



University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, Department of Economics

AND



FISCAL AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH CENTER

CITY OF WHITEWATER WISCONSIN CITIZEN'S OFF-CAMPUS HOUSING SURVEY

by

Russell D. Kashian, Ph.D.

Fiscal and Economic Research Center
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
800 W. Main Street, Carlson 4003
Whitewater, WI 53190

June 2009

Staff Paper 09.1

Contributors

Principle Researcher

Russell Kashian, Ph.D.

Data Administration and Auditing

Christie Kornhoff, Academic Department Associate

Data Collection and Entry

Rebecca Johnson

Research Associate, Coordination, & Editing

Joseph D. Carroll Jr.

Report Preparation

Joseph D. Carroll Jr.

Christopher Elfers

Survey & Focus Group Development

Scott Cerwinka

Dane Checolinski

Kyle Halweg

Dan Koch

Cameron Niven

Josh Smith

Focus Group Coordinators

James Bronson, PhD

Ronald (Bud) Gayhart

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Executive Summary.....	4
Housing.....	5
Student Impact.....	6
Conclusion.....	15
Appendix A, Technical Report.....	16
Appendix B, Sample Characteristics.....	18
Appendix C, Detailed Tabular Results.....	19
Appendix D, Survey Instrument.....	22

INTRODUCTION: WHITEWATER CITIZEN'S SURVEY

The City of Whitewater Student Housing Survey was designed to gather information from property owners in the City of Whitewater, Wisconsin to help the city assess the taxpayer's view of off-campus student housing. The survey questionnaire was designed by the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater's Fiscal and Economic Research Center, with input from the Whitewater Student Government, the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, and the City of Whitewater. The study was also financed by these three groups. In delivering the results, there are clear indications of citizen's concerns and their relationship to landlord concerns. It is interesting that they differ in a specific fashion. Survey sponsors were also interested in the homeowner's responses regarding development issues and the challenges and opportunities offered through off-campus student housing. Understanding residents' views of development and utilization is considered critical for planning continuing housing issues in the City of Whitewater.

The Fiscal and Economic Research Center (FERC) randomly selected homeowners from a database of property taxpayers provided by Walworth County. Owners of multiple properties were culled out (retaining one opportunity to complete a survey). In addition, tax bills addressed to businesses and non-profits were removed. A packet containing the survey, a cover letter, and a prepaid return envelope were sent to 1121 households. The survey was mailed in February, 2009. Two hundred and sixty nine (269) completed surveys were returned, yielding a response rate of 23%.

Through the use of random sampling, this survey was able to afford a more detailed survey. From the sample, the community looks to both univariate as well as multivariate analysis of the issues within the community. Univariate analysis looks to the isolated characteristic of a set of objects. In this survey, univariate analysis concentrates on the level of support, or lack thereof, given to various issues and ideas within the community. Multivariate analysis, on the other hand, focuses on simultaneous investigation of two or more variable characteristics. This matches, for example, demographic identifiers with level of support of these various issues and ideas. In our analysis, the Chi-Square test was used.

While the demographic questions posed at the end of the survey are designed to develop a picture of Whitewater, they also serve to determine the relevant demographic question: How does the sample reflect the 2000 United

States Census result. The survey responses came from an older and wealthier group than the community as a whole. This is partly due to the impact of the university students on this section of community demographics. While the median age of a resident of Whitewater (2008) is 23 years, the median age of the survey respondent was 56 years of age. In addition, the median income in the census was \$40,184. The survey also found that the median respondent's income was approximately \$90,000. Note that income responses were given as categorical data.

The survey was also more likely to have been completed by men. Of those providing specific information regarding gender, 44% of the surveys were completed by women. This compares to the community average where 50.7% are women. Finally, the average household size of the respondents is the same as Whitewater's median household size of 2.5. The differences between the census demographics and the survey were primarily a reflection of the decision to sample homeowners. This decision to oversample this part of the population resulted in a reflection of the long-term vision of the residents who are older and wealthier than the average resident of Whitewater.

This report focuses on two issues. The first issue is the aggregate community opinion on the individual questions. All of the questions are scaled according to their level of support as opposed to their level of opposition. Respondents were also provided the opportunity to answer "Neutral" or "No Opinion." The second issue is

the support these questions have within certain demographic categories. In this analysis, we attempt to determine if there is any difference in support/opposition between groups defined by demographic characteristics.

The basic econometric tool used to analyze relationships between demographic groups and the likert scale answers was the Pearson Chi-Square test. Karl Pearson introduced the Chi-Squared test in 1900 using a general difference equation.

Simple Equation for the Chi Square Test:

$$\chi^2 = \text{Sum}_{i=1}^k (O_i - E_i)^2 / E_i$$

Where : k is the number of categories

O_i is the observed frequency in category i

E_i is the expected or hypothesized frequency in category i

Although this test evaluates the null hypothesis (there are no differences between groups), it does not claim to explain causality. It is important to resist claims of insight into the utility of the individual. As a result, the conclusions are mathematical, not causally conclusive. It is also critical to note that the results are the product of a static environment and a condition of *ceteris paribus*.

Executive Summary

The Executive Summary focuses on a few of the major issues that will later be explored in the City of Whitewater Community Housing Survey analysis. This report is comprised of several distinct sections. The first section looks at the community's view regarding the overall availability of housing in the City of Whitewater. Several points stand out in this section.

a. The majority of respondents felt that housing and apartment availability is adequate, although a higher percentage agreed with that statement when referencing apartment availability.

b. The second issue addressed in this section referenced the affordability of housing. In regards to single family affordability, respondents were split in regards to these issues. However, in a fashion not replicated throughout the survey, the respondents were more likely to have no opinion or be neutral on the issue of apartment rent reasonableness. Also, when this issue is examined by respondent group, survey respondents who acknowledged owning a rental property were

more likely to answer that rents were reasonable than non-landlords.

c. Finally, the third issue confronted in this section focused on whether affordable single family housing should be a priority of the City of Whitewater. Over 68% of the respondents agree with this idea.

The remainder of this survey concentrated on issues of off-campus student housing and the respondents' observations of this housing. As our further analysis will show, the citizens that shared similar demographic characteristics tended to move in the same direction on the topics and issues. It is

also important to note that there are consistent opinions on topics of similar nature. This implies that the citizens have an intended direction and understand the implications to get there.

