

CHAPTER 2 – POPULATION AND HOUSING

Introduction

In order to positively affect the balance of growth that will occur in Morgan County, the Comprehensive Plan must determine the most appropriate direction in which to proceed to ensure that both existing and future populations are provided with adequate public services and housing. Using projections from the Land Use chapter and analyzing demographics and housing stock can most accurately make this determination. This analysis will provide a comprehensive direction in identifying projected housing needs, rehabilitation goals for existing housing stock, and adaptive reuse of underutilized structures. It will also serve to some degree in developing growth areas where housing will be encouraged to develop near existing population centers and public services.

Demographics

The most obvious demographic data are census figures that generalize changes in age, sex, and race. However, this data fails to provide an in-depth perspective of the socio-economic and cultural uniqueness of the community. For that reason it is also important to outline changes in income, education, and migration that provide a better picture of how the County is changing. To further understand these changes it would also be desirable to analyze how similar changes in neighboring counties and how migration from those counties might affect Morgan County.

Age, Sex, and Race

Although the best method by which to understand the demographic changes in a community over time is through the provision of the following tables, there are several points within each table that should be noted. First, the calculations for the 2005 figures are derived by using the 2000 figures and plotting a straight percentage calculation of the total number, which is then applied to the estimated 2005 population figure.

From the census tables it is clear to see that growth in over the past several decades has increased significantly, without greatly changing the trend of demographic characteristics. This is evident in the fact that census percentages in each of the categories within the age, sex, and race tables have remained fairly consistent from 1970 to 2000.

Changes in the age characteristics include decreases to those under age 19 of nearly 13% of the total population make up, while population figures for age 20 and up have increased by 11%, thus continuing the trend of an ever-aging population between 1970 and 2000. Male to female changes from 1970 include a slight increase in the female population from 50.5% of the total to 50.8% in 2000. Racial makeup has also remained fairly constant with less than a tenth of a percent change from the 1980 estimate of 98.7% increasing to 98.8% classified as white in 2000.

Table 2-1 Population by Age

Age	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
0-4	750	720	700	905	1,043
5-19	2,420	2,700	2,340	2,723	3,140
20-44	2,540	3,580	4,270	4,819	5,557
45-64	1,840	2,380	2,860	4,021	4,637
65+	1,000	1,440	2,040	2,475	2,854

Source: US Census Reports

Table 2-2 Population by Sex

Sex	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
Male	4,231	5,259	5,890	7,337	8,461
Female	4,316	5,452	6,238	7,605	8,769

Source: US Census Reports

Table 2-3 Population by Race

Race	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
White	N/A	10,583	11,985	14,689	16,939
Black	N/A	104	92	89	103
American Indian	N/A	8	25	26	30
Asian, Pacific	N/A	11	18	20	23
Other	N/A	5	8	34	39

Source: US Census Reports

Household Education, Income, and Size

In addition to basic age, sex and race statistics identified in census reports, education, income and household size provide a view of changing characteristics of households over time. These three factors play a larger role however in determining more of the socio-economic direction of the County.

The most notable point in educational achievement between 1970 and 2000 is the number of residents over 25 having some college experience, increasing from less than 6% to more than 43% during this period. Also important was the decrease in number of people without high school diplomas representing a decline of approximately 66% in 1970 to less than 24% in 2000.

Although Table 2-5 is not converted into today's dollars, the increases in per capita and household incomes are an obvious reflection of improvements in socio-economic status such as education. Most notable are the recent increases from census 2000 to estimated 2005 figures. While per capita increases over past census periods averaged around \$5,000, the County has experienced more than \$10,000 in average increase over the past 5 years. Poverty levels, which

declined between 1980 and 1990 and have gradually inclined since that period, still represent a decrease in total percent of population from more than 16% in 1970 to just over 10% in 2005.

While the household population has been steadily declining since 1970, it is important to note the current housing market for both seasonal and year round housing is steadily increasing in the average size of structures being built. Further, although it appears the average age has been increasing during this same period, it is likely the strong inward migration of new residents purchasing these larger homes may gradually decrease the average age and increase population per household over the next 20 years.

