



NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Department of Public Administration

School of Public and Global Affairs

OREGON AND THE MILLENNIAL GENERATION:
A GUIDE TO ATTRACT, MAINTAIN AND GROW

Prepared by Jacob Hobson and Cheyanne Pincsak



for the City of Oregon, Illinois

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The City of Oregon—the “City”—faces a housing shortage and hopes to address it by attracting young millennial families to the area, particularly through development of attainable housing. This report explores the millennial generation’s housing preferences; how Oregon can attract both millennials, and the developers needed to build housing millennials seek; and how zoning and other project costs affect a development’s feasibility. Each inquiry is explored through academic literature, professional journals, and by data collected by qualitative interviews with housing developers, business leaders and community practitioners. Recommendations are based on a synthesis of the aforementioned resources tailored to Oregon’s long-term goals as outlined in its Comprehensive Plan.

ANALYSIS

Background

For this report, “millennial” is someone born between 1981 and 1996, now aged 28 to 43. Factors such as high student loan debt, a struggling economy, and high inflation, have left many millennials unable to afford a typical single-family dwelling. Along with economic issues, the millennials gravitate towards “urban,” walkable neighborhoods with a wide variety of amenities. Accordingly, both academic and professional literature suggests both mixed-use and “Missing Middle” housing types (a term used to describe a range of multi-family dwellings including apartments, duplexes, townhomes, and condominiums) are potential solutions to address the housing shortage among millennials.

Incorporating mixed-use and Missing Middle Housing (MMH) can be challenging for developers due to zoning regulations and costs associated with construction. To benefit from mixed-use, a municipal code should foster expansion of housing unit types while remaining clear on objective, measurable standards. Reducing developer costs can include expediting construction permits, lowering development fees, reducing duplicative municipal procedures, and ensuring a unit is consistent with the cultural demand and market behavior of the district its built within. Establishing MMH requires minimizing lot sizes, permitting more housing types, and allowing increased density. Furthermore, MMH types can be more affordable to developers if they are constructed in phases, and municipalities reduce off-street parking requirements and lower fees related to the subdivision process. Likewise, municipalities developing mixed-use and MMH types should engage the public when making decisions. There are many benefits of public engagement when developing housing. The most salient of which are enhanced trust, improved community-government relations, and reduced long term costs associated with poor development and even litigation.

Qualitative Interviews

To supplement the literature, researchers conducted qualitative interviews with housing and business professionals. Beginning with outreach, the team emailed housing developers, business professionals, and community development organizations, requesting participation in forty-five-minute-long interviews over Zoom or through telephone conference. Seven individuals across multiple professions responded. The team interviewed three housing developers, one home appraiser, one realtor, one businessperson, and one public official. Interview questions ranged from general housing and community development practices related to millennial preferences; followed by specific inquiries into how the logistics of construction, finance, marketing, and public participation affects housing project feasibility. These interviews confirmed much of what was found in relevant literature. A successful housing project hinges on many factors, including building costs, incentives, flexible zoning regulations, and return on investment (profit). While, millennials generally seek walkable neighborhoods, with amenities (such as parks, restaurants, and shops), and require attainable housing types such as apartments, condominiums, and townhomes.

CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION(S) FOR ACTION

If Oregon is to grow at the hands of millennials, it must consider its current zoning regulations, the area's current feasibility to developers, the draw of its current and future job and entertainment markets to prospective residents, and whether the plan it purports to endorse resonates well with both millennials and its own residents. Bearing that community and economic development tend to share an inextricable relationship, this report posits sixteen recommendations that target both, including (1) ensure good quality, "obtainable" housing up front through identifying a developer who is committed, not to cheap development, but to designing sturdy and stylish units with affordable materials, like vinyl and manmade wood; (2) bolster transparency by displaying, both to developers and the public, all unrestricted information involving developable land, including that related to the price of procurement, quality of infrastructure, permitted incentives, and the use to which the land will be put; (3) evaluate the feasibility of building multi-family housing units, such as apartments and condominiums, above commercial businesses located within the 1.5-mile planning zone; (4) create a clear design direction by implementing form-based zoning strategies into Oregon's Future Land Use Plan, bearing specific detail to permitted housing units and their encouragement; (5) reduce development costs through expediting the permit process, lowering development fees, executing construction in phases, and facilitating collaboration among city departments; (6) facilitate successful development of a mixed-used district by providing for a cornerstone use—a coffee shop, pub, or other eatery—consistent with the community's aesthetic; (7) introduce zoning policies consistent with MMH development in the residential growth areas located on Oregon's east and west sides; (8) coordinate code enforcement, homeowner's associations, and developers to authorize the use of materials and architectural styles conducive to attainable housing types; (9) review the Illinois Housing Development Authority's (IHDA) Quality of Allocation Plan, as suggested by DVR 2, to assess the feasibility of receiving Federal Low Income Tax Credits; (10) bolster the City's marketability by rejuvenating and emphasizing its current assets, including, but not limited to, its geographic location, proximity to the Rock River, and downtown district; (11) determine the ratio between the City's goal population and the number of available eatery seats—possibly with the aid of a consulting firm—to assess whether Oregon has a sufficient number of restaurants and bars to sustain the future population; (12) increase opportunities for passive recreation by assessing the feasibility of development along the Rock River, and contact, if necessary, the governing body responsible for the River's oversight; (13) arrange focus groups with millennials living in Chicago's far west suburbs to assess their opinion of Oregon and what the City might do to draw their interest; (14) develop a presentation and accompanying survey—possibly with the aid of a consulting firm—tailored to persons attending the focus groups; (15) provide a platform to concerned residents through regularly-held town hall meetings and the—possible—establishment of a residential committee for development logistics; and (16) implement, as development ensues, a set of performance-based planning criteria to measure consumer satisfaction and manage development processes.

Although non-exhaustive, the foregoing recommendations should lend the City a promising start to pursue its community and economic initiatives. As millennials continue to leave Chicago in search of suitable neighborhoods, however, and as Chicago's outer ring innovates to attract those millennials, the City must remain committed to the applied wisdom of housing and business professionals and the high priority to which scholarship places public participation, feasible cost reductions to developers, and the millennial story if it is to see long-term success.

Introduction

Faced with a housing shortage, the City of Oregon— “the City”— has expressed a need for additional development that it hopes will attract a specific group of consumers; namely, young, millennial families who might settle in the area for a foreseeable future. The City therefore seeks to “expand [its] variety of high quality, attractive and safe neighborhoods” and has even expressed a willingness to “[e]ncourage a mix of residential types,” including planned unit development and single- to multi-family dwellings, in order to help facilitate the purchase of a first-time home.¹ Given its limited stock of two- and multi-family units (discussed in Part I),² however, this report reiterates that the City must be calculative with respect to its planning so as not to dissuade its target demographic.

There is, for instance, little reason to think that the housing market favors the millennial generation (persons born between 1981 and 1996 now aged 28 to 43)³: A typical home as of 2019 was reported to cost more than four-times the country’s median income (approximately \$320,000+),⁴ a going college tuition has increased by a whopping 1,375 percent since the late 1970s,⁵ and the availability of “stable and predictable employment [that once] let [prior generations] plan, save, and make long-term housing decisions” has become virtually obsolete due to mass technological advancement.⁶ Notwithstanding the fact that 52 percent of the country’s 75+ million millennials “owned their own home as of 2022,”⁷ the preceding events have led to a sweeping consensus that millions of young adults will struggle to attain the same home buying experience once enjoyed by their parents and grandparents.⁸ Despite their high educational pedigree,⁹ economic potential,¹⁰ and shared desire to buy a first home,¹¹ nearly twenty percent of millennials, or 15+ million, have been forced to room at their parents’ house,¹²

leading many in this so-called “roommate generation”¹³ to feel withdrawn—even resentful—toward the idea of procuring a home.¹⁴

In light of the student debt,¹⁵ employment insecurity,¹⁶ and scarce wealth-building opportunities,¹⁷ millennials have a good reputation for consuming what housing experts call “Missing Middle Housing,” or MMH.¹⁸ Although a “contemporary term,” MMH encompasses common, twentieth century housing types “that range[] between multi-story units and single-family unit layout,”¹⁹ including (for Oregon’s purposes), courtyard apartments, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhomes, and condominiums.²⁰ MMH is, more importantly, flexible in that it “allows for single family lots to be split or merged to support” the preceding housing types all the while serving “to meet varying budgets, life stages, family structures, and housing needs.”²¹ Accordingly, communities looking to reap the fruits of millennial consumption often look to MMH as a mean to offer obtainable housing.²²

Incorporation of MMH is not a one-size-fits-all effort, however, since successful implementation often depends on existing zoning regulations,²³ a developer’s assessment of a project’s feasibility,²⁴ the presence and diversity of the municipality’s job and entertainment markets,²⁵ and the receptivity of both current and prospective residents.²⁶ Henceforth, this report offers analyses of generational preferences, best development practices, and effective community engagement tools for purposes of priming the City for long-term, successful growth.

Accordingly, Part I starts with a contextual assessment of the City’s key features, including its location, housing stock, and available amenities. Part II then provides a literature review tailored specifically to factors that will drive the City’s success. Building from Part II, Part III sets forth the methodology with which the research team (1) identified a pertinent age group to whom the City may market, and (2) collected professional knowledge. Part IV discusses

the results, bearing specific weight to findings in relevant literature. Using Part II through IV, Part V posits tailored recommendations for future implementation, while concluding remarks offer a reflection of the report's results and their significance to rural development research.