- d. The citizens see student housing as business potential for the City of Whitewater; where 55.7% of the citizens saw this as a top advantage. In accordance with this, 60.3% of the citizens viewed student housing as a property tax advantage versus only 33.8% of the citizens not viewing the property tax basis of student housing as a top advantage.
- e. The citizens strongly feel that the location of student housing should be restricted with 65.1% agreeing with this concept. However, the source of the agreement or disagreement clearly varies between the different demographic groups and their geographic location relationship to the University.
- f. The level of student respect for their neighbors is a key concern for the citizens of Whitewater. Where 45.3% of the citizens disagree with the statement “Students respect their neighbors,” while 28.6% of the citizens have no opinion or are neutral on the issue. Over 70% of the citizens view this as an important challenge to the city.
- g. The citizens of Whitewater are split between allowing higher apartment density closer to campus, 38.7% for and versus 43.1% against. When broken into demographic groups, the break down becomes clearer.
- h. The citizens strongly feel that the City of Whitewater should enforce the parking restrictions that are currently on the books, 69.5% agree.
- i. The citizens recognize that the parking restrictions do not just relate to driveways but also street parking, 75% of the citizens agreed with the statement the City of Whitewater should enforce on-street parking.
- j. Though the citizens agree with the statement “I want the City to enforce jay walking limitations more rigorously,” 36% agreed and 28.7% disagreed. The source of the difference of opinions is very clear across the different demographic groups.
- k. On some topics of rental property management (such as the reasonableness of rent and inspection of properties) there is a significant difference between landlords and the citizens. However, this difference is only present when the questionnaire directly addresses management issues in regards to student impact on community life. The opinions of landlords and the citizens do not significantly differ otherwise.

Survey Results

Throughout this report, questions will be evaluated in two fashions. The first is “how did the community respond as a whole.” These responses are aggregated without consideration of age, location, or other respondent characteristics. The second will look at whether there were significant differences between the answers provided by differing groups, for example investors (owners of rental property) and single-family homeowners. While many of the questions provide the aggregate totals and responses, sum are broken up by demographic group. In both cases, all primary data is summarized in the Appendix C.

Housing Overview

The Housing Overview section of the report looks at general housing issues, irrespective of their relationship to the University. The goal of these questions is to assess whether the students are the cause of the problem or if they further exemplify or solve an existing problem.

The first question addressed the issue of single-family housing availability. Where 56.1% of the respondents agreed with idea that housing availability was adequate.

Single Family Housing Availability is Adequate

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	18	6.7%
Strongly Disagree	17	6.3%
Disagree	50	18.6%
Neutral	33	12.3%
Agree	99	36.8%
Strongly Agree	52	19.3%

The issue of availability was extended to apartment availability. In this case, 64.2% of the respondents agreed that apartment availability was adequate.

Apartment Availability is Adequate

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	31	12.2%
Strongly Disagree	5	1.8%
Disagree	24	8.9%
Neutral	35	12.9%
Agree	107	39.5%
Strongly Agree	67	24.7%

The following questions pursued the issue of the reasonableness of housing prices. With respect to single-family housing, the respondents were split in their opinion with 36.2% of the respondents disagreeing with the statement and 36.9% agreeing with the statement.

Single-Family Home Prices are Reasonable

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	18	7.4%
Strongly Disagree	23	8.5%
Disagree	75	27.7%
Neutral	53	19.6%
Agree	79	29.2%
Strongly Agree	21	7.7%

In the case regarding the reasonableness of apartment rents, many respondents had no opinion on this issue. It should be noted that a response of this type is expected given the sample population. Of those that did respond, no pattern appeared with residents split between agreeing, disagreeing, and holding a neutral opinion on the issue. Reviewing this issue based on different demographic groups and their location to the University, produced no significant difference in opinion. Reflecting on whether the respondent was a landlord or not, landlords were more likely to state that apartment rents are reasonable.

Apartment Rents are Reasonable

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Non-</i>	
	<i>Landlords</i>	<i>Landlords</i>
No Opinion	30.9%	17.7%
Strongly Disagree	4.6%	3.1%
Disagree	15.4%	14.6%
Neutral	29.7%	24.0%
Agree	16.0%	31.3%
Strongly Agree	3.4%	9.4%

The final question focused on general issues of housing asking whether affordable single-family housing should be a priority of the City of Whitewater. The answers to this question clearly displayed an interest on the part of the participant that they agreed with this statement. This support for affordable housing was consistent throughout all various demographic groups (gender, age, income, distance from campus, and property ownership type).

Affordable Single-Family Housing Should be a Priority of the City of Whitewater

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	13	5.5%
Strongly Disagree	12	4.4%
Disagree	23	8.5%
Neutral	36	13.3%
Agree	106	39.1%
Strongly Agree	79	29.2%

Student Impact

The student housing section focuses on the citizen's view of student housing and its impact on the community. The initial question regarding the community's relationship to student housing posed "Student housing is an important economic development tool for Whitewater." This question found widespread agreement throughout the community with 62.3% of citizens agreeing. However, for the citizens under the age of 30 only 29.2% of the respondents viewed this as an important tool; this is statistically significantly different from the population using a Chi-Square test. In addition, there was no significant difference in agreement between respondents based on geographic location to the University.

Student Housing is an Important Economic Development Tool for Whitewater

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Under 30</i>	<i>30 & Over</i>
No Opinion	8.3%	5.7%
Strongly Disagree	12.5%	3.2%
Disagree	25.0%	17.0%
Neutral	25.0%	11.7%
Agree	16.7%	44.1%
Strongly Agree	12.5%	18.2%

Using student housing as an economic development tool for the community has several advantages. The increased demand for this type of housing has a residual increase in property value. The City/County/School District would see an increase in tax revenue from property taxes. In accordance with the tax basis increase and using student housing as a tool for economic development, 45.0% of the citizens listed property tax revenue as the number one advantage of off-campus housing.

Advantages of Off-Campus Housing

<i>Advantage</i>	<i>Property Tax Revenue</i>	<i>Business Potential</i>
Most Important	45.0%	21.8%
Second Most Important	14.8%	33.6%
Third Most Important	5.9%	5.9%

An increase in demand for this type of housing would lead to an increase in supply, creating more business. We see that 21.6% of the citizens listed business potential as the number one advantage of off-campus housing. There are two important considerations regarding this data. First, all three of these opinions are congruent with one another indicating a willingness to utilize resources to accomplish economic development. Secondly, off-campus housing made no distinction between student and non-student housing.

Many University of Wisconsin-Whitewater students live in the neighborhood surrounding the university. These students interact with the local community every day. This is a challenge for both the students and their neighbors due to contrasting lifestyles and expectations. The assumption was made that the average citizen believes there is a problem with student housing and student – citizen interaction. This was established based on communication between the three groups requesting the study. Indications from this study support this view of the students by the citizens. When responding to the statement, "Students respect their neighbors," 45.0% disagreed with the statement. The citizens that geographically lived within 1 – 2 blocks of the University disagreed with this statement more statistically significant with 69% disagreeing.

Students Respect Their Neighbors

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Within 1-2 Blocks</i>	<i>2+ Blocks</i>
No Opinion	0.0%	7.4%
Strongly Disagree	33.3%	14.8%
Disagree	35.7%	25.8%
Neutral	4.8%	26.2%
Agree	19.0%	14.8%
Strongly Agree	7.1%	10.9%

There is a tendency for residents to believe they are not respected by their student neighbors. While this is the view of the majority of respondents, there is a small contingent that feels that the students respect their neighbors. This feeling is consistent throughout the community;

there is no statistical relationship between the distance they live from campus and whether or not the resident feels respected. In addition, residents' feelings of respect don't change if they own rental property, or if they previously lived in off-campus housing.