Table 2-4 Household Education

Education Level	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
No Diploma	3,315	3,010	2,934	2,564	N/A
High School Graduate	1,032	2,350	3,275	1,668	N/A
Some College	256	554	868	4,868	N/A
Associate Degree	N/A	N/A	274	291	N/A
Bachelors Degree	235	628	669	681	N/A
Graduate/Professional	N/A	N/A	316	506	N/A

Source: US Census Reports

Table 2-5 Household Income

Income Level	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
Median Income	\$6,018	\$13,632	\$24,372	\$35,016	\$49,700
Per Capita Income	\$2,132	\$6,242	\$11,420	\$18,109	\$28,550
% Below Poverty	N/A	1,764	1,317	1,531	1,765

Source: US Census Reports

Table 2-6 Household Size

Year	Persons in Household	Households	Persons per Household
1970	8,507	2,780	3.06
1980	10,609	3,830	2.77
1990	11,969	4,731	2.53
2000	14,748	6,145	2.40
2005	17,181	7,159	2.40

Source: US Census Reports

Population

Morgan County, along with Jefferson and Berkeley Counties, is located within Region 9, the easternmost of eleven West Virginia State Planning and Development Regions. Population

trends for Region 9 are in several respects unlike the trends and characteristics of the State as a whole. This is due in part to these three counties being wedged between three other states, including Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. As Morgan County, more so than Jefferson or Berkeley, serves as the gateway to the rest of the State, it is important to understand how it functions in the context of both Region 9 within the State as well the four state region it is also a part of.

Table 2-7 Regional County Comparison Census 2000

County	Population	Housing Cost	Median Income	Median Age
West Virginia				
Berkeley County	75,905	\$99,700	\$38,763	36
Hampshire County	20,203	\$78,300	\$31,666	38
Jefferson County	42,190	\$116,700	\$44,374	37
Mineral County	27,078	\$73,500	\$31,149	39
Morgan County	14,943	\$89,200	\$35,016	41
Virginia				
Clarke County	12,652	\$139,500	\$51,601	41
Frederick County	59,209	\$118,300	\$46,941	37
Maryland				
Allegany County	74,930	\$71,100	\$30,821	39
Washington County	131,923	\$115,000	\$40,617	37
Pennsylvania				
Bedford County	49,984	\$80,200	\$32,731	40
Franklin County	129,313	\$97,800	\$40,476	38
Fulton County	14,261	\$83,900	\$34,882	38
Region Average	54,383	\$96,933	\$38,253	38

Source: US Census Reports

Population Trends

Since 1950, all three counties within Region 9 have been exceeding the State's population growth trends. While the State's population declined from 1950-1970, Morgan County grew by 3%. Further, all three counties exceeded the State growth rate of 11.8% from 1970 to 1980, with Morgan County more than double at 25.3%. From 1980 to 2000 this increase and disparity continued, with the State again experiencing a loss in population and Morgan County growing by nearly 40%.

The bulk of Morgan County's population and growth has always and continues to be in the Central Valley region, especially in the Berkeley Springs area. However, the growth rate, which was greatest in the Sleepy Creek region between 1970 and 1980, shifted to the Central Valley region between 1980 and 2000, and most recently toward the southern districts of Timber Ridge

and Rock Gap. The proportion of the total county population made up by the population of the Cacapon region has been slowly but steadily increasing since 1980.

Table 2-8 Population Trends

Area	1970	1980	1990	2000	Avg. % Growth
Berkeley	36,356	46,775	59,253	75,905	109%
Jefferson	21,280	30,302	35,926	42,190	98%
Morgan	8,547	10,696	12,128	14,943	74%
Region 9	66,183	87,773	107,307	133,038	101%
West Virginia	1,744,237	1,949,644	1,793,477	1,808,344	4%

Source: US Census Reports

Historic Population Forecasts

It is interesting to note as part of this Comprehensive Plan the population forecasts made in the 1985 Comprehensive Plan, in order to better understand how well the County handled historic projected growth trends as compared to the projected increases over the next 20-year period.

Population projections from the 1985 Plan were developed by the West Virginia State Health Planning and Development Agency by assuming a natural rate of increase based on historic trends derived from comparison of average birth and death rates. It did not provide a more in depth analysis at that time due to the relatively small base and dominating migration factors.

Although extrapolating basic percentages from historic planning region counts may not have yielded accurate numbers for growth by planning region between 1980 and 2000, the overall County projections were fairly close. This includes the 1985 Plan projection of 12,991 people for 1990 compared to the actual census count of 12,210 for that same year. It appears this slightly over projection by the Plan continued into 2000 with the Plan projecting 15,276 total population, while the actual census figure was 14,943.

