





# Affordable Housing in Amsterdam and Copenhagen

January 16, 2019 | 12:30 PM SPUR Lunchtime Forum: Comparing International Housing Systems San Francisco

#### Natalie Bonnewit

Bonnewit Development Services bonnewit.com bahousingpeople.com



## German Marshall Plan Fund of the United States

Urban and Regional Policy Fellowship



### Presenter & Fellowship

## Why Amsterdam & Copenhagen? Similarities with SF Bay Area

- Commitment to integrated permanent supportive housing and "Housing First" principles
- Limited housing stock, tight land supply
- Expensive construction costs
- Nonprofit housing developer role as owners, developers and long-term property managers
- Similar best practice that 20-30% of an affordable housing development should be occupied by homeless and/or special needs households

## City Comparisons

## Why Amsterdam & Copenhagen? Differences between the Cities

- Income requirements in Amsterdam and SF Bay Area, not Copenhagen
- Individual project ownership legal structure in Copenhagen and SF Bay Area, not Amsterdam
- Broader special needs definition in AMS and CPH includes: Single parent households, former prostitutes, students, refugees. Excludes veterans.

## City Comparisons

## Why Amsterdam & Copenhagen? Differences between the Cities

 Housing is not a commodity held accountable to investor obligations for certain financial returns as is the case with Low Income Housing Tax Credit but is viewed as a form of social infrastructure serving societal needs which enhances social and economic well-being for everyone

Cultural

## City Comparisons



### 2015 Population

## Number of homeless people in city as a % of total population

	Copenhagen	Amsterdam	San Francisco
Homeless People	200	200	4,358*
City Population	591,481	841,186	864,816
Metropolitan Region	2,016,285	2,431,000	4,656,132

<sup>\*</sup>Unsheltered, on a given night; in 2018 number is estimated at 6,700

Sources: Cities of Amsterdam, Copenhagen & San Francisco

### Housing Stock

## Non-profit developer controlled affordable units as a % of total housing stock

	Copenhagen	Amsterdam	San Francisco
Affordable Units	56,660	181,917	30,368
Total Dwelling Units	298,209	399,817	379,597
% Affordable	19%	46%	8%

Sources: Cities of Amsterdam, Copenhagen & San Francisco

#### Amsterdam

- 85% of land is owned by City of Amsterdam, facilitates integration
- 60% of the housing stock is owned and managed by non-profit housing developers
- No project based public funds for development; commercial loans, however, are guaranteed
- Non-profits are able collateralize across portfolio and rely on portfolio strength for underwriting new deals

#### **Amsterdam**

- Operating costs covered by rent and the rent is determined by public regulatory body
- Any income-qualifying tenant that needs a rent subsidy can get one
- Anybody that needs services will receive them and the insurance company or the City pays the cost
- Social Housing industry is supported by legislatively mandated regional entity

## Copenhagen

- By Danish law each municipality is allowed to require that up to 25% of its housing stock be Common Housing
- Common Housing available to all, regardless of income
- Cost of construction is regulated which translates to lower rents and smaller unit sizes

## Copenhagen

- Unlike AMS and SF Bay Area, rent is tied to actual costs
- By law, rent is tied to individual unit based on unit size, amenities, etc. Rent may not be lower for special needs households
- Social Housing industry is supported by legislatively mandated regional entity

#### Structural Benefits

- Enterprise level/self-supporting financing (little or no public money necessary for development)
  - De-politicizes of portion of process
  - Facilitates speed of development

- Independent non-profit regional institutions monitor the sector and are mandated by legislation
  - Self-regulation and self-financing of the AH industry
  - Facilitates innovation

#### What can we learn?

# Financing and Industry Institutional Support Systems - Key Take-Aways

Recommendation for legislatively mandated regional body with capacity to:

- Provide low cost regional capital
- Facilitate a regional queue
- Hold pooled reserves
- Guaranty commercial real estate loans rather than provide direct loans for some projects

## Local Applicability

