In a list of important issues, the citizens listed respect for neighbors/property as their number one concern 29.9% of the time.

Regarding these citizen concerns, attention needs to be paid to what can be done to resolve these concerns. One option would be to restrict the locations of designated student housing and single-family homes. While respondents recognize that student housing is an important economic development tool, they also feel that the location of this instrument should be restricted.

The City of Whitewater Should Restrict the Location of Student Housing

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	11	4.8%
Strongly Disagree	20	7.4%
Disagree	35	12.9%
Neutral	28	10.3%
Agree	65	24.0%
Strongly Agree	110	40.6%

The opinion is clear among the residents that the location of student housing needs to be restricted; however, this opinion also has its fractures. There is a statistically significant difference in citizen opinion depending on their geographic location to the University. Those closest to the University believe the strongest that the location needs to be restricted, with 69.1% in agreement. As the geographic location of the respondent moves further from the University, opinion begins to wane; at 13 plus blocks from the University, opinions about restrictions on student housing are split.

The City of Whitewater Should Restrict the Location of Student Housing

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>1-3 Blocks</i>	<i>4-12 Blocks</i>	<i>13+ Blocks</i>
No Opinion	4.30%	5.40%	7.30%
Strongly Disagree	6.10%	6.10%	14.60%
Disagree	11.30%	12.80%	22.00%
Neutral	9.10%	8.80%	17.10%
Agree	26.10%	27.70%	12.20%
Strongly Agree	43.00%	39.20%	26.80%

One possible method of restricting student housing is to allow higher density housing closer to campus to restrict sprawl. Although there is a large opinion that the location of student housing needs to be restricted, the citizens are split on whether higher density is an answer. In addition, opinions on density differed significantly depending on how far citizens lived from the University. Citizens living within 3 blocks from campus did not want denser student population near campus, but those between 4 blocks and 12 blocks were statistically more likely to support denser population near campus.

The City of Whitewater Should Allow Higher Student Density Closer to Campus

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	7	3.3%
Strongly Disagree	46	17.0%
Disagree	70	25.8%
Neutral	42	15.5%
Agree	74	27.3%
Strongly Agree	30	11.1%

The City of Whitewater Should Allow Higher Student Density Closer to Campus

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>1-3 Blocks</i>	<i>4-12 Blocks</i>	<i>13+ Blocks</i>
No Opinion	4.2%	2.0%	2.4%
Strongly Disagree	44.4%	6.1%	7.3%
Disagree	16.7%	27.0%	36.6%
Neutral	11.1%	20.3%	9.8%
Agree	18.1%	31.8%	29.3%
Strongly Agree	5.6%	12.8%	14.6%

However, the citizens do not feel there should be zoned student housing with 57.9% agreeing that the city should treat student housing the same as all other rental property. When examining the responses based on geographic location to the University and demographic characteristics, no statistically significant different response appears. This may be an indication of a general problem citizens have with all apartment renters and not just students.

The City Should Treat Student Housing the Same as All Other Rental Properties

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	14	5.9%
Strongly Disagree	26	9.6%
Disagree	51	18.8%
Neutral	21	7.7%
Agree	102	37.6%
Strongly Agree	55	20.3%

Another area of concern is the maintenance of property by the landlord. While the previous question posed the idea that all rental properties should be treated equally, the majority of the responses disagree with the statement that landlords maintain their properties well.

Landlords Maintain Their Properties Well

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	12	5.2%
Strongly Disagree	49	18.1%
Disagree	90	33.2%
Neutral	56	20.7%
Agree	41	15.1%
Strongly Agree	21	7.7%

Examining the different responses from the citizens, we found that the residents that live within a 1 – 2 block range of the University campus disagreed with this statement on a statistically significant level. Those that lived within 1-2 blocks of the University disagreed with this statement 70.7% of the time.

The data also indicated that the Whitewater citizens under the age of 30 disagreed more with this statement on a statistically significant level, with 77.3% of respondents disagreeing with the statement. There were also statistically significant

responses for the citizens that lived within 5 – 7 blocks and over 13 blocks from the University in addition to residents over the age of 65. However, in each of three groups respondents showed to be more neutral and less opinionated about the subject.

It should also be of note that of the citizens who own rental property 48.9% of the respondents reported that they disagreed with the statement landlords maintain their property well, while only 33% agreed with the statement.

Problems associated with student housing are not limited to deterioration of property issues. To solve these issues landlord maintenance or interaction with the tenants becomes pivotal. The citizens were asked to share their opinion about whether student housing creates challenges associated with specific problems. The citizens agreed with the statement “Student housing creates challenges associated with vandalism” 68.3% of the time. When geographic location and demographic characteristics were controlled for no statistically significant difference in opinion appeared between the groups.

Student Housing Creates Challenges Associated With

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Vandalism</i>	<i>Garbage</i>	<i>Snow Removal (Sidewalks)</i>
No Opinion	5.5%	5.2%	5.5%
Strongly Disagree	2.2%	.7%	1.1%
Disagree	7.7%	3.7%	6.3%
Neutral	16.2%	14.8%	22.5%
Agree	39.1%	46.1%	39.1%
Strongly Agree	29.2%	29.5%	25.5%

The problem is not just limited to vandalism, citizens agree that garbage and snow removal are challenges created by student housing 75.6 % and 64.6% of the time respectively. As was the case regarding vandalism, when geographic location and demographic characteristics are evaluated, there is no statistically significant difference in opinion.

The citizens recognize this deficiency, just as the citizens acknowledged the utilization of student housing to spur economic development, the citizens realize that change is necessary for these rental properties. The question on property maintenance is closely associated with the idea of property inspections. The survey asked the citizens to list their opinion on the statement the city needs to more rigorously inspect rental properties, 73.4% of the respondents agreed.

**The City Needs to More Rigorously Inspect
Rental Properties**

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Landlords</i>	<i>Non-Landlords</i>
No Opinion	2.1%	4.6%
Strongly Disagree	13.5%	2.3%
Disagree	11.5%	4.0%
Neutral	12.5%	8.6%
Agree	21.9%	36.0%
Strongly Agree	38.5%	44.6%

The only statistically significant difference when controlling for geographic location and demographic characteristics comes from the rental property owners. As might be expected, the landlords disagree with this statement 25.0% of the time. Nevertheless, the clear majority still agrees with the statement the city needs to more rigorously inspect rental properties, with 60.4% agreeing.

The implied action from an increase in city inspections of rental properties and better landlord maintenance is an improvement in the quality of rental properties. When asked this question specifically, the citizens responded consistently with the previous two issues. The survey asked the respondent to list their opinion on the statement the City of Whitewater should strive to improve the quality of private student housing.

The clear majority opinion from the citizens on the statement “The City of Whitewater should strive to improve the quality of private student housing” is 65.3% of the respondents agree with this statement. The survey did produce one notable outcome, when the different geographic locations and demographic characteristics were

evaluated not all citizens shared the same opinion. The only group to have a statistically significant difference in opinion was the citizens under the age of 30, where only 41.7% agreed with this statement and 25.0% disagreed.

