IDENTIFYING SUITABLE LOCATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND PRESERVATION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN FLORIDA: THE AHS MODEL

ABSTRACT
The Shimberg Center has developed a GIS-based decision tool that identifies land suitable for affordable housing development and preservation, with the ability to identify locations at scales from individual sites to regional development areas.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The model prioritizes characteristics based on input from local planners, housing experts, and the community. Maps show where positive attributes overlap and conflicting characteristics coincide.

The tool works in a GIS environment that allows the overlaying of spatial data representing characteristics important to the location of affordable housing, such as:

- **Residential Suitability**
- **Physical Infrastructure and Environment**
- **Accessibility**
- **Rental Housing Costs**
- **Driving Costs**
- **Transit Accessibility**

Evaluating the Assisted Housing Inventory using the AHS Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>FHFC</th>
<th>LHFA</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>HUD</th>
<th>Entire County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving Cost</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYTICAL APPROACH AND METHODS

**Scoring:**
Each component is assigned a score between 0 and 25 where:
- 0 is not suitable and 25 is highly suitable. This reflects relationships among a set of spatial characteristics; the relationships are relative to local conditions, there are no thresholds or benchmarks.

**Evaluating the Assisted Housing Inventory:**
Each property in the Assisted Housing Inventory (rental housing developments receiving assistance from federal, state, and local government programs) in Orange County was assigned a score based on the average of the AHS result in an area defined by a radius of 400 meters from the property location.

**CONCLUSIONS**
- The final scores were around 55% of the highest possible score. This figure is similar to the average for parcels for the entire county.
- Infrastructure and Environmental Characteristics and Transit Accessibility were low when compared with the highest score possible but in both cases the Assisted Housing Inventory was above the average for parcels in the entire county.
- There is a trade-off between accessibility and social characteristics.
- Central municipalities have higher scores, especially in terms of driving cost and transit accessibility. However, they have lower Neighborhood Characteristics scores.
- HUD properties tend to have higher scores, mainly because of high Transit and Neighborhood Accessibility and low Rental Costs.
- FHFC properties tend to have higher Neighborhood Characteristics scores but low Transit and Neighborhood Accessibility.
- RD properties tend to have low Transit and Neighborhood Accessibility but low Rental Costs.
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