Part I: Contextual Assessment

The City's housing objective, while of central focus, exists alongside several economic goals that cannot go unnoted, particularly because community development shares an inextricable relationship with economic development.²⁷ To improve one necessarily entails improvement to the other;²⁸ thus, as community development produces "assets for improving the quality of life and business climate," the mobilization of those assets to realize the community's benefits (or economic development), should closely parallel.²⁹ Oregon's goals to "encourage residents and visitors to shop locally,"³⁰ to "strengthen the downtown business district,"³¹ and to "attract new businesses"³² may thus see results as the City pursues its housing objective.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency notes that "[v]irtually every community began and grew because its location supported economic activity."³³ Although located in one of Illinois's non-metropolitan counties,³⁴ the City looks to be in a promising location when viewed through the lens of the Agency's statement: It sits within a thirty-mile proximity to Rochelle, Rockford, and Freeport;³⁵ it facilitates quick access, and promotes in- and out-going travel, with respect to multiple state highways and national interstates, such as Illinois Routes 2 and 64 and U.S. I-39 and I-88;³⁶ and for that reason, it promotes effective transportation to regionally distant hubs like Chicago and the Quad Cities.³⁷ The City's placement within the context of northern Illinois's regional economy thus looks to be in a favorable location for purposes of supporting economic activity and offering housing options to prospective consumers. Hence, as millennials continue to leave high-priced cities for more

affordable towns,³⁸ the City may be well positioned to market its location provided it can tailor its development to the millennial taste.³⁹

Millennials “are willing to pay a premium to live in a walkable community;”⁴⁰ hence, Oregon’s objective to incorporate mixed-use housing options for first time home buyers of varying incomes⁴¹ offers a promising start inasmuch as it illustrates (1) that the City recognizes the need for diverse housing options, and (2) that the City is willing to compete alongside other hungry localities. The City’s current zoning scheme, when taken in tandem with projections from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2022 American Community Survey, reflects, however, that Oregon enjoys its image as a predominantly single-family-home community: A majority of the City’s territory is designated to single-family residential use,⁴² for instance, while the Census Bureau reports that single-unit structures represent 73.6 percent—or approximately three-fourths—of the City’s 1,749 homes.⁴³

Similar inferences may be drawn from Oregon’s Comprehensive Plan, particularly in terms of its discussion of the City’s 1.5-mile planning area: While 90.3 percent of the area is designated to matters such as agriculture, open space (conservational and recreational), and other business-like affairs (commercial, industrial, and institutional), the remaining housing designation—9.7 percent—is primarily to be used for single-family homes.⁴⁴ Taken together, for instance, two- and multi-family homes constitute only 0.4 percent of the area’s intended land use, while single-family constitutes 9.3 percent.⁴⁵ These statistics are telling in that, like many other U.S. communities,⁴⁶ Oregon has a propensity to appeal to the single-family market. Absent calculated planning efforts, therefore, it seems likely that Oregon’s MMH supply will remain comparatively low to less affordable housing options and that the City will face difficulties with respect to attracting millennials.

To its strengths, the City offers a unique opportunity to live in, and explore, a safe, charming “small-town” alongside Illinois’s Rock River⁴⁷ (all the while staying within easy reach of commercialized hubs); however, there is no getting around a salient fact that purports to hold weight among developers: Millennials want to live within walking distance from amenities.⁴⁸ Although Oregon already holds a few advantages—namely, that it is home to a range of biking paths, three state parks (within a fifteen-mile radius), and a beautiful river front that sits near the downtown’s business and restaurant district⁴⁹—the City admittedly needs “a greater variety of businesses, shopping, and restaurants.”⁵⁰ The City’s current zoning and planning area maps likewise reveal that much of the housing is likely not within walkable distance to commercial goods, restaurants, or entertainment centers.⁵¹ Oregon’s current selection of amenities, like its housing stock, may therefore not resonate with millennials unless further action is taken; the City’s current advantages, however, when coupled with the fact that its residents and community leaders appear to share an interest in sustainable growth,⁵² indicate that there are strong catalysts for change over time.

Part II: Literature Review

The following literature review examines three bodies of scholarship that prove pertinent to development processes. Section One analyzes the distinct nature of millennial housing preferences through the lens of generational challenges, strengths, and common socioeconomic habits; it assesses, most importantly, the types of housing in which millennials want to live and how the surrounding environment should play to their preferences. Section Two then examines best practices tailored to achieving affordable development for millennials; it explains, from both a municipal and development perspective, how a city may go about the process so as to (1) prime

an area for successful development, and (2) mitigate the costs of construction. Lastly, Section Three explores, from a municipal perspective, the benefits of public participation.

Section One: Is the Millennial Taste Really Different?

Millennials, formally known as Generation Y,⁵³ have overwhelmingly captured the attention of researchers over the past twenty years; the question of whether millennials differ from prior generations in terms of housing preferences, for example, has—in itself—continued to be a highly discussed topic among business,⁵⁴ finance,⁵⁵ housing,⁵⁶ planning,⁵⁷ and even legal⁵⁸ professionals. Answers to the housing question tend to share similar themes, although the conversation surrounding millennials is perplexing in that it emphasizes outright how they are different: Contrary to the Baby Boomers, there is no commonly accepted timeframe at which the generation begins and ends.⁵⁹ Accounts vary among a multitude of ranges, including 1980-1999,⁶⁰ 1980-2000,⁶¹ 1981-1996,⁶² 1981-1997,⁶³ 1982-to as late as 2001,⁶⁴ and even as long as 1980 to the mid-2000s;⁶⁵ hence, it is not surprising that generational cutoffs are used as tools with which to measure trends among age groups with similar experiences and attitudes.⁶⁶

Notwithstanding the cutoff debate, experts tend to agree that millennial preferences differ from those of prior generations at similar ages due to their shared struggles⁶⁷: Although the most educated generation,⁶⁸ millennials tend to have low spending power,⁶⁹ low homeownership rates,⁷⁰ and less children.⁷¹ With lower wages and less access to full-time, high-pay jobs, many millennials are underemployed or working part time;⁷² hence, saving money continues to be a challenge.⁷³ Given the unattainable housing, furthermore, millennials are known to rent, whether by choice or necessity,⁷⁴ while those who are lucky enough to buy a home can expect to rent for up to six years before they buy—proving to be starkly different from the 2.6 years someone in the 1970s would have waited.⁷⁵

Millennials have proved to be able to effectively navigate their circumstances, however: They are more optimistic and civic minded than previous generations,⁷⁶ and despite the barriers to homeownership, they still want to own homes,⁷⁷ make families, and raise children.⁷⁸ Hence it is of no surprise that millennials will eventually seek communities with good school districts and opportunities for shorter commutes.⁷⁹ The choice to engage millennials as future homeowners may therefore yield substantial economic benefits; however, the literature makes clear that there is no overlooking the fact that doing so requires an understanding of their housing and environmental preferences.

As Myers, LeBlanc, and Gensler suggest, convenience⁸⁰ and affordability⁸¹ rank high among millennials considerations when selecting a place to live—followed closely by proximity to employment and access to goods and services.⁸² Likewise, millennials have expressed a desire for denser, walkable environments (as opposed to sprawled single-family neighborhoods),⁸³ in tandem with diverse amenities⁸⁴—restaurants, retail shops, and public transportation.⁸⁵ Millennials also prefer, however, a strong presence of “smaller, older, and lower priced homes”⁸⁶ alongside said amenities, making MMH—apartments, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhomes, and condominiums⁸⁷—a popular housing candidate among graduates and young professionals in particular.⁸⁸

Fortunately, MMH tends to resonate well with high-density environments—especially when zoned mixed-use—since it “combines retail, office, and residential use and . . . provides[, in turn,] a good range of housing choices that increase affordability and equity” all the while reducing vehicular dependency.⁸⁹ Simultaneous integration of mixed-use zoning and MMH into one’s community is, accordingly, a land use mechanism consistently thought to yield fruitful

results, particularly as millennials continue to grow their spending power, create families, and (presumably) look to acquire larger homes in the same area.⁹⁰

Section Two: Land Use, Convenience, and Affordable Development

Although an essential tool for growth,⁹¹ incorporating mixed-used and MMH into one's community can be a challenge, particularly in terms of zoning⁹² and building costs.⁹³ Zoning, on the one hand, requires a myriad of legal decisions, and the regulatory scheme must allow for successful integration within the existing community.⁹⁴ From a cost perspective, on the other hand, a municipality must consider all expenses to developers, including those for land, development (review and permitting), construction (equipment and labor), parking, and parkland dedication.⁹⁵

Looking first to mixed-use, a municipality should always provide permitted, conditional, and accessory uses into one's code,⁹⁶ and ideally, include an innovative "purpose" to explain how its goal is serviced by a zoning district⁹⁷—stating, for example, how walkability in a mixed-use district contributes to community welfare. Likewise, Daniel Mandelker sets forth additional suggestions as to how municipalities can tackle two key issues; namely "how much control to exercise over mixed-use development," and "how much discretion to build into the zoning system."⁹⁸ Mandelker accordingly suggests that municipalities (1) include objective and measurable design guidelines that describe a building's height, floor, density, and intensity;⁹⁹ (2) consider form-based zoning (a popular strategy prioritizing walkability and community-centeredness),¹⁰⁰ as a mean to regulate the "character" of a district—rather than only dictating land use types;¹⁰¹ (3) expand, rather than restrict, unit types allowed per zone as to ensure developers have adequate discretion;¹⁰² and lastly, (4) address early pushback by, say, holding pre-application conferences between developers and concerned residents.¹⁰³

As to reducing mixed-use costs, general consensus suggests that municipalities should expedite permits and lower development fees,¹⁰⁴ although others suggest going further by providing clearly-defined design guidelines¹⁰⁵ and consolidating municipal departments—code enforcers, engineers, and zoning staff—to save time.¹⁰⁶ To optimize development plans, furthermore, the literature also suggests that a municipality assess demand according to its cultural behavior¹⁰⁷ synergize new and existing units,¹⁰⁸ and build around a “cornerstone” or “dominant” use, such as a popular coffee shop, since it often proves to be a vital aspect to mixed-use development.¹⁰⁹

Turning to MMH, municipalities should first be aware of a two-sided debate: first, that policies should abandon single-family housing for that which supports obtainable housing (like MMH),¹¹⁰ and second, that MMH is ineffective because it suffers from lack of interest, financing, and zoning barriers.¹¹¹ Second, municipalities should be aware of the resulting policy responses, such as (1) creating cost effective, sustainable uses for single family parcels,¹¹² (2) replacing “minimum lot sizes with minimum lot widths and t[ying] types of buildings to the lot’s width, not its square footage,”¹¹³ (3) permitting more housing types,¹¹⁴ (4) allowing for increased density, even in smaller structures,¹¹⁵ (5) reducing—or eliminating—parking minimums,¹¹⁶ and (6) framing the idea of developing MMH as options for housing, while avoiding words with negative connotations —e.g., “density, multifamily, or upzoning.”¹¹⁷

Equally important is the fact that MMH affordability hinges on a municipality’s ability to mitigate development costs,¹¹⁸ particularly since costs eventually are pushed to consumers as costs rise.¹¹⁹ There are, fortunately, a number of preventative actions that municipalities may take. Some suggest amplifying the quick return on investment that MMH can feasibly produce,¹²⁰ perhaps by going about its construction in phases and allotting the netted capital from

earlier phases (say, Phase 1) to costs associated with future developments (Phase 2).¹²¹ Likewise, others note that higher density of MMH reduces the price of land per unit¹²² and suggest increasing density, while reducing off-street parking requirements.¹²³ Lastly, others suggest that municipalities can limit contradictory rules pertaining to lot subdivision,¹²⁴ reduce complications with infrastructure and utilities, and roll back regulations originally enacted for single family development.¹²⁵

Section Three: The Need for Public Participation

Whether a municipality is able to work past the zoning and cost hurdles is, unmistakably, important; however, there is one group that can render even the most successful-looking mixed-use MMH projects a complete loss: the public,¹²⁶ including both a municipality's own residents and the consumer base it seeks to attract. Community engagement and participation—broadly defined as the “process through which community members are empowered to own the change they want to see”¹²⁷—thus remains a critical step in the development game if a municipality is to succeed. Accordingly, one should not be surprised that the literature supports the premise that the public ought to have a high place amid Arnstein's participatory ladder¹²⁸ and that giving the public that place proves beneficial.