**The City of Whitewater Should Strive to
Improve the Quality of Private Student Housing**

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>29 & Under</i>	<i>30 + Years</i>
No Opinion	16.7%	3.6%
Strongly Disagree	16.7%	6.5%
Disagree	8.3%	7.7%
Neutral	16.7%	14.6%
Agree	29.2%	47.0%
Strongly Agree	12.5%	20.6%

However, it should be noted that this is an area of inconsistency. Though the residents under the age of 30 do not feel that the city should improve the quality of rental properties, they do feel that it is a challenge surrounding student housing. When asked to evaluate what the top three challenges were surrounding off-campus student housing, the citizens under the age of 30 cited unsightly/unkempt housing as the most important challenge 37.5%. This is slightly higher than the population average of 31.7% and not completely congruent with the answers about the quality of rentals.

It should be noted that there are two important comments about this data. First, though the citizens listed the unkempt housing as their top challenge 37.5% of the time, 50.0% did not list it as a challenge at all. Second, even though the survey asked respondents only to rank the top three challenges total, respondents consistently failed to do this and listed multiple first second and third challenges.

Challenges of Off-Campus Rental Housing

<i>Challenge</i>	<i>29 & Under</i>	<i>30+ Years</i>
Not a Top Challenge	50.0%	39.7%
Most Important	37.5%	31.2%
Second Most Important	8.3%	20.6%
Third Most Important	4.2%	8.5%

Using the initial solution posed, increasing density in rental properties closest to the University, it is a clear outcome that noise levels would increase. This is merely due to the fact that there will be many more people living per home. The survey asked the respondents how strongly they agree or disagree with a list of problems associated with student housing. The citizens most strongly agreed that “Student housing creates challenges associated with noise,” 81.9% of the population agrees with this statement.

When evaluated for the different geographic locations and demographic characteristics no significant difference existed between the groups. The respondents listed noise as the most important challenge associated with off-campus rental housing 19.9% of the time.

Noise is a Challenge of Off-Campus Rental Housing

<i>Challenge</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Not a Top Challenge	124	46.5%
Most Important	54	19.9%
Second Most Important	52	19.2%
Third Most Important	39	14.4%

An increase in drinking or drug abuse from the increase in population density is unknown; however, the citizens were asked to list how strongly they agree with alcohol abuse among the students. When the respondents listed their opinion on the statement “Student housing creates challenges associated with alcohol abuse”, 75.4% of the respondents agreed with the statement. When evaluating the different geographic locations and demographic characteristics no statistically significant differences appear. When the citizens ranked the top challenges of off-campus rental housing, 22.1% listed drinking/drug abuse as the top challenge.

Drinking/Drug Abuse is a Challenge of Off-Campus Rental Housing

<i>Challenge</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Not a Top Challenge	136	50.9%
Most Important	60	22.1%
Second Most Important	36	13.3%
Third Most Important	37	13.7%

Despite these possible challenges to an increase in rental property density closest to the University, it may also help alleviate any housing shortages. However, when asked to indicate the most important challenges of off-campus rental housing, citizens listed housing availability as the most important challenge only 4.8% of the time.

Housing Availability is a Challenge of Off-Campus Rental Housing

<i>Challenge</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Not a Top Challenge	218	81.2%
Most Important	13	4.8%
Second Most Important	23	8.5%
Third Most Important	15	5.5%

Early in the process of writing the survey, the Fiscal and Economic Research Center held a public forum to identify “hot issues” and important questions. Many of the concerns expressed through the community forum focused on transportation. As a result, these questions address ideas that may mitigate some of these transportation challenges.

It would also be plausible to say that as a result of any increase in population density close to the University the number of cars per residence would also increase, merely due to the increase in the number of people living per house. Since options regarding mass transportation in Walworth County are extremely limited, transportation is initially addressed in terms of the automobile.

When asked to list their opinion on the challenges associated with student housing, 66.8% of the respondents agreed with the statement “Student housing creates challenges associated with automobile parking.” When evaluated for geographic location and demographic characteristics no statistically significant difference in responses appeared.

In accordance with this view of student housing parking, the citizens agreed with the statement “The City of Whitewater should enforce its residency parking restrictions” 69.0% of the time. The citizens also agreed with the statement “The City of Whitewater should

enforce its on-street parking restrictions” 74.6% of the time.

The extent that the citizens agreed with this statement varied depending on what geographic relationship you were to the University. It is clear that both statements have the majority of people agreeing with them, however, the closer the respondent was to the University, the stronger their opinion became. In addition, the further away from the University the respondent was the level of disagreement would increase. This range of answers is expected based on the level of impact the given citizen has from student parking.

The City of Whitewater Should Enforce Its Residency Parking Restrictions

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>1-3 Blocks</i>	<i>4-12 Blocks</i>	<i>13+ Blocks</i>
No Opinion	4.2%	2.0%	0.0%
Strongly Disagree	6.9%	6.8%	12.2%
Disagree	8.3%	8.8%	22.0%
Neutral	5.6%	13.5%	7.3%
Agree	20.8%	37.8%	41.5%
Strongly Agree	54.2%	31.1%	17.1%

The City of Whitewater Should Enforce Its On-Street Parking Restrictions

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>1-3 Blocks</i>	<i>4-12 Blocks</i>	<i>13+ Blocks</i>
No Opinion	4.2%	3.4%	2.4%
Strongly Disagree	1.4%	4.1%	4.9%
Disagree	9.7%	8.8%	12.2%
Neutral	8.3%	8.8%	7.3%
Agree	29.2%	43.9%	48.8%
Strongly Agree	47.2%	31.1%	24.4%

It is plausible that increased density will have a spill over affect on on-street parking during the day due to the increased number of vehicles per house. When the citizens were asked to evaluate the statement “Whitewater should limit on-street parking during the day” there was no clear

consensus between the respondents, with 45.8% disagreeing.

Whitewater Should Limit On-Street Parking During The Day

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>1-3 Blocks</i>	<i>4-12 Blocks</i>	<i>13+ Blocks</i>
No Opinion	5.6%	7.4%	4.9%
Strongly Disagree	15.3%	11.5%	17.1%
Disagree	23.6%	34.5%	43.9%
Neutral	23.6%	25.0%	22.0%
Agree	20.8%	18.9%	12.2%
Strongly Agree	11.1%	2.7%	0.0%

Even though citizens strongly agree that Whitewater should enforce its parking restrictions, the reactions about limitations on on-street parking indicate on-street parking is not an important challenge of off-campus housing. When asked to evaluate the challenges of off-campus rental housing, citizens listed on-street parking as the most important challenge only 7.7% of the time. When evaluated for geographic location and demographic characteristics no statistically significant difference appears.