As outlined in Chapter 1 of this Plan, population projections for the next 20-year period cannot realistically depend on the historic models used here. This is due to increases from current growth being well beyond the mere measure of birth and death rates, and depending much more heavily on inward migration from neighboring counties and beyond at a much faster pace.

Migration Trends

Population increases due to inward migration are difficult to estimate with accuracy. To do so, the analysis must take into account residential changes of those leaving and coming into the County. It also includes changes of births and deaths, which are based on national averages, and may not apply to Morgan County in a manner that would provide an accurate net migration figure.

There were two studies conducted covering the periods of 1960 to 1970 and 1970 to 1980. From the first study period of 1960 to 1970, estimates suggested that the County experienced a net

migration of 446 people out of the County. Based on the analysis, most of the outward migration occurred in the age groups between 15 and 29 years of age. The second period of 1970-1980 showed a reversed trend with a net inward migration of 1,794 people.

A study developed by the West Virginia Health Statistics Center for the periods of 1980 to 1990 and 1990 to 2000 reflected a continued increase in the net inward migration trend. This included a net inward migration of 1,334 people between 1980 and 1990, increasing the County's ranking from 3rd to 2nd overall for net inward migration of all counties in West Virginia. This trend further increased with the County moving to 1st overall, having a net inward migration of 2,783 people between 1990 and 2000.

Housing

Morgan County has continued to experience two distinct effects from additional housing development. This includes a continued decrease in population per household and a continued increase in housing stock being built for recreational or second home purposes.

Housing Occupancy

Historic growth trends show that Morgan County experienced an increase of 1,462 housing units from 1970 to 1980. While total housing during this period increased more than 42%, total population grew by only 25%. This is due in part to an increase in recreational housing stock from 7.1% to 7.7% of the total available housing as well as an increase in number of households comprised of elderly and single persons, and a slight decrease in children per household.

From 1980 to 2000 these trends continued with declines in children per household and increases in the middle age and elderly population resulting in a year 2000 average of 2.43 persons per dwelling. At the same time significant increases in seasonal housing, especially during the 1980's, produced an estimated increase from 7.7% of total housing to 15%, much of it occurring in the Sleepy Creek region. As a total percentage of housing occupancy, there was a decrease in vacant units from 15.4% in 1980 to 11.2% in 2000, which may be even less given that some units listed as vacant during the census report could have been completing construction for sale and occupancy at the time. As noted in the 1985 Plan, at more than 700 units, this still represents a relatively substantial stock for potential rehabilitation.

Table 2-9 Occupancy Statistics

Data	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
Owner Occupied	2,068	3,132	3,927	5,119	N/A
Mortgage Cost	N/A	\$378	\$619	\$747	N/A
Rental	700	684	804	1,026	N/A
Average rent	N/A	\$183	\$217	\$342	N/A
Married Households	N/A	2,690	3,107	3,780	N/A

Source: US Census Reports

Housing Stock

An important component of a successful community is a balance of housing stock. This provides housing opportunities for a financially diverse population, stabilizes equity within the tax base, promotes healthy urban and rural development patterns, and allows local government the ability to plan efficiently for the provision of services. As pointed out previously, housing stock within Morgan County has continued trends of declining persons per household, substantial vacant and seasonal housing, and dramatic increases in residential activity, especially in the last five-year period. For that reason, this section will use the estimated 2005 figures to provide some further insight on the balance of housing stock within the County.

Table 2-10 Housing Type

<u>Subject</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2005</u>
Total Housing	3,422	4,884	6,757	8,076	9,487
Year Round Housing	3,180	4,508	5,335	6,863	8,102
Seasonal Housing	242	376	1,422	1,213	1,385
Vacant Housing	413	694	604	718	843
Single Family	2,818	3,661	5,174	6,327	7,432
Multi Family	169	311	346	360	422
Mobile Home	260	537	1,237	1,360	1,646
Median Value	\$9,500	\$35,000	\$61,900	\$89,200	\$149,000

Source: US Census Reports

Seasonal housing during the past five years has increased by more than 100 units, while at the same time has decreased slightly as a percentage of overall housing stock. This is due in part to both the increase in number of year-round housing units being built, as well as the decrease in overall seasonal units experienced from 1990 to 2000. Although the total seasonal units appear to be on the rise, given the number of projected year-round housing units in the development pipeline, this number may continue to slightly increase in overall units, but continue to decrease as a percentage of total housing stock.

