

Smart Growth for Neighborhoods: Affordable Housing and Regional Vision

National Neighborhood Coalition, July 2001

Acknowledgements

This report was written by Leah Kalinosky, Coordinator of the National Neighborhood Coalition's Neighborhoods, Regions and Smart Growth Project. Kathy Desmond provided valuable research assistance. The report was edited by Dennis Johnson. We would also like to thank our Smart Growth Committee and Board of Directors for their contributions to this report. The following people generously donated their time to review various drafts of this document: Russ Adams, Metropolitan Alliance for Stability; Danielle Arigoni, Environmental Protection Agency; Mary Matheny, Maryland Committee for Children; Rolf Pendall, Cornell University Department of City and Regional Planning; Becky Sherblom, Maryland Center for Community Development. The National Neighborhood Coalition is grateful for the assistance of the Ford Foundation for its financial support of this report and our Neighborhoods, Regions and Smart Growth Project.

Betty Weiss, Executive Director

Some Smart Growth and Planning Terms

Brownfield - Abandoned or under-used properties where expansion or redevelopment is complicated by real or perceived environmental contamination.

Cluster zoning/subdivisions - Allows houses to be grouped closer together than normally allowed on small lots to protect open land.

Density bonus - Allows developers to build in specified areas densities that are higher than normally allowed.

Gentrification - The movement of middle- and upper-income people into areas where predominantly low- or moderate-income residents had lived.

Impact Fee - A charge to a developer to cover the cost of providing new services, such as roads and parks, for new development. Fees pass the cost of development onto the new property owners via the developer, rather than having the cost absorbed by all taxpayers in a jurisdiction.

Infill - Development in existing communities that utilizes existing infrastructure rather than building on previously undeveloped land.

Mixed Use - Zoning that allows for a range of land uses in one area, rather than segregated, single-use zoning. For example, buildings with retail space at street level and apartments above.

Smart Codes/Building Code Changes -- Changes to building codes to encourage investment in existing neighborhoods through the rehabilitation and reuse of existing buildings, and to increase predictability and flexibility of code requirements.

Transfer of Development Rights - Allows an owner of a property to sell the right to develop a piece of land to a developer, who then transfers these rights to a location where new development is allowed (such as an infill area in an older suburb or central city area).

Transit Oriented Development - The development of housing, commercial space, services, and job opportunities in close proximity to public transportation. Reduces dependency on cars and time spent in traffic, which protects the environment and can ease traffic congestion, as well as increasing opportunity by linking residents to jobs and services.

Urban Growth Boundary - A line drawn around a metropolitan area to designate where growth will be directed. New infill development is usually encouraged in existing urban areas to reduce the need to continue to build outward while land outside the boundary is protected as open space or for agricultural, forestry, or low-density residential development. Most UGBs are required to be adjusted periodically so that there is always a supply of developable land within the boundary.

For more information on planning related terms, see the American Planning Association's "Definitions and Other Useful Information About Planning,"

(<http://www.planning.org/info/infoguid.html>) or its book, "A Glossary of Zoning, Development, and Planning Terms" (APA Planning Advisory Service Report No. 491/492).

Smart Growth for Neighborhoods: Affordable Housing and Regional Vision

Executive Summary

America is facing an affordable housing crisis - a crisis that will worsen unless efforts to stop sprawl, revitalize cities and manage development through smart growth strategies and practices incorporate regional affordable housing measures.

Nowhere in the United States, whether you live in a major city, downtown neighborhood, adjoining suburb, outlying community, or rural town, can a minimum-wage worker afford a two-bedroom apartment at fair market rent. Worst-case housing needs have reached an all-time high of 5.4 million families -- a 4 percent increase between 1995 and 1997, according to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

A 370,000 unit or 5 percent decline since 1991 in the number of affordable rental units available to extremely low-income families compounds the problem. At the same time, the country's population is expected to increase by another 70 million people during the next two decades.