Salient among these benefits are the public's enhanced trust in government,¹²⁹ improved community-government relations,¹³⁰ and reduced long-term costs.¹³¹

Indeed, when public managers include residents in decision-making, people not only support difficult policy decisions, but tend to display more trust in the policymaking process;¹³² hence, “nontrivial” public inclusion through which municipalities choose to engage with residents and key stakeholders tends to yield the most success.¹³³ Substantive engagement,

particularly involving development plans, is therefore thought to bolster public acceptance—and reinforce the government’s legitimacy—with respect to project decisions and deliverables.¹³⁴

Public participation whereby policymakers learn from the community often builds rapport, and hence, a good relationship between residents and the government;¹³⁵ however, there is no overlooking the fact that municipalities need to engage key stakeholders if they are to understand the issues facing their communities.¹³⁶ In doing so, municipalities can better understand “racial, ethnic, generational, gender, and socio-economic divides” all the while gaining opportunities to (1) achieve the best development designs for consumers and existing residents,¹³⁷ and (2) provide tailored, often equitable, service delivery to the betterment of public-government relations.¹³⁸ Having been shown that their municipality actually weighs their preferences and ideas, moreover, the residents are more likely to cooperate with the government as it goes about new policies and projects.¹³⁹

Furthermore, a municipality can use public participation to reduce the risk of long-term costs related to poor planning—and even litigation¹⁴⁰—since it allows for residents to meaningfully voice their concerns and state their interests prior to any controversial action.¹⁴¹ Many recognize, for example, that a municipality’s failure to seek public input on a development project can potentially land the parties in court,¹⁴² and hence, that the use of participation processes involving management, developers, residents, and other stakeholders is always good practice to address conflicts and post solutions.¹⁴³

Part III: Methodology

To assess how Oregon can draw its target demographic—young millennial families—the research team first identified an age range to whom the City can tailor its marketing efforts. Consistent with the view that generational cutoffs are tools with which to measure trends among

like-experienced age groups,¹⁴⁴ the team adopted the operative timeframe selected by the Pew Research Center (1981-1996), particularly because persons amid this group, now aged 28 to 43,¹⁴⁵ are all likely to have been shaped by the same swath of events: the 9/11 attacks, the Iraq War, the Great Recession of '08, and mass racial diversification.¹⁴⁶

Having established a working definition of “millennials,” the research team developed a survey with which to conduct qualitative interviews of housing and business professionals. As illustrated by Table A below, the survey consists of twenty-five questions that cover five broad topics; namely, (1) the logistics of housing and economic development, such as project feasibility and what a municipality generally needs, or can do, to attract millennials; (2) the construction process—in particular, common challenges, material selection, and factors that affect a home’s affordability; (3) construction finance, including factors that affect it and how developers go about covering a project’s cost in a given environment; (4) marketing in preparation for economic development—specifically, whether and to what extent a municipality should; and (5) community engagement and participation—particularly, its value among housing and business personnel and how a municipality might initiate it from a development perspective. Moreover, each question was developed with the use of key insights found in relevant literature.

Bearing that community and economic development share an inextricable relationship,¹⁴⁷ the research team thought it necessary to interview professionals accustomed to each area. Accordingly, the team held forty-five-minute interviews with seven anonymous individuals: three housing developers (labeled in Table A as DVs 1, 2, and 3), one home appraiser (APR), one realtor (RTR), one businessperson with extensive experience in the domestic and international building materials market (BUS), and one public official—an Executive Director of Business and Economic Development (E-DVT).

Each individual was asked the same questions; however, responses varied according to expertise; those whose experiences are exclusively tied to the housing market spoke to housing and related issues, while those whose experiences fall exclusively in public economic development spoke to marketing issues—with some spill over. Table A illustrates, furthermore, each of the twenty-five questions alongside the speaking interviewees; the first question, “how do developers spot opportunities to develop?” was answered by the businessperson (BUS) as well as all three developers (DVRs 1-3), for example. A key containing this information is located under Table A.

Part IV: Discussion of Results

Despite differences in experience, all interviewees provided similar perspectives with respect to their professions and expertise; in fact, the synthesized results, depicted in Table B below, illustrate that the interviewees share common insights not only amongst each other, but with the literature as a whole.

Developers agree, for example, that the feasibility of housing development revolves around construction costs¹⁴⁸ and a municipality’s willingness to simplify procedures;¹⁴⁹ hence, each stated that they focus their decision making on (1) how much they can receive in municipal incentives,¹⁵⁰ and (2) the extent of costs they may incur in terms of construction and land procurement.¹⁵¹ Likewise, the developers and other interviewees agreed that millennials tend to prefer apartments, condominiums, and townhomes (either to buy or rent)¹⁵² and that the price of single-family homes should start low—\$200,000—for young families looking to migrate from MMH. When building for a younger consumer base, therefore, the developers unanimously look for the presence of flexible zoning regulations conducive to the subdivision of single-family lots.¹⁵³

Notwithstanding the construction of obtainable MMH, however, the housing professionals stressed that it is bad practice to push the costs of development unto consumers through using high-priced building materials.¹⁵⁴ DVR 1, the APR, and the RTR agreed, for instance, that a home's "obtainability" hinges on reasonably-priced materials but that it can often be difficult to hit the perfect mark between cheap, often badly-made materials and materials that may render the housing cost too expensive; the same respondents agreed, however, that vinyl siding, aluminum gutters, manmade hardwood, and a touch of brick on the home's frontage can keep the price within a reasonable range all the while providing millennial consumers with popular aesthetics. Equally so, the cost of land on which the development sits must not be too expensive; DVR 2 hence stated that municipalities can place purchase options on property, while DVR 1 suggested that Oregon's officials can market the land prices to offset delivery costs of construction materials.

Each developer's sentiment speaks to the literary finding that municipal policy can have a large impact on project feasibility.¹⁵⁵ DVT 3 indicated, for example, that private investment is often necessary for new housing development, that most builders are consequently paid in arrears, and hence, that any incentives a municipality can provide will improve a developer's return on investment. Likewise, DVR 2 noted that, because HUD-sponsored programs come with many hurdles, developers tend to appreciate less complicated alternatives, including tax incentives or credits, opportunity funds, or TIF districts in which to build. Any "pre-work" that the City can complete, in conjunction with any incentives it can offer, will accordingly make Oregon more attractive to developers.

Aside from flexible zoning, development incentives, and affordable MMH, a municipality must be able to offer a good quality of life in terms of convenience and access to

employment (E-DVT). Consistent with this finding are two overarching suggestions; namely, that municipalities (1) identify a “cornerstone” around which to revolve mixed-use development¹⁵⁶ and (2) procure businesses—say, tech offices—that attract and retain educated youths (or as BUS calls it, “an anchor”). There are, according to E-DVT, numerous tools with which municipalities can achieve both, chief among them being to use one’s existing assets—its location, amenities, local investors, or passionate officials who might want to market the image.

No matter a municipality’s marketing approach, there is no ignoring the unified consensus on the importance of public participation;¹⁵⁷ both business and housing professionals stated it should be valued to a high extent, and E-DVT specifically warned that negative public perception can break a development project. Upon further elaboration, E-DVT and DVR-2 spoke to the importance of allowing the public to voice concerns; they agreed that long-standing residents may be opposed to the unfamiliar and that allowing them to provide feedback garners constructive communication and acceptance.¹⁵⁸ If nothing else, these results reveal that Oregon will need to consider perception, especially since some of its 3,604¹⁵⁹ residents may enjoy the “non-metropolitan”¹⁶⁰ feel that the community offers and thereby oppose dense mixed-use MMH development.

According to the APR and RTR, the same holds true for prospective consumers; both agreed, for example, that the best way to envision development is to learn the preferences of the targeted base. The APR thereafter observed that far west suburbs—Geneva, St. Charles, Crystal lake—were once considered “far out” from Chicago before development ensued and further suggested that Oregon could spark a similar migration pattern if it learns—and provides for—the desires of those suburbs’ millennials who likely cannot afford to buy where their parents settled.

