the addition of the 180 unit Chase Manhattan Apartments was a major factor in the increase of total units that year. In 1996, University Commons, a 228 unit multifamily apartment complex, was constructed to provide modern rental housing for students. Single family unit construction has remained steady with the largest increases in number of units coming in 1992 and 1994.

Overall, 2,390 units were added, less demolitions, from 1990 to 1999. A total of 84 units have been demolished during that same time period, an average of 8.4 per year.

### **Evaluation of new housing stock**

The total valuation of new housing stock in Manhattan has ranged from \$21.5 million in 1990 to \$45.3 million 1999. **Between 1990 and 1999, the total valuation of new housing in Manhattan has equaled \$278 million.**

**TABLE 3.11  
NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS FOR WHICH  
BUILDING PERMITS WERE ISSUED  
MANHATTAN, KANSAS  
1990-1999**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Single Family</u>	<u>Two Family</u>	<u>Multifamily</u>	<u>Annexation</u>	<u>Demolition</u>	<u>Total less Demolition</u>
1990	82	20	131	0	11	222
1991	94	36	0	3	9	124
1992	120	18	12	17	10	159
1993	94	32	283	3	12	400
1994	103	32	20	567	4	718
1995	50	48	0	0	4	94
1996	57	32	277	0	4	362
1997	43	36	0	1	11	69
1998	72	33	0	86	11	180
<u>1999</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>58</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>765</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>723</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>2,390</b>

\* to date (September, 1999)

Source: Manhattan City Government, 1999  
Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

### **Housing Occupancy/ Vacancy Status**

**Table 3.12** profiles both the 1990 and 2000 **occupancy/vacancy status** in Manhattan, Kansas. In 1990, the Census recorded a total of 16,164 housing units in Manhattan with 869, or 5.4 percent of these being vacant. Vacant housing units consisted of seasonal and/or vacant housing units neither for sale nor rent (20) and vacant year-round housing units (849). The 1990 Manhattan, Kansas vacancy rate for year-round housing units was 5.2 percent.

**A standard, minimum community housing vacancy rate is 5 percent. This rate may fluctuate higher or lower for different time periods, depending upon the anticipated population growth and overall structural condition of the housing stock. This 5 percent minimum housing vacancy rate allows for (1) greater choice and selection for potential house buyers/renters and (2) elimination of substandard living units which are detrimental to the health and safety of the occupant.**

**TABLE 3.12**  
**HOUSING STOCK OCCUPANCY / VACANCY STATUS**  
**MANHATTAN, KANSAS**  
**1990 / 2000**

a)	1990	Census Housing Stock Count	16,164
b)	1990	Vacant Housing Units	869
c)	1990	Occupied Housing Units	15,295
d)	1990	Housing Vacancy Rate	5.40%
e)	1990	Seasonal or Other Vacant Housing Units Neither for Sale nor Rent	20
f)	1990	Census Year-Round Housing Stock <b>(a-e)</b>	16,144
g)	1990	Vacant Year-Round Housing Stock <b>(b-e)</b>	849
h)	1990	Occupied Year-Round Housing Units <b>(f-g)</b>	15,295
		▪ Owner Occupied	6,775
		▪ Renter Occupied	8,520
i)	1990	Year-Round Housing Vacancy Rate	5.25%
j)	2000	Additional Housing Unites, Since 1990 Census	2,474
k)	2000	Demolitions Since 1990	84
l)	2000	Year-Round Housing Stock	18,534
m)	2000	Vacant Year-Round Housing Units	760
n)	2000	Occupied Year-Round Housing Units	17,774
		▪ Owner Occupied	7,358
		▪ Renter Occupied	10,416
o)	2000	Year Round Housing Vacancy Rate	4.10%
		▪ Owner Occupied	6.40%
		▪ Renter Occupied	2.40%

Source: Census of Population and Housing, 1990  
City of Manhattan, 2000  
Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

**Rental comparables**

**Table 3.13** identifies **affordable and market rate comparables** in Manhattan. A vacancy rate of 0 percent existed for the 12 market rate apartment complexes surveyed in November, 1999. Average rent ranged from \$345 per month for studio apartments up to \$900 for four bedroom apartments. Affordable rental comparables had monthly rents based on 30 percent of the tenant’s income with ceiling rents ranging from \$275 for studio apartments to \$400 for four bedroom units.