The affordable housing shortage is not limited to inner cities. More than one-third of the worst-case households live in the suburbs. There also is a shortfall of affordable rental units in non-metro areas. Recent studies show that nearly one-quarter of rural households pay more than 30 percent of their incomes for housing and nearly one in 10 households live in inadequate units.

Smart growth holds the promise of revitalizing declining urban areas, containing explosive suburban development, and creating more sustainable, diverse neighborhoods. Yet these promises also can bring neighborhood gentrification and displacement of low-income residents. Where will those who cannot afford to rent or own a home today live tomorrow?

Solving the affordable housing crisis requires everyone's support, from local, state, and federal government officials to developers, community-based organizations and smart growth advocates. Providing an adequate supply of affordable housing will not occur by itself; to be successful, a conscious commitment is needed to make the necessary policy, regulatory, and financial changes.

The problem is complex, involving many factors, conditions and circumstances. More research is needed to better assess the issue so effective solutions can be developed. It also requires effective planning and the implementation of those plans. It means reversing the effects of exclusionary zoning through regional fair-share housing programs, inclusionary zoning, and enforcement of fair housing laws. It also requires preserving existing affordable homes and apartments, being more efficient with how we develop land, and making home mortgages more readily available. Affordable housing advocates and others are seeking to better understand the impact of smart growth on inner city, older suburban and rural housing availability and affordability, and to find ways to strengthen the connection between affordable housing, neighborhood revitalization, and smart growth. NNC reviewed the current literature to gain a better understanding of the research that has been conducted and its findings. In this report, NNC summarizes the conclusions of researchers and practitioners. As a leader in community development and low-income neighborhood issues, NNC also presents its own recommendations to ensure that smart growth addresses the needs of lower-income communities and their residents.

NNC is committed to ensuring that smart growth returns investment to low-income neighborhoods at the same time it protects the interests of current residents. Nothing can be achieved, however, unless communities work together at the regional level, recognizing that solving the affordable housing crisis and creating healthy, stable, mixed-income communities will take cooperation, coordination and consensus.

I. Introduction

Sprawl and smart growth have become increasingly common topics of discussion and debate at the local, state and national levels. There is a growing consensus that our communities and regions cannot continue to grow the way they have during the past 50 years. Americans have voiced their frustration with traffic congestion, loss of open space, the rising price of housing, and other costs associated with sprawl. The question is no longer whether to pursue smarter growth, but how.

The effects of sprawl are not limited to newer suburban areas. As development has spread unchecked across farmlands and green fields, inner cities, older suburbs and small towns have missed out on investment, new development, job growth, infrastructure and school improvements, housing choices and other opportunities. Now, however, there is renewed interest in revitalizing older neighborhoods as an alternative to sprawl. Greater use of compact and infill development in previously abandoned, overlooked, and underused areas is inevitable as growth is directed away from fringe and exurban areas and towards existing neighborhoods.

Smart growth presents an important opportunity for strengthening older communities and bringing new opportunities to their residents. Many of these places are home to low-income and working families, small businesses, people of color, and new immigrants. Community leaders, residents and advocates are concerned that as these neighborhoods are rediscovered for their convenient locations, affordable housing, and opportunities for investment and revitalization, existing residents will be squeezed out.

The challenge for smart growth and affordable housing advocates is how to protect these residents in the face of this progression back to urban areas, older suburbs and small town centers. How do we assure that affordable housing is preserved, current neighborhood residents are not displaced, and comprehensive growth strategies provide an adequate supply of

affordable housing throughout a region so stable, mixed income communities are created and all residents enjoy a better quality of life and greater access to economic opportunities?