Part V: Implementation

Both the literature and interview responses reaffirm an earlier-stated premise: If the City wants to experience community and economic growth at the hands of millennials, it must ensure (1) that its existing zoning regulations can facilitate an environment conducive to both mixed-use and MMH,¹⁶¹ (2) that developers see the area as a feasible opportunity with a high return on investment,¹⁶² (3) that its future job and entertainment markets have sufficient draw to sustain incoming residents,¹⁶³ and (4) that the plan it purports to endorse resonates well, not only to millennials, but to its own residents.¹⁶⁴ Bearing these necessities, this report posits sixteen recommendations that may prime the City for long-term, as opposed to rapid, growth; specifically, this report recommends that the City

1. ensure good quality, “obtainable” housing up front through identifying a developer who is committed, not to cheap development, but to designing sturdy and stylish units with affordable materials, like vinyl and manmade wood;
2. bolster transparency by displaying, both to developers and the public, all unrestricted information involving developable land, including that related to the price of procurement, quality of infrastructure, permitted incentives, and the use to which the land will be put;
3. evaluate the feasibility of building multi-family housing units, such as apartments and condominiums, above commercial businesses located within the 1.5-mile planning zone;
4. create a clear design direction by implementing form-based zoning strategies into Oregon’s Future Land Use Plan, bearing specific detail to permitted housing units and their encouragement;

5. reduce development costs through expediting the permit process, lowering development fees, executing construction in phases, and facilitating collaboration among city departments;
6. facilitate successful development of a mixed-used district by providing for a cornerstone use—a coffee shop, pub, or other eatery—consistent with the community’s aesthetic;
7. introduce zoning policies consistent with MMH development in the residential growth areas located on Oregon’s east and west sides;
8. coordinate code enforcement, homeowner’s associations, and developers to authorize the use of materials and architectural styles conducive to attainable housing types;
9. review the Illinois Housing Development Authority’s (IHDA) Quality of Allocation Plan,¹⁶⁵ as suggested by DVR 2, to assess the feasibility of receiving Federal Low Income Tax Credits;
10. bolster the City’s marketability by rejuvenating and emphasizing its current assets, including, but not limited to, its geographic location, proximity to the Rock River, and downtown district;
11. determine the ratio between the City’s goal population and the number of available eatery seats—possibly with the aid of a consulting firm—to assess whether Oregon has a sufficient number of restaurants and bars to sustain the future population;
12. increase opportunities for passive recreation by assessing the feasibility of development along the Rock River, and contact, if necessary, the governing body responsible for the River’s oversight;
13. arrange focus groups with millennials living in Chicago’s far west suburbs to assess their opinion of Oregon and what the City might do to draw their interest;

14. develop a presentation and accompanying survey—possibly with the aid of a consulting firm—tailored to persons attending the focus groups;
15. provide a platform to concerned residents through regularly-held town hall meetings and the—possible—establishment of a residential committee for development logistics; and
16. implement, as development ensues, a set of performance-based planning criteria¹⁶⁶ to measure consumer satisfaction and manage development processes.

Conclusion

The City’s overall intention to attract young millennial families as a mean to grow its community and economic vitality warrants much excitement; millennials are projected to be a lucrative consumer base, after all, even in spite of their struggle to afford housing.¹⁶⁷ As millennials head toward Chicago’s suburbs,¹⁶⁸ and as those suburbs exploit their “opportunities to create energetic town centers and mixed-use developments, and to provide a greater variety of housing stock,”¹⁶⁹ the City will have to remain diligent with respect to many factors if it is to keep a competitive edge. This report therefore urges that the City consider not only the applied wisdom of housing and business professionals, but the high priority to which scholarship places public participation, feasible cost reductions to developers, and the millennial story.

The recommendations, while not exhaustive, may thus lend a fruitful start to the City’s goal, particularly because they provide what this report intends to give: a bridge between theory and practice.

Bibliography

- Abu-Khalaf, Ahmad. *White Paper: Barriers and Opportunities to Creating Low-Density Multifamily Housing*. Enterprise Community Partners, Inc., 2022.
<https://www.enterprisecommunity.org/sites/default/files/2022-01/2021-038-white-paper-ldmf-r5.pdf>.
- American Bar Association. "Zoning for Mixed-Use Development." *Probate and Property* (2024): 60-61.
- Arnstein, Sherry R. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 35, no. 4 (1969): 216-24.
- Bergstrom, Danielle, Kalima Rose, Jillian Olinger, and Kip Holley. "The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities." *Journal of Affordable Housing & Community Development Law* 22, no. 2 (2014): 191-211.
- Campbell, Jesse W. "Public Participation and Trust in Government: Results from a Vignette Experiment." *Journal of Policy Studies* 38, no. 2 (2023).
<https://jps.scholasticahq.com/article/77970-public-participation-and-trust-in-government-results-from-a-vignette-experiment>.
- City of Oregon. *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*. Oregon, IL, 2024. 1-46.
<https://cityoforegon.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Oregon-Comprehensive-Plan-DRAFT-v05-Public-Hearing.pdf> (accessed March 11, 2024).
- City of Oregon. *City of Oregon Zoning*. Oregon, IL, 2024. 1-2. <https://cityoforegon.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Zoning-Maps.pdf> (accessed March 28, 2024).
- Choi, Jung, Jun Zhu, Laurie Goodman, Bhargavi Ganesh, and Sarah Stochak. *Millennial Homeownership: Why is it so Low, and How Can we Increase It?*. Urban Institute, 2018.
https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/98729/2019_01_11_millennial_homeownership_finalizedv2_0.pdf.
- Davidovich, Yana, Cecilia Herrick Reynolds, Ning Kang, and KT Thomas. *Millennials and Housing: Homeownership Demographic Research*. Freddie Mac Single Family Marketing Analytics, Market Research and Insights Department, 2021.
https://sf.freddiemac.com/docs/pdf/fact-sheet/millennial-playbook_millennials-and-housing.pdf.
- DeVaney, Sharon A. "Understanding the Millennial Generation." *Journal of Financial Service Professionals* 69, no. 6 (2015): 11-14.
- Dickerson, A. Mechele. "Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership." *Journal of Affordable Housing & Community Development Law* 24, no. 3 (2016): 435-65.
- Dimock, Michael. "Defining Generations: Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins." *Pew Research Center*, January 17, 2019. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>.
- Dodgson, Lindsay. "Millennials Have Been Priced Out of Buying Homes, and are Venting that They Can't Afford Rent Either." *Business Insider*, February 22, 2024.
<https://www.businessinsider.com/millennials-priced-out-of-homes-now-they-cant-afford-rent-2024-2>.
- "Economic Development." The City of Oregon, Illinois. <https://cityoforegon.org/economic-development/>.

- Elgin, Alexander, Amy Buitenhuis, David MacMillan, Jasmine Frolick, Jed Kilbourn, Jeffrey Lee, Michael Otchie, Olwen Bennett, and Stephanie Maignan. *Missing Middle Housing: Development Costs and Affordability*. Urban Land Institute Center Urban Leaders Program, 2020.
https://ulidigitalmarketing.blob.core.windows.net/ulidcnc/sites/14/2020/09/2020-09-16_ULI-Financial-Team-Report.pdf.
- Garcia, David, Muhammad Alameldin, Ben Metcalf, and William Fulton. *Unlocking the Potential of Missing Middle Housing*. Berkeley, CA: Turner Center for Housing Innovation, 2022. <https://turnercenter.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Missing-Middle-Brief-December-2022.pdf>.
- Glaeser, Edward, and Joseph Gyourko. “The Economic Implications of Housing Supply.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 32, no. 1 (2018): 3-30.
- Hendon, Joshua D. “Mixed-Use Development in Theory and Practice: Learning from Atlanta’s Mixed Experiences.” Master’s thesis., Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, 2011. Georgia Tech Library. <https://repository.gatech.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/105cfd0d-10f7-43ec-826b-a204b43992f2/content>.
- Houle, Jason N., and Cody Warner. “Into the Red and Back to the Nest? Student Debt, College Completion, and Returning to the Parental Home Among Young Adults.” *Sociology of Education* 90, no. 1 (2017): 89-108.
- Illinois Housing Development Authority. *2024-2025 Low Income Housing Tax Credit Qualified Allocation Plan*. 2023. 1-65. https://www.ihda.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/FINAL-QAP_2024-2025-for-website.pdf (accessed April 8, 2024).
- Illinois Institute for Rural Affairs. *Promoting Comprehensive Community and Economic Development Strategies for Rural Illinois: Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly*. Macomb, IL: Western Illinois University, 2018.
<https://www2.illinois.gov/lrg/Documents/GRAC-Annual-Report-2018-FINAL.pdf>.
- Irvin, Renée A., and John Stansbury. “Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is it Worth the Effort?” *Public Administration Review* 64, no. 1 (2004): 55-65.
- Kashef, Mohamad. “Residential Developments in Small-Town America: Assessment and Regulations.” *City, Territory and Architecture* 4, no. 14 (2017): 1-18.
- Kaul, Karan, Laurie Goodman, and Michael Neal. *The Role of Single-Family Housing Production and Preservation in Addressing the Affordable Housing Supply Shortage*. Urban Institute Housing Finance Policy Center, 2021.
<https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/105265/the-role-of-single-family-housing-production-and-preservation-in-addressing-the-affordable-housing-supply-shortage.pdf>.
- Knaap, Gerrit, Stuart Meck, Terry Moore, and Robert Parker. *Zoning as a Barrier to Multifamily Housing Development*. Report Number 548. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association, 2007. https://www.huduser.gov/publications/pdf/zoning_multifmlydev.pdf.
- Kotkin, Joel, Wendell Cox, Mark Schill, and Ali Modarres. *Building Cities for People*. Edited by Zina Clapper. Orange, CA: Chapman University Press, 2015.
<https://www.newgeography.com/files/Cities-for-People-web.pdf>.
- Lachman, M. Leanne, and Deborah L. Brett. *Gen Y and Housing: What They Want and Where They Want It*. Washington, DC: Urban Land Institute, 2015. <https://uli.org/wp-content/uploads/ULI-Documents/Gen-Y-and-Housing.pdf>.