The number of vacant housing units has nearly doubled since 1970. However, as a percentage of overall housing stock it has decreased from more than 12% in 1970 to less than 9% in 2005. As noted previously the significant increase from 2000 to 2005 may be associated with seasonal housing being counted as vacant, or housing within new subdivisions just placed on the market.

Year round housing continues to increase as both a percentage and overall part of the total housing stock. This includes conversions of seasonal housing, rehabilitation of vacant housing, and especially increases in new housing. While it appears there have been nearly 200 seasonal units converted and more than 100 vacant units rehabilitated since 1990, new housing over the past five years has increased in permit activity from less than 100 permits per year to nearly 300 permits in 2005.

While mobile and multi-family homes have increased significantly over time, much of the balance of recent permit activity has included single-family housing. During this period median housing value has risen from less than \$100,000 to nearly \$150,000, or a 50% increase over the past five years.

Housing Conditions

Since 1970, housing standards have dramatically improved for the overall housing stock within Morgan County. These standards are measured by such factors as age of structure, overcrowding, and presence of heating equipment and plumbing.

Although it is difficult to measure an exact number of substandard housing units given the overlap in criteria, generally, from 1970 to 1980 substandard housing decreased from approximately 23% of the total housing stock to less than 10%. Much of this housing exists in the Central Valley region, while a larger proportion is in the Sleepy Creek region. This can be directly correlated to the proportion of seasonal and vacant housing units within these respective regions of the County.

Between 1980 and 2000 this number continued to decrease as a percentage of the overall housing stock. This was due in part to the continued decline in persons per household, conversion of seasonal housing, rehabilitation of vacant structures and an overall increase in number of houses. This is evident by the decline in total number of units constructed prior to 1939 from 1,229 to 1,111. More significant however, is the total number of units constructed from 1970 to 2000 making up more than 50% of the available year-round housing stock.

As of 2000 less than 10% of the remaining housing units were considered substandard, with much of those units listed as lacking an adequate heating system. However, as the number of units lacking adequate plumbing has decreased significantly, it should also be reflected that a majority of the units listed as lacking an adequate heating system actually use a natural wood heating method, thus indicating that most of the substandard housing units are either adequately provided with heat or that they lack both adequate plumbing and heating systems.

Table 2-11 Substandard Housing

Subject	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
Without Plumbing	N/A	291	N/A	66	N/A
Constructed Pre-1939	N/A	1,229	1,229	1,111	N/A
Overcrowded	81	93	78	119	N/A
Lacking Heating System	N/A	1,027	N/A	1,133	N/A

Source: US Census Reports

Housing Needs

General housing needs should provide for a balance of housing types and opportunities for individuals of all income levels and family size. This balance is important in both recognizing

the diversity of the community make up and the provision of sustaining and promoting a healthy housing stock for existing residents and those who would choose to move into the County. In establishing this balance, growth should be directed in a manner that makes efficient use of public services and infrastructure, and promotes the establishment of sustainable communities and neighborhoods through a mixture of housing types.

Much of the existing subsidized housing in Morgan County is located within the Towns of Bath and Paw Paw. However, the total units within this classification make up less than 1% of the total housing stock. These units are primarily within multi-family type housing, which serves mostly elderly and low-income families, and includes at times a waiting list of people seeking housing. To measure low-income status most Federal HUD Programs use a factor of 30-50% of median income. Using 50% of the median household income it appears that nearly 21% of families based on the 2000 Census would be considered low income. This factor is important to consider as it relates to new development and redevelopment efforts for multi-family residential structures given that at least 90% of all new housing units built since 1990 were single-family detached dwellings.

With housing prices continuing to increase, the County should also identify the housing needs of the moderate-income population to ensure that all areas of the County include opportunities for those who typically work in the County to be able to afford to live in the County. This may include implementation of local, State, and Federal programs where assistance of such programs is most appropriate. Although there is no standard measure of moderate income households Federal HUD programs typically use 80% of median household income for 2 person and 90% for 3 person. Given that average household size for Morgan County is roughly 2.5 persons per household, a measure of 85% of median household income is used in this chapter to determine the number of moderate-income families. Not including the low-income households above, it appears that 20% of the total households could be defined as moderate income in 2000. This is important given that between 2000 and 2005 average housing costs have increased by more than 50%.