This report examines the findings and policy recommendations of researchers and practitioners addressing the effects of smart growth on affordable housing. The literature suggests there are little data to support arguments that smart growth has had a direct, negative impact on the supply of affordable housing. However, smart growth tools such as compact development, reinvestment in, and infill of, existing areas, and control of growth on the fringe by themselves do not guarantee housing affordability. Ultimately, the research suggests that careful planning and regional approaches to affordable housing must be a fundamental component of smart growth. Lack of housing choice is not limited to those jurisdictions with growth management policies in place. Affordability is a problem in every U.S. metropolitan area and affects a growing segment of the US population, including working families, students, seniors, and lower income households. Smart growth presents an opportunity to bring the issues of affordability and the importance of housing into the broader public discussion underway about land use, traffic congestion and mass transit, and preservation of farmland and open space.

The authors reviewed for this report acknowledge racial and economic segregation of metropolitan areas, inadequate affordable housing opportunities, and the spatial mismatch between affordable housing and job opportunities as grave consequences of sprawl¹. However, much of the smart growth literature has not focused on how these concerns can be remedied, or how they may be unintentionally worsened through new growth policies. Addressing race and social equity issues in growth decisions is particularly important as more local and state governments adopt smart growth measures. Creating a stronger connection between smart growth, affordable housing, and racial and social equity may help foster a more sustainable and just approach to growth and development.

¹See NNC, "Connecting Neighborhood and Region for Smarter Growth", and the associated annotated bibliography for a discussion of sprawl's impacts on low-income neighborhoods and communities of color. Authors reviewed included Bullard, Delgado, Marcuse, powell, and others. <http://www.neighborhoodcoalition.org>.

II. Smart Growth and Housing

The housing industry estimates that an additional 1.3 to 1.5 million housing units will be needed every year for the next ten years to accommodate a population that is expected to grow by 30 million people during that period (National Association of Home Builders). At the same time, our population is aging and becoming increasingly diverse. The smart growth movement is in part a response to the increasing awareness that current development patterns are not sustainable or adequate to meet the needs of a growing, changing population.

Smart growth is an alternative to sprawl that emphasizes more compact design, greater choice in transportation and housing, and a mix of land uses while promoting development that meets the economic, environmental, and social needs of all communities. The Smart Growth Network (which recently created an affordable housing sub-group) defines smart growth through a set of 10 principles that highlight land-use and design practices, the environment, and transportation issues (<http://www.smartgrowth.org>).

Smart growth calls for increasing housing options beyond traditional, single-family residential units; integrating housing with other commercial and industrial land uses and services; and refining design standards to make compact and mixed-use areas more attractive (Nelson, 2000). Compact, higher-density development is an important part of the smart growth formula. Alternatives to large lot single-family homes and other housing tools that are part of the smart growth toolbox include smaller lot sizes, more multi-family housing and attached homes, accessory units, mixed-use and transit-oriented development, cluster subdivisions, and zoning that permits all of these higher-density residential developments in all communities. Design features and amenities that might make higher density living more desirable have been an important focal point of the housing discussion. Location of

housing close to transportation options and employment centers is also a hallmark of smarter growth.

What about Affordability?

While many American households have benefited from the strong economy in recent years there is also a widening gap between those at the top end of the economic ladder and those at the middle and bottom. The inability of many workers to live near their work is a growing concern as an increasing proportion of the population struggles with the burden of rising housing prices and a dwindling supply of quality, affordable housing units². Lower income households are the most severely affected. According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) there are 5.4 million households with "worst case" housing needs³ (HUD, 2000). The National Low Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC) further substantiates these findings, reporting that there is no county, metropolitan area or state in the U.S. where a minimum wage worker can afford a 2-bedroom apartment at Fair Market Rent. Rural areas also are facing critical affordable housing shortages. According to the Housing Assistance Council, in 1995 about one in four rural households paid more than 30 percent of its monthly income for housing costs.