- Lanzetta, Karen. *The New Playbook: Attracting and Servicing Gen Y & Z*. Envestnet, Inc., 2019. https://www.envestnet.com/files/announcements/New_Playbook_GenYZ.pdf.
- LeBlanc, Wes, and Alice Davis Gensler. "Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago's Suburbs." *Illinois Municipal Policy Journal* 3, no. 1 (2018): 1-16.
- Mandelker, Daniel R. "Zoning for Mixed-Use Development." *Real Property, Trust and Estate Law Journal* 58, no. 1 (2023): 3-45.
- Metzinger, Jamie R. "Considerations for Mix-Use Development." Paper presented at the 53rd ASC Annual International Conference Proceedings, 2017. <http://ascpro0.ascweb.org/archives/cd/2017/paper/CPGT189002017.pdf>.
- Myers, Dowell. "Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials." *Housing Policy Debate* 26, no. 6 (April 2016): 1-20.
- National Association of Realtors Research Group. *2023 Home Buyers and Sellers Generational Trends Report*. National Association of Realtors, 2023. <https://www.nar.realtor/sites/default/files/documents/2023-home-buyers-and-sellers-generational-trends-report-03-28-2023.pdf>.
- Ojah Maharaj, Shrimatee. "Factors Affecting the Supply of 'Missing Middle' Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods." *Muma Business Review* 4, no. 1 (June 2020): 1-15.
- "Oregon City, Illinois, Housing." United States Census Bureau. <https://data.census.gov/all?q=Oregon%20city,%20Illinois%20housing>.
- "Oregon City, Illinois, Population." United States Census Bureau. <https://data.census.gov/all?q=Oregon%20city,%20Illinois,%20population>.
- Paulsen, Kurt. "The Goldilocks Dilemma of Moderate-Income Housing Subsidies: Finding the 'Just Right' Amount for the Missing Middle." *Cityscape* 19, no. 1 (2017): 245-52.
- Pittman, Robert, Evan Pittman, Rhonda Phillips, and Joe Cangelosi. "The Community and Economic Development Chain: Validating the Links Between Processes and Outcomes." *Community Development* 40, no. 1 (2009): 80-93.
- Rabianski, Joseph S., and J. Sherwood Clements. *Mixed-Use Development: A Review of Professional Literature*. Herndon, VA: National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, 2007. [https://www.cdfa.net/cdfa/cdfaweb.nsf/ord/e85f455bb30951708825793600673c68/\\$file/mixed-use.pdf](https://www.cdfa.net/cdfa/cdfaweb.nsf/ord/e85f455bb30951708825793600673c68/$file/mixed-use.pdf).
- Schmidhuber, Lisa, Frank Piller, Marcel Bogers, and Dennis Hilgers. "Citizen Participation in Public Administration: Investigating Open Government for Social Innovation." *R&D Management* 49, no. 3 (June 2019): 343-55.
- Shaver, Katherine. "Cities turn to 'Missing Middle' Housing to Keep Older Millennials from Leaving." *The Washington Post*, December 9, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/trafficandcommuting/cities-turn-to-missing-middle-housing-to-keep-older-millennials-from-leaving/2017/12/09/3a129bc8-d54a-11e7-95bf-df7c19270879_story.html.
- Smith, Travis J., and Tommy Nichols. "Understanding the Millennial Generation." *Journal of Business Diversity* 15, no. 1 (January 2015): 39-47.
- "The Relationship Between Community and Economic Development." *EConsultant Solutions, Inc.* (blog), March 12, 2021. <https://econsultsolutions.com/relationship-between-community-and-economic-development/>.

- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). *How Small Towns and Cities Can Use Local Assets to Rebuild Their Economies: Lessons from Successful Places*, by Nora Johnson, Adhir Kackar, and Melissa Kramer. EPA Document 231-R- 15-002. Washington, DC, 2015. 1-38. https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-05/documents/competitive_advantage_051215_508_final.pdf (accessed March 12, 2024).
- Vasa, Jake. “Why Missing Middle Housing is an Emerging Trend in Multi-Family Development.” *Short Elliott Hendrickson, Inc.*, 2024. <https://www.sehinc.com/news/why-missing-middle-housing-emerging-trend-multi-family-development>.
- Wang, Wendy, and Paul Taylor. *For Millennials, Parenthood Trumps Marriage*. Pew Research Center, 2011. <https://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2011/03/millennials-marriage.pdf>.
- Wilson, Nigel, John Godfrey, and Edyta Borowy. *2021 U.S. Millennials and Home Ownership – A Distant Dream for Most: Part 4*. Legal & General U.S. Housing Study, 2021. <https://group.legalandgeneral.com/media/lgvdfbvr/legal-general-u-s-housing-study-part-4-mind-the-gap-the-intergenerational-money-blues-12-1-2021.pdf>.
- Woock, Kati. “5 Practical Zoning Hacks for Missing Middle Housing.” *American Planning Association*, March 21, 2022. <https://www.planning.org/planning/2022/winter/5-practical-zoning-hacks-for-missing-middle-housing/>.
- Wright, Gwendolyn. “Design and Affordable American Housing.” *Cityscape* 16, no. 2 (2014): 69-86. (70)
- Zillow. “Today’s First-Time Homebuyers Older, More Often Single.” Press Release. Last modified August 17, 2015. <https://zillow.mediaroom.com/2015-08-17-Todays-First-Time-Homebuyers-Older-More-Often-Single>.

Appendix

Table A: Qualitative Survey Questions

Questions	Interviewee(s)
One: Housing & Economic Development Logistics	
1. How do developers spot opportunities to develop?	DVRs 1-3; BUS
2. How do developers judge a project's feasibility?	DVRs 1-3; BUS
3. What characteristics do developers look for in a community when evaluating a potential development site?	DVRs 1 & 3; BUS
4. To what types of housing are 27- to 43-year-olds (millennials) attracted?	DVRs 1-3; APR; RTR DVRs 1 & 2;
5. What, if anything, can a municipality do to be more attractive to millennials?	APR; RTR; E-DVT
6. What local amenities should a community have to retain the presence of residents and visitors?	DVRs 1-3; APR; RTR; E-DVT
7. What other businesses should be in place before, or shortly after, development?	DVRs 1 & 2 ; BUS
8. How does zoning effect one's decision to build?	DVR 1
9. Assuming no HUD grant, how can housing be more affordable to young buyers?	DVRs 1 & 3
Two: The Construction Process	
10. Where might challenges arise if a developer wants to build further from metro areas?	DVR 1
11. Do design and architecture thematic effect affordability, and if so, how?	DVRs 1; APR
12. With what types of materials can a developer build affordable, but not cheap, housing?	DVRs 1; APR; BUS
13. What actions, if any, can a municipality take to make the construction process easier?	DVRs 1 & 3 APR and RTR
14. How might construction costs influence the beginning of the construction process?	DVRs 1& 3
Three: Construction Financing	
15. How do developers raise capital or cut costs to build?	DVRs 2 & 3
16. How does profit margin effect feasibility?	DVRs 1-3

17. Do developers frequently rely on incentives--TIF district, vouchers? DVRs 1-3
18. How might the costs of regulatory compliance hinder, or help, the construction process? DVRs 3
19. What actions, if any, can a municipality take to make the construction process less costly to both itself and to the developer? DVRs 1-3
- Four: Marketing for Economic Development**
20. What actions, if any, can a municipality take to market itself during and after the development process? E-DVT
21. To what extent should a municipality value intergovernmental collaboration throughout the development process? E-DVT
- Five: Community Engagement & Participation**
22. To what extent do housing professionals find community engagement (or participation) valuable? DVR 2; APR; RTR
23. To what extent do business professionals find community engagement (or participation) valuable? BUS; E-DVT
24. What actions, if any, can a municipality take to engage target demographics? DVR 2; APR; RTR
25. What actions, if any, can a municipality take to ease public concern or pushback regarding future development? DVR 2

Interviewee Code Key

DRVs 1	First developer interviewed
DVR 2	Second developer interviewed
DVR 3	Third developer interviewed
APR	The home appraiser
RTR	The realtor
BUS	The businessperson specializing in the sale of construction material
E-DVT	The public official—Executive Director of Business and Economic Development

Table B: Respondent Answers

Questions	Respondent Answers (synthesized)
One: Housing & Economic Development	
Logistics	
1. How do developers spot opportunities to develop?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They seek upcoming towns that are not over-built and a local government willing to collaborate. • Location of the development site; does it promote economic activity, and is it somewhere with a draw? • Evaluating whether the city is “hungry”—is the city willing to “play ball” with the developer? • Evaluating the availability of lots. • City’s willingness to use housing vouchers. • Availability of TIF money.
2. How do developers judge a project’s feasibility?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current demographics in the area. • Price of land. • Analyzing whether there is room to make a profit. • The cost of construction. • Amount of money they need to pay their workers. • Amount of money they pay in development fees, like impact fees, and connection fees. • Other incentives.
3. What characteristics do developers look for in a community when evaluating a potential development site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether land can be rezoned ; if townhouses are special use, can it be rezoned to allow townhomes and condominiums by right? • Whether the municipality is supportive. • Presence of nearby amenities, like coffee shops and restaurants. • Whether open lots for building and construction are available near already developed areas. • Whether there is a possibility to build mixed-use in a busy area. • Whether infrastructure is already installed, or whether the city is willing to maintain the infrastructure if the developer provides it.
4. To what types of housing are 27- to 43-year-olds (millennials) attracted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In most cases, houses that cost \$200,000 or less. • Townhouses (pre-family) followed by a single-family home (post-family). • Twenty-eight and under are renting (or renting to own in condominiums). • Homes that do not require yardwork. • Homes with an urban feel (one- to two- person units of apartments or condominiums). • Newly constructed homes and nicely renovated old homes with an “old feel.” • Homes that are in “move in condition”—no work needed to be done, and everything is up to date.

-
- For first-time single-family buyers, homes with two bedrooms on a second floor (for eventual child).
 - For first-time single-family buyers, home with a basement and a mid-sized yard.
-
5. What, if anything, can a municipality do to be more attractive to millennials?
- Advertise a good school district.
 - Think outside of the box; do not be traditional.
 - Try to increase the level of entry-level jobs in town.
 - Find a developer who has extensive experience with building for younger generation.
 - Zone for walkability with access to public transportation.
 - Foster an attractive downtown and main street.
 - Prioritize mixed-use districts and apartments with respect to new development projects.
 - Provide parks for children and dogs.
 - Build communities with no homeowner’s association payments (No HOAs).
 - Build more townhomes.
 - Even if not urban, provide an urban aesthetic for an “urban” feel.
 - Build up and beautify local assets (parks, riverfront, etc.)
 - Organize street markets and art fairs.
-
6. What local amenities should a community have to retain the presence of residents and visitors?
- Diverse food options, strip malls (usually close to the main road), festival offerings, and (if there is a river), riverside cafes and eateries.
 - Clean, safe parks within a walkable distance from shops and restaurants.
 - Heal clubs and workout spaces, preferably within the vicinity of apartments and condominiums.
 - The ability for special zoning.
-
7. What other businesses should be in place before, or shortly after, development?
- Several grocery stores to provide a variety of options.
 - A hospital or health care facility.
 - Employers that can offer entry level and middle management positions—an anchor.
-
8. How does zoning effect one’s decision to build?
- It can make or break a project; allowance for re-subdividing provides builders with more options to build smaller homes.
 - Rezoning and permitting costs tend to affect profit margin down the line, often resulting in delays.
-
9. Assuming no HUD grant, how can housing be more affordable to young buyers?
- Larger lots often need to be subdivided into townhomes or condominiums.
 - Certain incentives, like enterprise zones, can often help.
-