As new development continues to concentrate on construction of primarily single-family detached dwellings, the County may consider using this opportunity to promote the rehabilitation efforts of its vacant multi family structures as well as development of infill lots, where services are most conducive to the population seeking this type of housing lifestyle. This approach would focus on the urban areas where much of the County's existing underutilized structures are located, and given the age and proximity of such structures to existing services may be eligible to utilize comprehensive plans and funding strategies to accomplish larger redevelopment efforts.

Although new housing development has increased significantly in cost and capacity, it appears the most important impact on the County is location. As much of the new housing is projected for the lower Central Valley region where existing services are limited, the County should take appropriate steps to ensure that development occurs in such a manner that services and resources will be adequate to address. The geographic distribution of housing as noted in the Land Use chapter appears to reflect the continued trend of much of the new growth occurring in the Central Valley region. As more than 70% of all new growth has been in this region over the past several decades, more than 90% of the new growth potential is projected to occur in this region.

The total demand for mobile home placement as well as seasonal housing may not be completely accurate given that applications for mobile homes include both new as well as transferred units, and seasonal housing starts are listed as such on occasion by an applicant seeking more favorable tax treatment from the process. However, market demand has and continues to remain steady for mobile, seasonal, and single family housing, while demand for new multi-family and attached style development has remained relatively low.

The demand for mobile home construction comes from both an issue of affordability as well as a greater general acceptance of the higher quality type mobile home structures being introduced into the market. Also, while many homebuyers continue to seek larger homes on several acre lots, larger builders are introducing a new trend toward larger developments located near existing services with homes on smaller lots.

The demand for seasonal housing has changed over time, with a growing trend toward middle age and older couples seeking long weekend use and eventual retirement locations. However, there continues to be little interest in joint ownership or conversion of seasonal homes to timeshare investments. Since 1980, the number of applications for seasonal homes has remained relatively constant at nearly 70% out-of-state, primarily from Maryland and Virginia. However, in that same time costs for seasonal homes have increased from \$50,000 to more than \$200,000. This is due in part to the fact that many seasonal homes are being constructed much larger than the one and two bedroom styles in the 1980s.

Among the barriers to future housing development are the prospect of rising interest rates, saturation of the surrounding market, lack of adequate public services, and constraints on natural resources. Each factor will have a varying effect on the types of housing currently in demand and projected for development. This includes interest rates and the economy affecting seasonal housing, saturation of the market influencing large single-family subdivisions, and limitations on public services and resources limiting densities.

Housing Affordability

As land and housing costs continue to escalate in Morgan County it is important to consider the overall affordability of housing that is available. To address the issue of affordability there are a number of strategies that should be considered to improve the availability of this housing stock.

One strategy would be to incorporate smart growth techniques into the development process that would encourage affordability, especially in designated growth areas. This would decrease the cost to provide services, allow for adequate densities, provide for mixed-use developments and ensure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.

A second measure could be the development of inclusionary housing tools to target affordable housing to below market and moderate income households. This approach may include a minimum percent of each development being offered as affordable housing that encourages smart growth techniques and provides housing opportunities for changes demographics.

Other methods include working with the development community to establish innovative housing styles and expanding relationships with lending institutions to diversify funding mechanisms for home ownership financing.

Goals and Objectives

Goals

The makeup of Morgan County's population will continue to be driven by regional factors, i.e. housing affordability relative to the surrounding area, population mobility and transportation costs, economic conditions (especially the proportion of disposable income as this relates to vacation homes), and the aging of the population. Goals related to population and housing include:

- Maintaining a growth rate that is in concert with the availability of services;
- Promoting the creation of diverse housing types, with a healthy balance between permanent and recreational dwellings, for all income levels, with special attention to affordable housing for the local workforce and the elderly;
- Encouraging improvement of aging and neglected housing stock; and
- Maximizing open space and protecting environmentally sensitive areas.

Objectives

The following objectives will further accomplishment of these goals:

- Increasing the proportion of housing stock served by public water and sewer systems;
- Providing incentives to focus new development around existing population centers and available public resources;
- Encouraging diverse housing alternatives such as assisted living and apartments;
- Identifying the needs of the seasonal housing population and assessing the impact of this group on public facilities in relation to its contribution to the tax base;
- Developing programs to assist with purchase and rehabilitation of neglected or deteriorating housing stock;
- Providing incentives for innovative development methods that will help achieve County goals; and
- Exploring the need for a housing committee to monitor and make recommendations on the availability of housing;