Until recently, the smart growth movement has focused primarily on the physical design and land use aspects of housing, rather than affordability, availability and supply. The first wave of smart growth initiatives has done little to address the housing needs of lower income people. While the advantages of smart growth that have been touted include more housing choice and location of housing near jobs, the issue of affordability has not been directly addressed, in most cases. As the housing crisis grows and affects a larger segment of American households, however, the impact of smart growth on housing costs has emerged as an important issue that is becoming a central focus of the smart growth debate. Important questions have

surfaced about how measures to attract middle- and upper-income residents and businesses to older, closer-in urban and suburban neighborhoods may affect the cost of housing and current residents in these communities.

Today, an increasing number of environmentalists and other smart growth advocates are awakening to the need to include affordable housing as a central component of smart growth and affordable housing providers and community development practitioners are increasingly making their voices heard in the debate. Recent smart growth ballot initiatives in Colorado and Arizona both were defeated, in part, because of concerns about possible negative effects on the long-term supply of affordable housing. In Colorado, for example, a Habitat for Humanity chapter was among the opposition to Amendment 24, the Responsible Growth Initiative, which would have required certain cities and counties to designate growth areas. The group objected because of fears that the measure would drive up land and housing prices in an already hot market (Myers and Puente, 2000).

²HUD defines very-low income as below 50% of Area Median Income (AMI).

Lower income is defined as 50-80 percent of AMI and moderate income as 80-100 percent of AMI.

³Worst-case housing needs are defined as very-low-income renter households that do not receive assistance and that pay more than 50 percent of their incomes toward rent or that live in severely substandard housing.

III. The Arguments: Can Smart Growth be Affordable?

A growing focus of the smart growth debate is how strategies to slow growth on the fringe and redirect development back to existing communities will accommodate the existing residents of those communities. Gentrification is a major concern. As regions change their development policies to incorporate smart growth strategies, such as mixed residential and retail land uses and transit-oriented development, neighborhoods that were formerly undesirable will become more attractive.

Community-based organizations (CBOs) and affordable housing and community development advocates express concerns about how to balance the need for revitalization that smart growth can bring with the potential for gentrification and displacement of existing residents⁴. To lower income households, smart growth represents a threat to an already tenuous grasp on housing. At a macro level, if one community or region adopts smart growth policies (improved public transportation systems, permanent open space, improved design standards, etc.) and another does not, then it is expected that the smart growth region would become more desirable and prices would go up there as a result of demand (Pendall, 2001). Concerns also have been raised about what effects restricting growth in outlying areas may have on low-income rural communities within these areas, if not done in concert with affordable housing strategies.

Smart growth and growth management advocates maintain that compact development, a key feature of smart growth, reduces infrastructure costs--especially in already developed areas. Construction and infrastructure costs are less for higher-density developments with a greater portion of attached units, thereby increasing affordability (Abbott, 1997; Burchell, 1997). In this case affordability depends on developers passing on the savings from reduced infrastructure and

construction costs to consumers. There also are savings associated with development near public transit. Households with better access to transit and less dependence on cars can potentially reduce their transportation costs and instead invest these savings into housing. Smart growth also may promote affordability by increasing housing choices beyond typical detached, single-family home developments to include attached units, accessory units, multi-family housing, and smaller homes.

Critics of smart growth argue that smart growth policies have the potential to increase housing costs. Some smart growth policies may reduce the amount of land available for housing by restricting growth in certain areas. If municipalities do not adjust land-use practices to accommodate higher densities, the result will be reduced affordability. In *Housing Policy Debate*, Karen Danielson, Robert Lang, and William Fulton caution that if smart growth policies that limit green-field development are not balanced with complementary measures for new growth in developed areas, "an affordable housing crisis could result" and these planning methods "could create new forms of segregation."

Some critics make market-based arguments against smart growth. They suggest that achieving increased affordability via higher densities is unlikely, since most Americans do not choose compact development and high density. The National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), while supporting policies that can increase more compact development, maintains that most Americans still would rather own a single-family home in a suburb, and that infill development will only meet a small percentage of demand for new housing⁵. Danielson, Lang, and Fulton suggest that design prescriptions such as large houses/rooms, expensive upgrades, and upscale multifamily housing, to get people to accept higher density in the inner suburbs, could exacerbate the shortage of affordable housing.