Two: The Construction Process

10. Where might challenges arise if a developer wants to build further from metro areas?
- One might think material delivery, but it is usually not an issue, since a good price on the land will often offset the price of materials. (TIP: procure land at reasonable price).
-

11. Do design and architecture thematic effect affordability, and if so, how?

-
- Yes, upscale designs, like curved walls, are more expensive; simple design is typically less expensive.
 - More brick equals more costs; however, millennials usually want the contemporary brick front and porch. Using minimal brick or stone to add posts or columns adds style while keeping the price reasonable.
 - Builders can make arched entrances, volume ceiling, and crown molding for small improvements to style without making costs unreasonable.
 - Open concept is usually an affordable design plan; plus, it is stylist and millennials like it.
-

12. With what types of materials can a developer build affordable, but not cheap, housing?

- Vinyl siding, aluminum gutters, and a little brick on the front for aesthetic appeal is a good way to mitigate high costs for the consumer (without being bad quality).
 - Manmade hardwood is always less costly than real hardwood.
-

13. What actions, if any, can a municipality take to make the construction process easier?

- Put options on property—like a right to purchase—to facilitate quicker process for developers.
 - The mayor can market the town, but the municipality needs to have power to actually sell a house/property.
 - Be sure to complete pre-work on a property or neighborhood.
 - Allow for special service areas that place tax on new homeowners for sewers and roads.
-

14. How might construction costs influence the beginning of the construction process?

- If construction costs are too high, a developer will not start building, or they will build and pass those costs on to the end consumer.
-

Three: Construction Financing

15. How do developers raise capital or cut costs to build?

- Private investment, or private loans from banks.
 - Arrears (payment post-development); usually, smaller developers or contractors only benefit from successful ventures.
 - Tax credits (usually for affordable housing).
 - The Illinois Housing Development Authority's (IHDA) Qualified Allocation Plan (specifically, its ten-point Quality of Life Index score sheet that can be used to cut costs provided development meets certain criteria).
-

16. How does profit margin effect feasibility?

- Developers lose money building affordable housing, unless they can do projects that are profitable alongside it (to make project is feasible, make sure it is profitable).
 - Higher construction cost will cause higher rents down the line.
 - Laws/regulations surrounding housing development affect the project's cost.
 - Profit margins are only about three to five percent.
-

17. Do developers frequently rely on incentives--TIF district, vouchers?

- Yes; TIF money attracts developers to property.
 - TIFs reimbursable costs are helpful.
-

18. How might the costs of regulatory compliance hinder, or help, the construction process?

-
- Tax incentives, opportunity funds, tax credits, and new market credits help offset the cost of construction.
-

19. What actions, if any, can a municipality take to make the construction process less costly to both itself and to the developer?

- If tax dollars are used to support development, a builder must pay a certain amount to the workers (Prevailing Wage). Developers tend not to prefer this route.
 - Fees, such as permitting, development, and impact, create higher costs and time delays.
 - HUD sponsored programs tend to slow process due to heavy red tape.
-
- Pay for infrastructure, roads, and sewer, especially if the developer is paying for the raw land price.
 - Waive fees and, if possible, shorten the process to develop (requiring attorneys and architects make things more complicated, for example).
 - Hold zoning meetings w/ developers.
 - Cut red tape and have less meetings (reduces time cost).
 - Use incentives while reducing impact and connection fees.
 - Adopt a hands-off approach; no micromanaging (e.g., do not “nickel and dime” the developer).
 - Do not use an unincorporated area for the development site.
 - Facilitate easy connection to public infrastructure, like the city sewer.
-

Four: Marketing for Economic Development

20. What actions, if any, can a municipality take to market itself during and after the development process?

- Generally to a high extent.
 - Work from within the city; find a potential investor from successful businesspeople in town. And look for someone who would be passionate about investing in the community.
 - Market the city’s quality of life.
 - Meet with developers and use word of mouth.
 - Try to attract tourism using local assets.
 - Let the community speak for itself.
 - Use attractions and amenities in the city, like access to highways, good schools, state parks etc.
 - Put your housing stock and development projects in the comprehensive plan.
 - Be upfront with developers about how feasible a project is.
 - Build up amenities, like cabins near forest preserves, or docks on the river.
 - Need an anchor! Figure out an institution to draw in people from surrounding communities.
-

21. To what extent should a municipality value intergovernmental collaboration throughout the development process?

- Generally to a high extent; collaboration helps builders cut down on time and cost.
-

-
- Get the school district involved; they know who is coming to town and (and their age groups).
 - Passionate people collaborating wotj everyone is extremely valuable.
-

Five: Community Engagement & Participation

22. To what extent do housing professionals find community engagement (or participation) valuable?

- Very strongly; if city council or local business are unhappy about development, developers may feel unwelcome and won't come.
 - A neighborhood will not do well if the target group does not want to live in it
-

23. To what extent do business professionals find community engagement (or participation) valuable?

- Very strongly; public opinion is everything and can ruin a project before it gets off the ground.
-

24. What actions, if any, can a municipality take to engage target demographics?

- Develop innovative strategies to reach out to target groups (it can often be hard to find them without the right hook).
 - Hold a focus group in Western suburbs dedicated to your definition of millennials
 - Make the city desirable for commuters.
-

25. What actions, if any, can a municipality take to ease public concern or pushback regarding future development?

- Do not use the phrase “affordable housing”d—try “attainable” or “obtainable.’
- Allow the public to voice their concerns, although be careful to educate at the same time; use examples like, “imagine your niece who just graduated from college on a \$60k annual salary.

Notes

- ¹ City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan* (Oregon, IL, 2024), 10, <https://cityoforegon.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Oregon-Comprehensive-Plan-DRAFT-v05-Public-Hearing.pdf>.
- ² *Ibid.*, 4, 14-5.
- ³ Michael Dimock, “Defining Generations: Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins,” *Pew Research Center*, January 17, 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>. Note that the article reports the ages of millennials from the year 2019 (23 to 38); the Introduction simply adds five years to both ages so that the numbers reflect the current age range (28 to 43).
- ⁴ Karen Lanzetta, *The New Playbook: Attracting and Servicing Gen Y & Z* (Envestnet, Inc., 2019), 8, https://www.envestnet.com/files/announcements/New_Playbook_GenYZ.pdf.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.
- ⁶ A. Mechele Dickerson, “Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership,” *Journal of Affordable Housing & Community Development Law* 24, no. 3 (2016): 443.
- ⁷ Lindsay Dodgson, “Millennials Have Been Priced Out of Buying Homes, and are Venting that They Can’t Afford Rent Either,” *Business Insider*, February 22, 2024, <https://www.businessinsider.com/millennials-priced-out-of-homes-now-they-cant-afford-rent-2024-2; accord> M. Leanne Lachman and Deborah L. Brett, *Gen Y and Housing: What They Want and Where They Want It*, (Washington, DC: Urban Land Institute, 2015), 1, <https://uli.org/wp-content/uploads/ULI-Documents/Gen-Y-and-Housing.pdf> (reporting the total number of millennials in the United States as roughly 78.6 million).
- ⁸ Dickerson, “Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership,” 437-43; Nigel Wilson, John Godfrey, and Edyta Borowy, *2021 U.S. Millennials and Home Ownership – A Distant Dream for Most: Part 4* (Legal & General U.S. Housing Study, 2021), 2, <https://group.legalandgeneral.com/media/lgvdfbvr/legal-general-u-s-housing-study-part-4-mind-the-gap-the-intergenerational-money-blues-12-1-2021.pdf>.
- ⁹ Lanzetta, *The New Playbook: Attracting and Servicing Gen Y & Z*, 3 (indicating that millennials are “better educated” than past generations).
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 16; Lachman and Brett, *Gen Y and Housing: What They Want and Where They Want It*, 1 (noting that nine in ten millennials anticipate that they will exceed their parents’ economic circumstances).
- ¹¹ Dickerson, “Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership,” 442.
- ¹² Lachman and Brett, *Gen Y and Housing: What They Want and Where They Want It*, 1.
- ¹³ Lindsay Dodgson, “Millennials Have Been Priced Out of Buying Homes, and are Venting that They Can’t Afford Rent Either,” *Business Insider*, February 22, 2024, <https://www.businessinsider.com/millennials-priced-out-of-homes-now-they-cant-afford-rent-2024-2>.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*; Wilson, Godfrey, and Borowy, *2021 U.S. Millennials and Home Ownership – A Distant Dream for Most: Part 4*, 3.
- ¹⁵ Sharon A. DeVaney, “Understanding the Millennial Generation,” *Journal of Financial Service Professionals* 69, no. 6 (2015): 12; Jason N. Houle and Cody Warner, “Into the Red and Back to the Nest? Student Debt, College Completion, and Returning to the Parental Home Among Young Adults,” *Sociology of Education* 90, no. 1 (2017): 91.
- ¹⁶ Dickerson, “Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership,” 445.
- ¹⁷ Lanzetta, *The New Playbook: Attracting and Servicing Gen Y & Z*, 22; Wilson, Godfrey, and Borowy, *2021 U.S. Millennials and Home Ownership – A Distant Dream for Most: Part 4*, 3.
- ¹⁸ Shrimatee Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” *Muma Business Review* 4, no. 1 (June 2020): 2; accord Wes LeBlanc and Alice Davis Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” *Illinois Municipal Policy Journal* 3, no. 1 (2018): 12.
- ¹⁹ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 2.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*; David Garcia et al., *Unlocking the Potential of Missing Middle Housing* (Berkeley, CA: Turner Center for Housing Innovation, 2022), 2, <https://turnercenter.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Missing-Middle-Brief-December-2022.pdf>; City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*, 19.
- ²¹ City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*, 19.
- ²² Katherine Shaver, “Cities Turn to ‘Missing Middle’ Housing to Keep Older Millennials from Leaving,” *The Washington Post*, December 9, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/trafficandcommuting/cities-turn-to->

missing-middle-housing-to-keep-older-millennials-from-leaving/2017/12/09/3a129bc8-d54a-11e7-95bf-df7c19270879_story.html.

²³ Alexander Elgin et al., *Missing Middle Housing: Development Costs and Affordability* (Urban Land Institute Center Urban Leaders Program, 2020), 5, https://ulidigitalmarketing.blob.core.windows.net/ulidcnc/sites/14/2020/09/2020-09-16_ULI-Financial-Team-Report.pdf.