On-Street Parking is a Challenge of Off-Campus Rental Housing

<i>Challenge</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Not a Top Challenge	208	77.5%
Most Important	21	7.7%
Second Most Important	24	8.9%
Third Most Important	16	5.9%

With any increase in parking congestion, no matter what the source, the number of people and traffic around the vehicles will also increase. As a result the safety of going to and from your vehicle as well as driving your vehicle may become of concern. However, when asked to evaluate the statement “Automobile safety is a challenge of off-campus rental housing,” respondents only listed this as the most important challenge 6.6% of the time. When evaluated for geographic location and demographic characteristics no statistically significant difference appeared.

Automobile Safety is a Challenge of Off-Campus Rental Housing

<i>Challenge</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Not a Top Challenge	223	83.0%
Most Important	18	6.6%
Second Most Important	15	5.5%
Third Most Important	13	4.8%

While citizens may not feel that automobile safety is a challenge of off-campus housing, the increase in traffic becomes a concern. When citizens were asked to list how strongly they felt about the statement “Student housing creates challenges associated with automobile traffic,” 61.7% of the respondents agreed with this statement. However, when evaluated for demographic characteristics, the income tier of the respondent affected the opinion on a statistically significant level. The citizens who made over \$120,000 only agreed with the statement 37.9% of the time. (A complete table of responses is in Appendix C, Table C:1)

Nevertheless, traffic is still a problem around the City of Whitewater. The question now becomes can anything be implemented to help alleviate this traffic problem. The citizens were asked to evaluate the statement “The City of Whitewater and the University need to focus on developing a more pedestrian friendly Whitewater to transition the students away from automobiles” with 64.2% of the citizens agreeing with this statement. When evaluated for geographic location and demographic characteristics no statistically significant difference appeared.

The City of Whitewater and the University
Need to Focus on Developing a More
Pedestrian Friendly Whitewater to Transition
the Students Away from Automobiles

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	14	5.9%
Strongly Disagree	14	5.2%
Disagree	22	8.1%
Neutral	45	16.6%
Agree	94	34.7%
Strongly Agree	80	29.5%

While it cannot be assumed that there is any relationship between parking issues and a pedestrian friendly community, any decrease in the use of automobiles by student may increase the amount of pedestrian traffic and the problems associated with it. When the citizens were asked to evaluate the statement “Student housing creates challenges associated with pedestrian traffic (ex. jaywalking, ignoring traffic lights),” 62.4% agreed with the statement. When evaluated for geographic location and demographic characteristics no statistically significant difference in opinion appeared.

Student Housing Creates Challenges
Associated With Pedestrian Traffic

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	10	4.4%
Strongly Disagree	5	1.8%
Disagree	23	8.5%
Neutral	62	22.9%
Agree	88	32.5%
Strongly Agree	81	29.9%

Even if there is no increase in pedestrian traffic there is still a concern about jaywalking throughout the city. When the citizens were asked to evaluate the statement “I want the city to enforce “jay-walking” limitations more rigorously throughout Whitewater” the responses were varied.

I Want the City to Enforce "Jaywalking"
Restrictions More Rigorously Throughout
Whitewater

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	12	5.2%
Strongly Disagree	23	8.5%
Disagree	54	19.9%
Neutral	83	30.6%
Agree	55	20.3%
Strongly Agree	42	15.5%

If the respondent was between 45 and 59 years of age or had previously lived in student housing, the respondent disagreed with further

enforcement of jaywalking restrictions, 42.9% and 44.4% of the time respectively. If the respondent was 60 or older, the respondent agreed with further enforcement of jaywalking restrictions 46.9% of the time. (A complete table of responses is in Appendix A Table 1-2)

A solution to problems associated with pedestrian traffic may be to encourage the use of bicycles. However, there is no clear indication whether this would alleviate or exacerbate the problems associated with jaywalking or ignoring traffic lights. When citizens were asked to evaluate the statement “Whitewater is a bike-friendly community;” only 38.3% of respondents agreed with the statement. Even further when asked to evaluate the statement “Whitewater should develop more bike paths,” only 48.4% agreed with the statement. When evaluated for geographic location and demographic characteristics neither question produced any statically significant different responses.

Whitewater is a "Bike-Friendly" Community		
<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	14	5.9%
Strongly Disagree	11	4.1%
Disagree	48	17.7%
Neutral	92	33.9%
Agree	89	32.8%
Strongly Agree	15	5.5%

Whitewater Should Develop More Bike Paths		
<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	16	6.6%
Strongly Disagree	18	6.6%
Disagree	34	12.5%
Neutral	70	25.8%
Agree	82	30.3%
Strongly Agree	49	18.1%

If the solution for transportation issues is more control over student automobile traffic and parking, then a solution might be to install parking meters on the streets around the

University. However, when asked to evaluate the statement “Whitewater should install parking meters (or permit parking) on the streets around the University,” 50.6% of the respondents disagreed with this statement. In addition, when the citizens were asked to evaluate the statement “I approve of the current level of enforcement of speed limits throughout Whitewater,” 59.4% of respondents agreed with this statement. When evaluated for geographic location and demographic characteristics neither question produced any statistically significant difference in responses.

Whitewater Should Install Parking Meters (or permit parking) on the Streets Around the University		
<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	15	6.3%
Strongly Disagree	55	20.3%
Disagree	82	30.3%
Neutral	48	17.7%
Agree	55	20.3%
Strongly Agree	14	5.2%

I Approve of the Current Level of Enforcement of Speed Limits Throughout Whitewater		
<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
No Opinion	8	3.7%
Strongly Disagree	23	8.5%
Disagree	39	14.4%
Neutral	38	14.0%
Agree	129	47.6%
Strongly Agree	32	11.8%

Conclusion

It is clear that there is some tension between the survey respondents and their perception of the off-campus students at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater. While the respondents, all of whom received a survey due to their owning real estate in Whitewater, generally recognize the role of the University as an engine of economic growth in the community. A challenge was presented to the students in regards to communicating their respect to these community members. Since the questions regarding respect are based on perceptions and beliefs, it is possible much of the residents' feelings are not perceived correctly by the student body. It is also possible residents are not cognizant of the positive efforts displayed by the student body. In the event that efforts regarding respect are present, but misunderstood, they should be amplified. In the event that efforts need to be augmented, the student body should consider remedies to assist in that task.

In another major area of concern, transportation, it appears there are contradictory views. The respondents feel transportation issues are a major concern. However, measures that further limit their own transportation freedom (limits on on-street parking and increased costs of transportation) are not overwhelmingly supported. In general, it appears the residents demand enforcement of the current regulations and laws.

In the third area of concern, housing quality, the respondents paint an equally consistent picture. They see little need for additional legislation. Similar to the conditions presented through the transportation area, enforcement of current building and rental requirements appear to be supported.

The last questions in the survey addressed the nature of these issues over time. The average respondent has lived in the City of Whitewater for 28.27 years. During this time, 62.1% of the respondents feel the quality of off-campus student housing has stayed the same or become worse. This opinion is consistent regardless of how long the citizen has lived in the city, and is most strongly held by the citizens whom are under the age of 30. Thus the clear consensus is that there has been no improvement in the overall quality and visual appearance in off-campus student housing.