Authors also suggest different market interventions to manage growth. Some suggest that rather than regulating growth through what

they see as overzealous land-use policies, market-oriented approaches -- such as reducing regulatory barriers -- can create smart growth-compatible development with better efficiency and fewer negative side effects (Staley, Edgens and Mildner, 1999). Other authors propose different approaches, such as reducing public subsidies that promote sprawl and charging impact fees that require developers to pay up front for their fair share of infrastructure and public service costs (Dimond, 2000; Richmond, 1997).

⁴Downs (1999) warns that shifting growth to infill areas of central cities and older suburban neighborhoods could cause housing prices to rise, resulting in gentrification and displacement of low-income households; In their study of Washington, D.C., housing strategies, Turner and Rubin (2000) of the Urban Institute say that as a city becomes a more attractive place to live, there is a potential for increased housing costs and displacement of lower-income residents from high-demand neighborhoods if measures are not taken to balance this new demand; analysis by Harvard Joint Center's Sarah Karlinsky (2000) of community development and smart growth policies suggests that community-based organizations should be concerned about displacement in neighborhoods where affordable housing demand already exceeds supply. In neighborhoods with less pressure, community development corporations and others should be more concerned about attracting investment and stabilizing the neighborhood to stem population loss.

⁵Some researchers contend that our current housing market has failed to respond to the housing preferences and needs of many Americans and that it is not ultimately a "free market". Government policies, not the market, have promoted sprawl, large-lot development, urban disinvestment, unfair housing policies, and a lack of affordability (Bollier, 1998; Downs, 1994).

IV. The Evidence: Does Smart Growth Raise Housing Costs?

Research studies have explored the effectiveness of growth management and smart growth tools in slowing sprawl, preserving farms and green space, and improving transportation options. Many authors also have discussed the negative social, economic and environmental effects of low-density, sprawling land-use patterns. An examination of studies on the effects of smart growth on housing affordability is somewhat inconclusive, in part because there is limited research that explores the results of a comprehensive smart growth strategy on affordable housing. Where data exist, they often focus on growth management techniques or open space preservation initiatives that have not included affordable housing or other elements that are embodied in smart growth principles. While additional research is needed, existing studies strongly suggest that smart growth is not the cause of high housing costs or affordable housing shortages.

Portland, OR, with its urban growth boundary (UGB), has been the most examined and is the oft-cited example of growth controls leading to rising housing costs. The argument is that Portland's UGB has made land scarce and, consequently, has driven up housing prices within the boundary. Samuel Staley, Jefferson Edgens, and Gerard Mildner of the Reason Public Policy Institute looked at amounts of vacant land available for development and housing prices since the UGB was put in place. They found that after recovering from a depressed housing market in the 1980s, housing prices began to rise in Portland. The authors claim that, "By restricting the supply of vacant land and forcing development into higher cost, inner-city locations, the boundary is contributing to Portland's housing price appreciation and potentially reducing overall housing quality by making homes less affordable." They go on to argue that despite increases

in density, the amount of land available for development has declined.

NAHB has consistently ranked the Portland region near the bottom of its Housing Opportunity Index, which compares recent single-family home sales with local median salaries to determine what percentage of the homes on the market someone who is earning the median salary could purchase. This rating has been used repeatedly to suggest that the UGB is the cause of Portland's high housing costs⁶ (Young, 1999).

Others who have studied the Portland example argue that the UGB is not to blame for an affordable housing shortage in Portland but that conventional housing market dynamics and above average growth in employment and population are better explanations for this trend. One Thousand Friends of Oregon, a statewide growth management advocacy group, argues that changes in housing prices are the result of many factors, including land prices, and hard and soft development costs, such as installing water and sewer lines, utilities, system development charges, and architecture fees. The argument that a limited land supply will cause housing prices to rise is flawed, they say, since an unlimited land supply does not assure affordable housing. They also contend that homebuilders are choosing to build more expensive units.