²⁴ *Ibid.*; Garcia et al., *Unlocking the Potential of Missing Middle Housing*, 16.

²⁵ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 5.

²⁶ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 7; Danielle Bergstrom et al., “The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities,” *Journal of Affordable Housing & Community Development Law* 22, no. 2 (2014): 192-93.

²⁷ “The Relationship Between Community and Economic Development,” *EConsultant Solutions, Inc.* (blog), March 12, 2021, <https://econsultsolutions.com/relationship-between-community-and-economic-development/>.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ *Ibid.* (quoting Robert Pittman et al., “The Community and Economic Development Chain: Validating the Links Between Processes and Outcomes,” *Community Development* 40, no. 1 (2009)).

³⁰ City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*, 39.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*, 40.

³³ United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), *How Small Towns and Cities Can Use Local Assets to Rebuild Their Economies: Lessons from Successful Places*, by Nora Johnson, Adhir Kackar, and Melissa Kramer, EPA Document 231-R- 15-002 (Washington, DC, 2015), 3, https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-05/documents/competitive_advantage_051215_508_final.pdf.

³⁴ Illinois Institute for Rural Affairs, *Promoting Comprehensive Community and Economic Development Strategies for Rural Illinois: Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly* (Macomb, IL: Western Illinois University, 2018), 3, <https://www2.illinois.gov/lgt/Documents/GRAC-Annual-Report-2018-FINAL.pdf>. Note that Ogle County is, indeed, classified as non-metropolitan.

³⁵ “Economic Development,” The City of Oregon, Illinois, accessed March 25, 2024, <https://cityoforegon.org/economic-development/>.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Katherine Shaver, “Cities Turn to ‘Missing Middle’ Housing to Keep Older Millennials from Leaving,” *The Washington Post*, December 9, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/trafficandcommuting/cities-turn-to-missing-middle-housing-to-keep-older-millennials-from-leaving/2017/12/09/3a129bc8-d54a-11e7-95bf-df7c19270879_story.html.

³⁹ Although discussed in Part II, Section 1, the millennial taste has roughly three facets: (1) the availability of financially obtainable, low-maintenance dwellings, *ibid.*, (2) in walkable, high-amenity environments, LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 12-3, that are (3) within reasonably close proximity to one’s place of employment. Lachman and Brett, *Gen Y and Housing: What They Want and Where They Want It*, 13, 24; Dowell Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” *Housing Policy Debate* 26, no. 6 (April 2016): 4.

⁴⁰ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 12.

⁴¹ City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*, 10.

⁴² City of Oregon, *City of Oregon Zoning* (Oregon, IL, 2024), 1, <https://cityoforegon.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Zoning-Maps.pdf>; accord City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*, 18.

⁴³ “Oregon City, Illinois, Housing,” United States Census Bureau, accessed March 11, 2024, <https://data.census.gov/all?q=Oregon%20city,%20Illinois%20housing>.

⁴⁴ City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*, 14, 15.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁴⁶ Karan Kaul, Laurie Goodman, and Michael Neal, *The Role of Single-Family Housing Production and Preservation in Addressing the Affordable Housing Supply Shortage* (Urban Institute Housing Finance Policy Center, 2021), 2, <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/105265/the-role-of-single-family-housing-production-and-preservation-in-addressing-the-affordable-housing-supply-shortage.pdf> (noting that, as of 2019, 85.6 million of the country’s 139 million housing units, or roughly 61.6 percent, were classified as detached, single-family homes).

-
- ⁴⁷ City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*, 9-10.
- ⁴⁸ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 1; LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 13; Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 3.
- ⁴⁹ City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*, 20; “Economic Development,” The City of Oregon, Illinois, accessed March 25, 2024, <https://cityoforegon.org/economic-development/>.
- ⁵⁰ City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*, 20.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 15; City of Oregon, *City of Oregon Zoning*, 1.
- ⁵² City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*, 1.
- ⁵³ DeVaney, “Understanding the Millennial Generation,” 11.
- ⁵⁴ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 1.
- ⁵⁵ Lanzetta, *The New Playbook: Attracting and Servicing Gen Y & Z*, 9.
- ⁵⁶ Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 1; Lachman and Brett, *Gen Y and Housing: What They Want and Where They Want It*, 6.
- ⁵⁷ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 1.
- ⁵⁸ Dickerson, “Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership,” 436.
- ⁵⁹ Michael Dimock, “Defining Generations: Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins,” *Pew Research Center*, January 17, 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>; Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 2.
- ⁶⁰ Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 2.
- ⁶¹ DeVaney, “Understanding the Millennial Generation,” 11; Travis J. Smith and Tommy Nichols, “Understanding the Millennial Generation,” *Journal of Business Diversity* 15, no. 1 (January 2015): 39.
- ⁶² Michael Dimock, “Defining Generations: Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins,” *Pew Research Center*, January 17, 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>; Lanzetta, *The New Playbook: Attracting and Servicing Gen Y & Z*, 14; Yana Davidovich et al., *Millennials and Housing: Homeownership Demographic Research* (Freddie Mac Single Family Marketing Analytics, Market Research and Insights Department, 2021), 3, https://sf.freddie.com/docs/pdf/fact-sheet/millennial-playbook_millennials-and-housing.pdf.
- ⁶³ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 1.
- ⁶⁴ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 4.
- ⁶⁵ Dickerson, “Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership,” 436.
- ⁶⁶ Michael Dimock, “Defining Generations: Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins,” *Pew Research Center*, January 17, 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>.
- ⁶⁷ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 12 (stating that, although millennials are following a general pattern of suburban migration previously seen with prior generations, the millennial preference is indeed distinct); Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 6 (stating that millennials value proximity to jobs and affordability more so than had prior generations); Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 1; Davidovich et al., *Millennials and Housing: Homeownership Demographic Research*, 3 (stating that millennials disrupted consumer behavior by adopting their own brand of life-stage priorities).
- ⁶⁸ DeVaney, “Understanding the Millennial Generation,” 12; LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 4.
- ⁶⁹ Wilson, Godfrey, and Borowy, *2021 U.S. Millennials and Home Ownership – A Distant Dream for Most: Part 4*, 3.
- ⁷⁰ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 6; Davidovich et al., *Millennials and Housing: Homeownership Demographic Research*, 4; Jung Choi et al., *Millennial Homeownership: Why is it so Low, and How Can we Increase It?* (Urban Institute, 2018), 1, https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/98729/2019_01_11_millennial_homeownership_finalizedv2_0.pdf.

-
- ⁷¹ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 6; Dickerson, “Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership,” 456.
- ⁷² Dickerson, “Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership,” 444; Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 3.
- ⁷³ Lanzetta, *The New Playbook: Attracting and Servicing Gen Y & Z*, 9.
- ⁷⁴ Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 8; National Association of Realtors Research Group, *2023 Home Buyers and Sellers Generational Trends Report* (National Association of Realtors, 2023), 9, <https://www.nar.realtor/sites/default/files/documents/2023-home-buyers-and-sellers-generational-trends-report-03-28-2023.pdf>.
- ⁷⁵ “Today’s First-Time Homebuyers Older, More Often Single,” Press Release, Zillow, last modified August 17, 2015, <https://zillow.mediaroom.com/2015-08-17-Todays-First-Time-Homebuyers-Older-More-Often-Single>.
- ⁷⁶ DeVaney, “Understanding the Millennial Generation,” 13; Smith and Nichols, “Understanding the Millennial Generation,” 13
- ⁷⁷ Davidovich et al., *Millennials and Housing: Homeownership Demographic Research*, 4.
- ⁷⁸ Wendy Wang and Paul Taylor, *For Millennials, Parenthood Trumps Marriage* (Pew Research Center, 2011), 3, <https://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2011/03/millennials-marriage.pdf>.
- ⁷⁹ Kotkin et al., *Building Cities for People*, edited by Zina Clapper (Orange, CA: Chapman University Press, 2015), 27, <https://www.newgeography.com/files/Cities-for-People-web.pdf>.
- ⁸⁰ Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 16; LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 5.
- ⁸¹ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 5; Dickerson, “Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership,” 442; Kotkin et al., *Building Cities for People*, 40.
- ⁸² LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 2.
- ⁸³ *Ibid.*, 5-6; Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 17.
- ⁸⁴ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 10; Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 1.
- ⁸⁵ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 5.
- ⁸⁶ Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 17.
- ⁸⁷ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 2; Garcia et al., *Unlocking the Potential of Missing Middle Housing*, 2; City of Oregon, *City of Oregon 2023 Comprehensive Plan*, 19.
- ⁸⁸ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 5.
- ⁸⁹ American Bar Association, “Zoning for Mixed-Use Development,” *Probate and Property* (2024): 60; accord Daniel R. Mandelker, “Zoning for Mixed-Use Development,” *Real Property, Trust and Estate Law Journal* 58, no. 1 (2023): 3-4.
- ⁹⁰ Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 10-1; Davidovich et al., *Millennials and Housing: Homeownership Demographic Research*, 9.
- ⁹¹ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 10; Jamie R. Metzinger, “Considerations for Mix-Use Development” (paper presented at the 53rd ASC Annual International Conference Proceedings, 2017), 340, <http://ascpro0.ascweb.org/archives/cd/2017/paper/CPGT189002017.pdf>.
- ⁹² Mandelker, “Zoning for Mixed-Use Development,” 13-20; Metzinger, “Considerations for Mix-Use Development,” 338.
- ⁹³ Gerrit Knaap et al., *Zoning as a Barrier to Multifamily Housing Development*, Report Number 548 (Chicago, IL: American Planning Association, 2007), 44, https://www.huduser.gov/publications/pdf/zoning_multifamilydev.pdf; Metzinger, “Considerations for Mix-Use Development,” 342; Joshua D. Hendon, “Mixed-Use Development in Theory and Practice: Learning from Atlanta’s Mixed Experiences” (master’s thesis., Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, 2011), 34, Georgia Tech Library, <https://repository.gatech.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/105cfd0d-10f7-43ec-826b-a204b43992f2/content>.