<b>TABLE 3.13</b>				
<b>AFFORDABLE AND MARKET RATE RENTAL COMPARABLES</b>				
<b>MANHATTAN, KANSAS</b>				
<b>2000</b>				
<b><u>Market Rate</u></b>	<b><u># of Units</u></b>	<b><u>Year Contracted</u></b>	<b><u>Cost of Living Range (rent)</u></b>	<b><u>Vacancy Rate</u></b>
Westchester Park	360	1984	N/A	0.0%
Georgetown Apts.	200	1989	N/A	0.0%
Campus East	110	1965	\$370 - \$500	0.0%
Chase Manhattan	180	1993	\$455 - \$900	0.0%
Crestwood	132	1981 & 1985	\$485 - \$540	0.0%
Evergreen	96	N/A	\$360 - \$420	0.0%
Heritage Ridge	200	N/A	\$420 - \$680	0.0%
Park Plaza	253	N/A	\$350 - \$630	0.0%
Plaza West	128	1980	\$380 - \$440	0.0%
Winston Place	80	1973	\$450 - \$520	0.0%
West Park	24	N/A	\$345 - \$425	0.0%
Woodway	87	1991	\$415 - \$856	0.0%
<b><u>Affordable</u></b>				
Carlson Plaza	47	1975	30 % of Income	0.0%
Colorado Plaza	46	1980	30 % of Income	0.0%
Pottawatomie Court	28	1983	30 % of Income	7.0%
Flint Hills Place	60	1974	30 % of Income	0.0%
Apartment Towers	88	1973	30 % of Income	9.0%
Baehr Place	20	1975	30 % of Income	0.0%
Hudson Circle	19	1983	30 % of Income	0.0%
Source: Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000				

## Housing Costs

The cost of housing in any community is influenced by many factors, primarily cost of construction, availability of land and infrastructure, and lastly, the organizational capacity of the community to tie these factors into an applicable format and draw in appropriate resources. **The City of Manhattan is challenged to organize needed resources to meet the needs of its residents.**

Accessibility to safe, decent and affordable housing is the ultimate goal of any community. The 1990 Census provided information regarding owner occupied housing values and contract rents in Manhattan and Riley County.

### Owner housing costs

**Table 3.14 identifies median value for owner occupied housing in the City of Manhattan and Riley County for 1990 and 2000, plus a percentage of change, as per the 1990 Census and Consultant estimates. The estimated median value of owner occupied housing in Manhattan has increased 35 percent since 1990 and 28 percent County-wide.**

<b>TABLE 3.14 OWNER OCCUPIED MEDIAN HOUSING VALUE MANHATTAN AND RILEY COUNTY, KANSAS 1990 / 2000</b>			
	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>% of Change</u>
<b>Manhattan</b>	\$65,900	\$88,950	+35.0
<b>Riley County</b>	\$63,500	\$81,280	+28.0

Source: Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

**Rental housing costs**

**Table 3.15** displays **median contract rents** for the City of Manhattan and Riley County for both 1990 and 2000, plus the percentage of change, as per the 1990 Census and consultant estimates. Median rent for Manhattan in 1990 was \$333. **For 2000, median monthly rent in Manhattan is estimated to be \$410, thus a 23 percent increase from 1990.** County-wide, the Consultant estimates an increase from \$323 to \$384, from 1990 to 2000, a 19 percent increase.

<b>TABLE 3.15</b>			
<b>MEDIAN CONTRACT RENT</b>			
<b>MANHATTAN / RILEY COUNTY, KANSAS</b>			
<b>1990 / 2000</b>			
	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>% of Change</u>
<b>Manhattan</b>	\$333	\$410	+23.0%
<b>Riley County</b>	\$323	\$384	+19.0%

Source: Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000

**Household income limits**

Household income levels are guidelines for tenants eligibility and affordability for most publicly funded affordable and market rate rental housing projects. **Table 3.16** identifies household income limits at 50, 60, 80, 100 and 125 percent of median income for Riley County.

<b>TABLE 3.16</b>						
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME LIMITS</b>						
<b>RILEY COUNTY, KANSAS</b>						
<b>JANUARY, 2000</b>						
<b>Household</b>						
<u>Income Limits</u>	<u>1 Person</u>	<u>2 Person</u>	<u>3 Person</u>	<u>4 Person</u>	<u>5 Person</u>	<u>6 Person</u>
50%	\$14,344	\$16,406	\$18,438	\$20,500	\$22,125	\$23,781
60%	\$17,213	\$19,688	\$22,125	\$24,600	\$26,550	\$28,538
80%	\$22,950	\$26,250	\$29,500	\$32,800	\$35,400	\$38,050
100%	\$28,688	\$32,813	\$36,875	\$41,000	\$44,250	\$47,563
125%	\$35,859	\$41,016	\$46,093	\$51,250	\$55,313	\$59,453

Source: Hanna:Keelan Associates, P.C., 2000