Justin Phillips and Eban Goodstein from Lewis and Clark University add it is possible that popular perceptions of an UGB-induced land shortage have fed speculation. Nonetheless, average lot sizes of new residences in Portland have decreased and the high rates of infill and redevelopment within the growth area have not jumped beyond the growth boundary. Although housing prices in Portland rose faster than the national average, they were not high compared to similarly sized western cities. Salt Lake, for example, had the highest increase in prices and no UGB or supply side constraints (Phillips and Goodstein, 1998). Likewise, Henry Richmond, former Chair of the Growth Management Leadership Alliance, points out that housing prices in Portland are half those in Silicon Valley and slightly less than in

Examples of Smart Growth and Growth Management Initiatives

Portland and the State of Oregon - Adopted in 1973, Oregon's state land-use planning regulations require every city and county plan to be in accordance with statewide planning goals, which include provisions for citizen involvement, land-use planning, transportation, agricultural lands, and housing. Planning Goal 10 (Housing) requires "fair share" housing policies to meet the needs of households of all income levels (1000 Friends of Oregon). Portland is perhaps best known for its urban growth boundary (UGB). The UGB encourages higher-density development within a line drawn around the metropolitan area. The area outside of the boundary is preserved for agricultural uses, open space, and lower-density development. The UGB is periodically reviewed and expanded. Metro, Portland's regional government, extended the boundary in 1997 in response to a housing needs analysis. Metro developed the 2040 Growth Concept Map and Regional Framework Plan, which smart-growth advocates say has succeeded in stemming sprawl and providing more housing options (Harmon, 2001).

Maryland's Smart Growth Program - It is designed to direct state resources to revitalize older developed areas, preserve valuable resources and open space lands, and discourage the continuation of sprawling development into rural areas. Most state infrastructure funding and economic development, housing and other program monies are limited to Priority Funding Areas that local governments designate for growth. There also are provisions to encourage infill develop-

ment, the re-use and preservation of older buildings, and revitalization efforts. However, there are no requirements for preservation of existing affordable housing units or production of new units in these areas as part of the program. Some have criticized the initiative on this account, particularly for failing to address the need for affordable housing in rural areas that fall outside of Priority Funding Areas (Axel-Lute, 1999; Rogers, 2001).

Florida - The 1985 Growth Management Act was developed to preserve environmental resources and reduce sprawl. The act includes measures to encourage compact development and housing affordability. Implementation varies from county to county, with some emphasizing conservation and others focusing more on affordable housing preservation (Anthony, 2000).

City of Austin, Texas - Here a smart growth matrix scoring system is used that allots points for each positive feature meeting city planning goals, such as proximity to mass transit, urban design characteristics, and compliance with nearby neighborhood plans. Affordable housing is encouraged but not required under the program. East Austin, a Mexican-American community near downtown, is facing rapid gentrification and is concerned that the escalating real estate values and potential for displacement have not been adequately addressed through the smart growth planning program (NNC, 2000).

Examples of State and Regional Affordable Housing Programs

California Tax Credit Program - In June 2000, the state of California reformed its tax credit program for affordable rental housing. The new program establishes a point system that prioritizes projects meeting sustainable development goals (such as walking distance to transit and schools) and projects in neighborhoods where housing is part of a comprehensive revitalization effort (Angelides, 2000).

Florida's Housing Trust Fund - Florida's Sadowski Coalition, led by 1000 Friends of Florida (a smart growth organization), advocated successfully for the creation of the state's Housing Trust Fund in 1992. Since passage, the Sadowski Act has generated \$1.01 billion of state funding for affordable housing through a ten cent increase statewide on a transfer tax on deeds (CCC, 1999).