-
- ⁹⁴ Mandelker, “Zoning for Mixed-Use Development,” *Real Property, Trust and Estate Law Journal*, 4, 13-20 (speaking to mixed-use); Garcia et al., *Unlocking the Potential of Missing Middle Housing*, 2 (speaking to MMH).
- ⁹⁵ Edward Glaeser and Joseph Gyourko, “The Economic Implications of Housing Supply,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 32, no. 1 (2018): 6-7; Elgin et al., *Missing Middle Housing: Development Costs and Affordability*, 5.
- ⁹⁶ Mandelker, “Zoning for Mixed-Use Development,” *Real Property, Trust and Estate Law Journal*, 28.
- ⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 37.
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 26.
- ⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 29.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 32.
- ¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 31.
- ¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 37.
- ¹⁰³ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰⁴ Elgin et al., *Missing Middle Housing: Development Costs and Affordability*, 3.
- ¹⁰⁵ Metzinger, “Considerations for Mix-Use Development,” 342.
- ¹⁰⁶ United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), *How Small Towns and Cities Can Use Local Assets to Rebuild Their Economies: Lessons from Successful Places*, by Nora Johnson, Adhir Kackar, and Melissa Kramer, EPA Document 231-R- 15-002, 6.
- ¹⁰⁷ Metzinger, “Considerations for Mix-Use Development,” 340.
- ¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 338.
- ¹⁰⁹ Hendon, “Mixed-Use Development in Theory and Practice: Learning from Atlanta’s Mixed Experiences,” 35.
- ¹¹⁰ Dickerson, “Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership,” 461.
- ¹¹¹ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 1.
- ¹¹² Garcia et al., *Unlocking the Potential of Missing Middle Housing*, 16.
- ¹¹³ Kati Woock, “5 Practical Zoning Hacks for Missing Middle Housing,” *American Planning Association*, March 21, 2022, <https://www.planning.org/planning/2022/winter/5-practical-zoning-hacks-for-missing-middle-housing/>.
- ¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁸ Elgin et al., *Missing Middle Housing: Development Costs and Affordability*, 5; Glaeser and Gyourko, “The Economic Implications of Housing Supply,” 5.
- ¹¹⁹ Glaeser and Gyourko, “The Economic Implications of Housing Supply,” 5.
- ¹²⁰ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 11.
- ¹²¹ Jake Vasa, “Why Missing Middle Housing is an Emerging Trend in Multi-Family Development,” *Short Elliott Hendrickson, Inc.*, 2024, <https://www.sehinc.com/news/why-missing-middle-housing-emerging-trend-multi-family-development>.
- ¹²² Ahmad Abu-Khalaf, *White Paper: Barriers and Opportunities to Creating Low-Density Multifamily Housing* (Enterprise Community Partners, Inc., 2022), 7, <https://www.enterprisecommunity.org/sites/default/files/2022-01/2021-038-white-paper-ldmf-r5.pdf>.
- ¹²³ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 11.
- ¹²⁴ Garcia et al., *Unlocking the Potential of Missing Middle Housing*, 10.
- ¹²⁵ An MMH developer might struggle to build separate livable units without incurring more costs if, for example, “only two water meters are allowed per parcel.” *Ibid.*, 11.
- ¹²⁶ Renée A. Irvin and John Stansbury, “Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is it Worth the Effort?,” *Public Administration Review* 64, no. 1 (2004): 57.
- ¹²⁷ Bergstrom et al., “The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities,” 192.
- ¹²⁸ Sherry R. Arnstein, “A Ladder of Citizen Participation,” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 35, no. 4 (1969): 221 (explaining that the bottom of the ladder represents “nonparticipation,” while the top represents “full citizen control” where constituents and municipal leaders share the planning and decision making through mediums such as policy boards and planning committees to solve problems—with room for “give and take.”).

-
- ¹²⁹ Jesse W. Campbell, “Public Participation and Trust in Government: Results from a Vignette Experiment,” *Journal of Policy Studies* 38, no. 2 (2023), <https://jps.scholasticahq.com/article/77970-public-participation-and-trust-in-government-results-from-a-vignette-experiment>; Lisa Schmidhuber et al., “Citizen Participation in Public Administration: Investigating Open Government for Social Innovation,” *R&D Management* 49, no. 3 (June 2019): 344.
- ¹³⁰ Bergstrom et al., “The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities,” 193
- ¹³¹ *Ibid.*; Irvin and Stansbury, “Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is it Worth the Effort?,” 56.
- ¹³² Campbell, “Public Participation and Trust in Government: Results from a Vignette Experiment,” <https://jps.scholasticahq.com/article/77970-public-participation-and-trust-in-government-results-from-a-vignette-experiment>.
- ¹³³ *Ibid.*
- ¹³⁴ Bergstrom et al., “The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities,” 193; Campbell, “Public Participation and Trust in Government: Results from a Vignette Experiment,” <https://jps.scholasticahq.com/article/77970-public-participation-and-trust-in-government-results-from-a-vignette-experiment>; Irvin and Stansbury, “Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is it Worth the Effort?,” 54; Schmidhuber et al., “Citizen Participation in Public Administration: Investigating Open Government for Social Innovation,” 345.
- ¹³⁵ Schmidhuber et al., “Citizen Participation in Public Administration: Investigating Open Government for Social Innovation,” 345; Bergstrom et al., “The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities,” 193.
- ¹³⁶ Bergstrom et al., “The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities,” 193; *accord* Schmidhuber et al., “Citizen Participation in Public Administration: Investigating Open Government for Social Innovation,” 351.
- ¹³⁷ Gwendolyn Wright, “Design and Affordable American Housing,” *Cityscape* 16, no. 2 (2014): 70.
- ¹³⁸ Bergstrom et al., “The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities,” 193.
- ¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 200; Irvin and Stansbury, “Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is it Worth the Effort?,” 56.
- ¹⁴⁰ Bergstrom et al., “The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities,” 193; Irvin and Stansbury, “Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is it Worth the Effort?,” 56.
- ¹⁴¹ Bergstrom et al., “The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities,” 193.
- ¹⁴² *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴³ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁴ Michael Dimock, “Defining Generations: Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins,” *Pew Research Center*, January 17, 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>.
- ¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* Recall that the article reports the ages of millennials from the year 2019 (23 to 38); as stated in the Introduction, this report simply adds five years to both ages so that the numbers reflect the current age range of the millennial generation.
- ¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁷ “The Relationship Between Community and Economic Development,” *EConsultant Solutions, Inc.* (blog), March 12, 2021, <https://econsultsolutions.com/relationship-between-community-and-economic-development/>.
- ¹⁴⁸ Elgin et al., *Missing Middle Housing: Development Costs and Affordability*, 5; Glaeser and Gyourko, “The Economic Implications of Housing Supply,” 5.
- ¹⁴⁹ United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), *How Small Towns and Cities Can Use Local Assets to Rebuild Their Economies: Lessons from Successful Places*, by Nora Johnson, Adhir Kackar, and Melissa Kramer, EPA Document 231-R- 15-002, 6.
- ¹⁵⁰ Elgin et al., *Missing Middle Housing: Development Costs and Affordability*, 3.
- ¹⁵¹ Glaeser and Gyourko, “The Economic Implications of Housing Supply,” 6-7; Elgin et al., *Missing Middle Housing: Development Costs and Affordability*, 5.
- ¹⁵² Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 5; Myers, “Peak Millennials: Three Reinforcing Cycles that Amplify the Rise and Fall of Urban Concentration by Millennials,” 17.
- ¹⁵³ Kati Woock, “5 Practical Zoning Hacks for Missing Middle Housing,” *American Planning Association*, March 21, 2022, <https://www.planning.org/planning/2022/winter/5-practical-zoning-hacks-for-missing-middle-housing/>.

¹⁵⁴ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 5; Dickerson, “Millennials, Affordable Housing, and the Future of Homeownership,” 442; Kotkin et al., *Building Cities for People*, 40.

¹⁵⁵ Mandelker, “Zoning for Mixed-Use Development,” 4, 13-20 (speaking to mixed-use); Garcia et al., *Unlocking the Potential of Missing Middle Housing*, 2.

¹⁵⁶ Hendon, “Mixed-Use Development in Theory and Practice: Learning from Atlanta’s Mixed Experiences,” 35.

¹⁵⁷ Bergstrom et al., “The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities,” 193; Irvin and Stansbury, “Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is it Worth the Effort?,” 56; Arnstein, “A Ladder of Citizen Participation,” 221.

¹⁵⁸ As an aside, the respondents also agreed that municipalities should avoid using the word “affordable” when describing new housing development; they advise, rather, that cities use words that are more relatable to family members amid the middle class, such “attainable” or “obtainable.”

¹⁵⁹ “Oregon City, Illinois, Population,” United States Census Bureau, accessed April 10, 2024, <https://data.census.gov/all?q=Oregon%20city,%20Illinois,%20population>.

¹⁶⁰ Illinois Institute for Rural Affairs, *Promoting Comprehensive Community and Economic Development Strategies for Rural Illinois: Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly*, 3.

¹⁶¹ Elgin et al., *Missing Middle Housing: Development Costs and Affordability*, 5.

¹⁶² Ibid.; Garcia et al., *Unlocking the Potential of Missing Middle Housing*, 16.

¹⁶³ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 5.

¹⁶⁴ Ojah Maharaj, “Factors Affecting the Supply of ‘Missing Middle’ Housing Types in Walkable Urban Core Neighborhoods,” 7; Bergstrom et al., “The Sustainable Communities Initiative: The Community Engagement Guide for Sustainable Communities,” 192-93.

¹⁶⁵ Illinois Housing Development Authority, *2024-2025 Low Income Housing Tax Credit Qualified Allocation Plan* (2023), 1, 43, https://www.ihda.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/FINAL-QAP_2024-2025-for-website.pdf. For additional discussion of MMJH subsidies, see Kurt Paulsen, “The Goldilocks Dilemma of Moderate-Income Housing Subsidies: Finding the ‘Just Right’ Amount for the Missing Middle,” *Cityscape* 19, no. 1 (2017): 249-50.

¹⁶⁶ Mohamad Kashef, “Residential Developments in Small-Town America: Assessment and Regulations,” *City, Territory and Architecture* 4, no. 14 (2017): 10. Although not within the primary scope this report, the research team deemed it important to include a performance recommendation so that the City can effectively assess its decisions and plan for the future.

¹⁶⁷ Lanzetta, *The New Playbook: Attracting and Servicing Gen Y & Z*, 16.

¹⁶⁸ LeBlanc and Gensler, “Understanding the Preferences of Millennials: Implications for Chicago’s Suburbs,” 12.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.