The two other questions asked how the citizen felt about the progress of the student-town relationship and the impact student housing has had on them. There was a clear divergence in opinion based on where the respondent lived in relation to the University; however, responses were consistent between all respondents considering the length of time they have lived in the City of Whitewater. Respondents living within 3 blocks of the University, 66.6%, felt the student-town relationship and the growth of off-campus student housing has become worse (negatively impacted) or remained the same (little or no impact). Whereas, 57.8% of the respondents who did not live within 3 blocks of the University felt the student-town relationship and the growth of the campus and off-campus student housing has improved (positively impacted) or remained the same (little or no impact).

In conclusion, town-gown issues have plagued and frustrated colleges for decades. Since colleges will continue to exist in communities, studies like this one are necessary so college personnel, city leaders, and student leaders can learn to improve communication methods and discover what fosters positive town-gown relations. In the end, an open dialogue between the town and the college will allow both sides to peacefully co-exist and prosper.

Appendix A: Technical Report

The City of Whitewater Student Housing Survey was conducted by the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Fiscal and Economic Research Center between January, 2009 and May, 2009. Surveys were mailed to 1121 randomly selected property owners in Whitewater. Two hundred sixty nine (269) surveys were completed and returned by mail. The response rate for the survey was 23% (Table A:1.)

Table A:1 Response Rates		
Completed Surveys	269	23%
Non-returned surveys	910	77%
Total	1121	100%

Sampling Error

The City of Whitewater Student Housing Survey, like all surveys, is subject to the existence of Confidence Intervals and Statistical Sampling Error. While error caused by statistical sampling is only one type (others include sample selection bias, social desirability bias, etc), the calculation of this error is important. This Survey, like all survey instruments, is subject to sampling error due to the fact that all households in the area were not interviewed. The sampling error is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Sampling Error} = \pm(1.96) * \sqrt{\frac{P * (100 - P)}{N}}$$

Where P is the percentage of responses in the answer category being evaluated and N is the total number of persons answering the particular question. Turning to the t-distribution and a two-tailed test, the sampling error provides that the probability is 95% that the results fit within this range.

This report presents values that are bounded by this 95% confidence interval estimate. Thus some answers provide a plus/minus range. However, due to the nature of Likert scaling, this type of probability estimation is not applied to all univariate answers. While results can be estimated, their meaning (in regards to Likert scaling) lacks decisiveness.

For example, suppose you had the following distribution of answers to the question, "Should the state spend more money on road repair even if that means higher taxes?" Assume 1,000 respondents answered the question as follows:

Yes	- 47%
No	- 48%
Don't Know	- 5%

The sampling error for the "YES" percentage of 47% would be:

$$\text{Sampling Error} = \pm(1.96) * \sqrt{\frac{47 * (100 - 47)}{1000}} = \pm 3.1\%$$

The sampling error for the “Yes” percentage of 48% would be:

$$\text{Sampling Error} = \pm(1.96) * \sqrt{\frac{48 * (100 - 48)}{1000}} = \pm 3.1\%$$

The Sampling error for the “Don’t Know” percentage of 5% would be:

$$\text{Sampling Error} = \pm(1.96) * \sqrt{\frac{5 * (100 - 5)}{1000}} = \pm 1.4\%$$

In this case we would expect the true population figures to be within the following ranges:

Yes	43.9% - 50.1% (i.e., 47% \pm 3.1%)
No	44.9% - 51.1% (i.e., 48% \pm 3.1%)
Don’t Know	3.6% - 6.4% (i.e., 5% \pm 1.4%)

Chi Square Test

In its simplest fashion, the chi-square test is used to test the difference between two independent proportions. In one instance, this report considers the difference between groups in their view on affordable single-family housing (are single family home prices reasonable?). This question was exposed to a chi square test, which tested the answers against the different groups answering the question. It was found that given the degrees of freedom given, and chi-square value exceeding 37.652 prompted a rejection of the null hypotheses (all groups feel the same).

The chi-square test is commonly used in political polling. Suppose, for example, a pollster is interested in knowing whether males and females differ in their endorsement of a candidate. The null hypothesis is that females and males are just as likely to support a candidate. If 33% of the 100 males interviewed support the candidate while 17% of the females support the candidate, it is important to test whether the difference was due to chance alone.

The chi-square test provides a simple mechanism to test whether certain group’s responses fall outside the expected range, given the group’s response. This study uses a standard significance level of 5%. This significance level makes the statement that sampling variation is an unlikely explanation of the discrepancy between the null hypothesis and the sample values.

Appendix B: Sample Characteristics

The following are the demographic characteristics of the population used in this study. All responses are respondent answered; in some instances the respondent did not fully answer all of the demographic information. If the respondent answered all question in the survey but not all questions about their demographics, the survey was still included. If the respondent did not answer all questions on the survey, under all conditions it was omitted.

Respondent Demographics

	Mean	Median	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Standard Deviation
Age	53.3	57.0	90.0	0.0	90.0	20.0
Household Size	2.3	2.0	9.0	0.0	9.0	1.5
Blocks From Campus	8.3	6.0	96.0	0.0	96.0	9.9
Years Lived in Whitewater	28.3	26.0	87.0	0.0	87.0	20.2

Gender Demographics

	Frequency	Percent
No Response	10	3.7%
Male	144	53.5%
Female	115	42.8%

Completed Education Demographics

	Frequency	Percent
No Response	4	1.5%
Less Than High School	0	0.0%
High School	61	22.7%
2-Year College	38	14.1%
Bachelor's Degree	68	25.3%
Master's Degree	59	21.9%
Doctoral Degree	39	14.5%
Total	269	100.0%

Income Demographics

	Frequency	Percent
No Response	30	11.2%
Less than \$40,000	32	11.9%
\$40,000 - \$59,999	62	23.0%
\$60,000 - \$79,999	52	19.3%
\$80,000 - \$99,999	38	14.1%
\$100,000 - \$119,999	26	9.7%
\$120,000 or more	29	10.8%
Total	269	100.0%

Appendix C: Detailed Tabular Results

Student Housing Creates Challenges Associated with Automobile Traffic

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>No Response</i>	<i>Less than \$40,000</i>	<i>\$40,000 - \$59,999</i>	<i>\$60,000 - \$79,999</i>	<i>\$80,000 - \$99,999</i>	<i>\$100,000 - \$119,999</i>	<i>\$120,000 or more</i>
No Opinion	6.7%	12.5%	1.6%	5.8%	2.6%	0.0%	3.4%
Strongly Disagree	3.3%	0.0%	1.6%	1.9%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	10.0%	0.0%	4.8%	5.8%	23.7%	15.4%	13.8%
Neutral	16.7%	12.5%	17.7%	28.8%	10.5%	30.8%	44.8%
Agree	43.3%	43.8%	45.2%	32.7%	44.7%	42.3%	27.6%
Strongly Agree	20.0%	31.3%	29.0%	25.0%	15.8%	11.5%	10.3%