Montgomery County, Maryland's Moderate Priced Dwelling Unit Ordinance - Between 12.5 and 15 percent of any new housing development with 50 or more units in this Maryland jurisdiction must be produced at prices affordable to moderate-income households (approximately 60% of the area median income). In exchange, builders receive a density bonus allowing them to build more units on a site than normally would be allowed under the county's zoning. (Burchell and Galley, 2000).

New Jersey Fair Housing Act - Every municipality in the state must meet a "fair share" of its region's needs for low-

and moderate-income housing. The law was developed as a result of the Mt. Laurel decision, which found that one- and two-acre minimum lot size requirements had the effect of excluding racial minorities and low-income residents from neighborhoods (Lawrence, 2001).

Minnesota's Inclusionary Zoning Legislation - This voluntary program provides incentives to builders willing to make 10 to 15 percent of units in new developments affordable to lower-income households. The Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Council, for example, funds developments where at least 15 percent of the owner-occupied units are affordable to households at or below 60 percent of the area annual median income and at least 10 percent of the rental units are affordable at or below 30 percent of the area annual median income (NNC, 2000).

Vermont Housing and Conservation Trust Fund - In 1987 state legislation was enacted creating a trust fund with the dual goal of providing affordable housing assistance and preserving farms and open space. The fund was created in response to escalating real estate prices that were displacing low-income tenants and pressuring farmers to sell their land. Since inception, the fund has helped more than 10,000 people with affordable housing and saved 165,000 acres of farms and open space (Axel-Lute, 1999).

Denver, another sprawling metropolitan area without a growth boundary. He cites high state property taxes and low incomes compared to other cities as the real problem.

David Rusk, a national expert on regional growth strategies, notes that until the 1990s, affordability was not a pressing issue in Portland (the UGB was designated in 1979). Affordability had been promoted through increases in multi-family housing construction and decreased single-family home lot sizes. In the mid-1980s, 77 percent of the region's households could afford to rent the median-priced, two-bedroom apartment. Further, according to the 1990 census, there was less concentrated poverty in Portland than in most metropolitan areas. In fact, Portland rated lowest among places with more than one million residents regarding segregation of poor households (Rusk, 1999). According to Rusk, rapid economic growth and demand for housing by newcomers - not UGB-induced land shortages - left Portland facing an affordable housing crisis by the 1990s.

Studies of growth management and smart growth in other areas also produce mixed results. Jerry Anthony's research on Brevard and Martin counties in Florida suggests that the state's Growth Management Act has raised housing costs. However, inconsistencies in the way jurisdictions implemented the act may have caused the variation in housing prices. For instance, higher impact fees and prepayment of fees required in Martin County contributed to higher costs there. In Brevard County, lower impact fees and a focus on affordable housing programs have curbed housing prices⁷.

An examination of regulatory reform in Colorado communities suggests that some land-use regulations, such as impact fees, zoning and subdivision controls, building codes and environmental protections, can contribute from 7 to 20 percent of the cost of an average new home (Clarion Associates, 1998). These may have the unintended effect of increasing housing prices if not used in conjunction with a comprehensive affordable housing strategy.

In his study of racial composition and diversity in the 25 largest metropolitan areas that use land-use controls, Rolf Pendall of Cornell University found that urban growth boundaries had no consistent effect on housing growth, type, or tenure; rental affordability; or racial composition. He did find that low-density zoning⁸ consistently reduced rental housing opportunities, limiting the number of black and Hispanic residents in neighborhoods (Pendall, 2000). Adequate public facility ordinances had an indirectly positive effect on racial inclusion.

Robert Burchell's (Rutgers University) examination of the economic effects of sprawl versus growth management in New Jersey suggests that in every category examined - public infrastructure, land consumption, fiscal impacts on government, and private housing - planned growth is less expensive than sprawl. Using a statewide housing cost model to compare housing prices, he found that "planned development relative to sprawl doesn't increase housing costs and, in fact, may afford a small (i.e., less than six percent) savings." He concludes that new housing prices would decrease in town "centers" where growth was encouraged since redevelopment and infill areas would have higher density and higher share of attached units than under sprawl (Burchell, 1997).