Table C.1

Survey Results

		N	No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1a	Single family housing availability is adequate	269	6.7%	6.3%	18.6%	12.3%	36.8%	19.3%
1b	Apartment availability is adequate	269	11.5%	1.9%	8.9%	13.0%	39.8%	24.9%
1c	Single family home prices are reasonable	269	6.7%	8.6%	27.9%	19.7%	29.4%	7.8%
1d	Apartment rents are reasonable	269	25.7%	4.1%	15.2%	27.9%	21.6%	5.6%
1e	Affordable single family housing should be a priority of the City of Whitewater	269	4.8%	4.5%	8.6%	13.4%	39.4%	29.4%
2a	Student housing is an important economic development tool for Whitewater	269	5.2%	4.1%	17.8%	13.0%	42.0%	17.8%
2b	The City of Whitewater should restrict the location of student housing	269	4.1%	7.4%	13.0%	10.4%	24.2%	40.9%
2c	The city should treat student housing the same as all other rental properties	269	5.2%	9.7%	19.0%	7.8%	37.9%	20.4%
2d	Landlords maintain their properties well	269	4.5%	18.2%	33.5%	20.8%	15.2%	7.8%
2e	The city needs to more rigorously inspect rental properties	269	3.0%	6.3%	6.7%	10.0%	31.2%	42.8%
2f	Students respect their neighbors	269	5.6%	17.8%	27.5%	23.0%	15.6%	10.4%
3a	The City of Whitewater should allow higher student density closer to campus	269	2.6%	17.1%	26.0%	15.6%	27.5%	11.2%
3b	The City of Whitewater should enforce its residency parking restrictions	269	2.2%	7.8%	10.4%	10.0%	34.2%	35.3%
3c	The City of Whitewater should enforce its on-street parking restrictions	269	3.3%	3.7%	9.3%	8.6%	40.1%	34.9%
3d	The City of Whitewater should strive to improve the quality of private student housing	269	4.1%	7.4%	7.8%	14.9%	45.7%	20.1%
3e	The City of Whitewater and the University need to focus on developing a more pedestrian friendly Whitewater to transition the students away from automobiles	269	5.2%	5.2%	8.2%	16.7%	34.9%	29.7%

Challenges of Off-Campus Student Housing

		N	Most Important	Second Most Important	Third Most Important	Not a Top Challenge
4a	On-Street Parking	269	7.8%	8.9%	5.9%	77.4%
4b	Noise	269	20.1%	19.3%	14.5%	46.1%
4c	Housing Availability	269	4.8%	8.6%	5.6%	81.0%
4d	Drinking/Drug Abuse	269	22.3%	13.4%	13.8%	50.5%
4e	Pedestrian Safety	269	10.0%	9.3%	5.9%	74.8%
4f	Automobile Safety	269	6.7%	5.6%	4.8%	82.9%
4g	Unsightly/Unkempt Housing	269	32.0%	19.7%	8.2%	40.1%
4h	Low Cost Labor Pool	269	2.2%	5.9%	2.2%	89.7%
4i	Respect for Neighbors/Property	269	30.1%	25.3%	16.7%	27.9%
4j	Other	269	0.7%	1.5%	2.6%	95.2%

Advantages of Off-Campus Housing

		N	Most Important	Second Most Important	Third Most Important	Not a Top Advantage
5a	Property Tax Revenue	269	45.4%	14.9%	5.9%	33.8%
5b	Business Potential	269	21.9%	33.8%	5.9%	38.4%
5c	Cultural Impact	269	11.2%	14.1%	10.4%	64.3%
5d	Pool of Volunteers	269	4.8%	11.2%	8.6%	75.4%
5e	Low Cost Labor Pool	269	7.1%	8.2%	13.0%	71.7%
5f	Other	269	1.5%	1.5%	2.2%	94.8%

		N	No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Student housing creates challenges associated with:								
6a	Vandalism	269	4.8%	2.2%	7.8%	16.4%	39.4%	29.4%
6b	Noise	269	3.7%	0.7%	3.3%	9.7%	40.9%	41.6%
6c	Garbage	269	4.5%	0.7%	3.7%	14.9%	46.5%	29.7%
6d	Automobile Traffic	269	4.5%	1.5%	9.7%	22.3%	40.1%	21.9%
6e	Pedestrian Traffic	269	3.7%	1.9%	8.6%	23.0%	32.7%	30.1%
6f	Alcohol Abuse	269	4.5%	1.5%	2.6%	14.5%	43.1%	33.8%
6g	Automobile Parking	269	4.5%	1.5%	3.3%	23.4%	45.7%	21.6%
6h	Snow Removal (sidewalks)	269	4.8%	1.1%	6.3%	22.7%	39.4%	25.7%

		N	No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
7a	Whitewater should develop more bike paths	269	5.9%	6.7%	12.6%	26.0%	30.5%	18.2%
7b	Whitewater is a "bike-friendly" community	269	5.2%	4.1%	17.8%	34.2%	33.1%	5.6%
7c	Whitewater should limit on-street parking during the daytime	269	6.7%	13.8%	32.3%	23.8%	18.2%	5.2%
7d	Whitewater should install parking meters (or permit parking) on the streets around the University	269	5.6%	20.4%	30.5%	17.8%	20.4%	5.2%
7e	I approve of the current level of enforcement of speed limits throughout Whitewater	269	3.0%	8.6%	14.5%	14.1%	48.0%	11.9%
7f	I want the city to enforce "jay walking" limitations more rigorously throughout Whitewater	269	4.5%	8.6%	20.1%	30.9%	20.4%	15.6%

Demographic Characteristics		N	No	Yes
8d	Own Rental Property	269	64.3%	35.7%
8f	Lived in Off-Campus Student Housing	269	66.5%	33.5%

During your time in Whitewater do you feel						
		N	Improved	Remained the Same	Become Worse	No Opinion
8j	The student-town relationship has:	269	24.9%	38.3%	26.8%	10.0%
8k	The quality of off-campus housing has:	269	26.0%	25.3%	36.8%	11.9%
8l	The visual appearance of off-campus housing has:	269	26.0%	27.9%	41.3%	4.8%
		N	Positively Impacted	Had Little or No Impact	Negatively Impacted	No Opinion
8m	The growth of the campus and off-campus student housing has:	269	39.8%	44.6%	11.9%	3.7%

Appendix D: Survey Instrument



University of Wisconsin-Whitewater



University of Wisconsin-Extension

Economics Department, 800 W. Main Street, Whitewater, WI 53190

Fiscal and Economic Research Center

Whitewater Housing Survey

Dear Resident:

The Fiscal & Economic Research Center invites you to participate by completing this survey regarding many important issues facing the City of Whitewater. Along with this letter is a questionnaire that asks a variety of questions about the City including those relating to Off-Campus Student Housing and Economic Development.

The results of this project will assist the City in making many important decisions for the future. Through your participation we hope to clarify the relationship between the University and community.

The survey should take you about 15 minutes to complete. There are no risks to you if you decide to participate, and I guarantee that your responses are confidential.

If you have any questions or concerns about completing the survey, you may contact *The Fiscal and Economic Research Center* at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater at 262-472-1355, as they are administering the survey and results.

I hope you will take the time to complete this questionnaire and return it in the prepaid reply envelope as the direction of the community affects us all.

INSTRUCTIONS Please complete this survey in consideration of the housing conditions in the City of Whitewater with special consideration given to housing occupied by Students from the University of Wisconsin Whitewater. You may attach a separate sheet for responses as needed. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers and everyone's opinion counts! Your responses will be strictly confidential!

Please return this survey in the enclosed envelope by: March 1, 2009

Q1: Housing in Whitewater	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Single family housing availability is adequate	5	4	3	2	1	0
Apartment availability is adequate	5	4	3	2	1	0
Single family home prices are reasonable	5	4	3	2	1	0
Apartment rents are reasonable	5	4	3	2	1	0
Affordable single family housing should be a priority of the City of Whitewater	5	4	3	2	1	0

Comments _____

In the series of questions focusing on students, a “student” is defined as a person who attends UW-Whitewater part-time or full-time and lives in the City of Whitewater for the convenience of living close to campus. It is also assumed that “students” will not continue to live in the city after their enrollment at UW-Whitewater has ended.

Q2: Student housing In Whitewater

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Student housing is an important economic development tool for Whitewater	5	4	3	2	1	0
The City of Whitewater should restrict the location of student housing	5	4	3	2	1	0

If you agree, how should the city restrict the location of student housing? _____

If you agree, why should the city restrict the location of student housing? _____

Attached is a map of Whitewater—if you agree that the city should attempt to restrict the location of student housing, circle and identify where the boundaries should be set?

Q2 (Continued)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
The city should treat student housing the same as all other rental properties	5	4	3	2	1	0
Landlords maintain their properties well	5	4	3	2	1	0
The city needs to more rigorously inspect rental properties	5	4	3	2	1	0
Students respect their neighbors	5	4	3	2	1	0

Comments

Q3: Off-campus housing & economic development

In Question #2, the concept of student housing as a tool of economic development was posed. Please consider these measures as an attempt to improve the market for the provider (the City of Whitewater) and the customers (the students).

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
The City of Whitewater should allow higher student density closer to campus (Current unrelated residency restrictions limit some rental properties to 4, or 5 people per unit)	5	4	3	2	1	0
The City of Whitewater should enforce its residency parking restrictions (Whitewater's current parking restriction allow only 3 vehicles to be parked in the front driveway)	5	4	3	2	1	0
The City of Whitewater should enforce its on-street parking restrictions (There are currently limitations on overnight street parking)	5	4	3	2	1	0
The City of Whitewater should strive to improve the quality of private student housing	5	4	3	2	1	0
The City of Whitewater and the University need to focus on developing a more pedestrian friendly Whitewater to transition the students away from automobiles	5	4	3	2	1	0

Comments

Q4: Challenges of Off-Campus Rental Housing

Please rank the following according to the biggest issues with Whitewater’s off-campus student housing and its associated student population (1 is the biggest problem, 2 is the second biggest problem). Only rank 3 (if you have an answer not listed, please write it down—this is not unusual, respondents often provide their own insights)

- a. On-Street Parking _____
- b. Noise _____
- c. Housing Availability _____
- d. Drinking/Drug Abuse _____
- e. Pedestrian Safety _____
- f. Automobile Safety _____
- g. Unsightly/Unkempt Housing _____
- h. Low Cost Labor Pool _____
- i. Respect for Neighbors/Property _____
- j. Other _____

Comments _____

Q5: Advantages of Off-Campus Housing

Please Rank the Following According to the Most Pleasing or Advantageous with Whitewater’s Off-Campus Student Housing and its associated student population (1 is the biggest asset, 2 is the second biggest asset)

Only Rank 3 (if you have an answer not listed, please write it down—this is not unusual, respondents often provide their own insights)

- a. Property Tax Revenue _____
- b. Business Potential _____
- c. Cultural Impact _____
- d. Pool of Volunteers _____
- e. Low Cost Labor Pool _____
- f. Other _____

Comments _____

Q6: Student housing creates challenges associated with (consider these problems relative to other citizens, homeowners and renters):

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Vandalism	5	4	3	2	1	0
Noise	5	4	3	2	1	0
Garbage	5	4	3	2	1	0
Automobile traffic	5	4	3	2	1	0
Pedestrian traffic (Ex. jaywalking, ignoring traffic lights)	5	4	3	2	1	0
Alcohol Abuse	5	4	3	2	1	0
Automobile parking	5	4	3	2	1	0
Snow removal (sidewalks)	5	4	3	2	1	0

Comments

Q7: Transportation in Whitewater

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Whitewater should develop more bike paths	5	4	3	2	1	0
Whitewater is a “bike-friendly” community	5	4	3	2	1	0
Whitewater should limit on-street parking during the daytime	5	4	3	2	1	0
Whitewater should install parking meters (or permit parking) on the streets around the University	5	4	3	2	1	0
I approve of the current level of enforcement of speed limits throughout Whitewater	5	4	3	2	1	0
I want the City to enforce “jay walking” limitations more rigorously throughout Whitewater	5	4	3	2	1	0

Comments

Q8: Demographic Questions

What is your age? _____ What is your gender? Male Female
Including yourself, what is your household size? _____

Do you own residential rental property in Whitewater? _____

How many blocks do you estimate you live from the University of Wisconsin Whitewater? _____

Did you ever live in off-campus student housing? _____

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than high school | <input type="checkbox"/> High school degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2-year college degree | <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Master's degree | <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral degree |

Which of the following ranges includes your annual household income?

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than \$40,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$60,000 - \$79,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,000 - \$119,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$40,000 - \$59,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$80,000 - \$99,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$120,000 or More |

How many years have you lived in the City of Whitewater? _____

During this time, do you feel that the student-town relationships have:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improved | <input type="checkbox"/> Remained the Same |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Become Worse | <input type="checkbox"/> No Opinion |

During your years in Whitewater, do you feel that the quality of off-campus student housing has:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improved | <input type="checkbox"/> Remained the Same |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Become Worse | <input type="checkbox"/> No Opinion |

During your years in Whitewater, do you feel that the visual appearance of off-campus student housing has:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improved | <input type="checkbox"/> Remained the Same |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Become Worse | <input type="checkbox"/> No Opinion |

During your years in Whitewater, has the growth of the campus and off-campus student housing:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Negatively Impacted Me | <input type="checkbox"/> Had Little or No Impact on Me |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Positively Impacted Me | <input type="checkbox"/> No Opinion |

Thank you for your cooperation!

I understand that when I return the completed survey in the enclosed envelope I am providing voluntary consent to participate in this research. Every effort will be made to safeguard your identity and any information you provide from unauthorized access.

For any questions regarding the study:
Russell Kashian, PhD (262-472-1361)

If you have any questions regarding your role in the research, please contact:
Denise Ehlen (262-472-4212)