⁶For a discussion of the Housing Opportunity Index, see NAHB,

http://www.nahb.org/facts/hoi/2000_4Q/regional_rank.htm; Manvel, Evan. "Four Reasons NAHB's Housing Affordability Rankings Don't Tell Us What We Care About," <http://www.friends.org/resources/nahb.html>; and Young, Bob. "Portland's Housing Myth," <http://www.wweek.com/html/politics011399.html>.

⁷It is important to note that Florida's Growth Management Act requires every local government in the state to adopt a Housing Element that addresses adequate and affordable housing for all its current and future anticipated populations, and a Future Land Use Map that identifies adequate sites for affordable housing (See Pattison).

⁸Zoning that restricts residential densities to fewer than eight dwelling units per acre.

V. The Conclusions: Preserving Affordability as Part of Smart Growth

Smart growth, as endorsed by NNC, Smart Growth America, and other advocates (control of growth on the fringe with concurrent strategies for infill development and revitalization of existing neighborhoods), is still in the developing stages. While many economic models and arguments are used to explain the potential burdens or benefits of smart growth, many arguments about the impacts of smart growth on housing affordability are based on anecdotal evidence or analysis of isolated local growth management initiatives developed primarily to protect green space, farmland and environmentally sensitive areas instead of producing a balanced, regional approach to development. Because much of what is referred to as smart growth is actually a limited instead of a comprehensive and balanced approach toward growth management, there has been little data collection or systematic analysis of the impacts of regional or statewide smart growth initiatives. Furthermore, there has been little emphasis on the effects of smart growth on low-income communities. Much of the research measures the impact on property values and homeowners rather than on low-income and other renters, and looks at redevelopment of neighborhoods in terms of changes to "place" instead of impacts on or opportunities for current residents.

Many in the research and advocacy communities have suggested affordable housing strategies should be central to the type of regional planning needed to ameliorate sprawl and regional inequities. The authors clearly remind us that smart growth has the potential to contribute to the revitalization of our central cities, older suburbs, and rural communities. They also caution that the danger of gentrification and displacement must be specifically acknowledged and addressed. The research offers useful corrections for exclusionary, large-lot zoning practices and outdated zon-

ing policies. Findings in the literature also promote regional approaches to affordable housing production to ensure growth management policies do not inhibit the supply of such housing. The conclusion is not that smart growth has made matters worse for low-income individuals and families, but that adequate planning must be done to ensure this does not occur.

Regional Approaches and Coordination

Just as growth management and transportation planning require collaboration across jurisdictions, efforts to preserve affordability must be coordinated at the regional level to succeed. All local jurisdictions must be encouraged to provide their fair share of affordable housing. A combination of mandatory and voluntary programs is needed to promote affordable housing across a region. Mandatory programs are more effective at meeting need and result in more affordable units, but are less readily accepted by state legislatures, local governments, and private developers (Burchell, Listokin and Pashman, 1994). A good example of regional coordination is in Minneapolis and St. Paul. Affordable housing advocates there have promoted a regional systems approach, tying funding for transportation, and environmental and livable communities programs to a community's performance in providing affordable housing (Dewar and Barron, 2001).

Reverse Exclusionary Practices

Local governments and regional bodies must address the exclusionary nature of current land-use practices. This includes large-lot zoning that prohibits small lot, single-family homes; attached houses; and apartments. Jurisdictions may choose to pursue this type of development out of concerns that multi-family and low-income housing does not "pay for itself" in terms of tax revenues generated or cost of service provisions. However, according to the Multifamily Housing

Council, renter households place less burden on local infrastructure and schools. The Council also finds that the cost of providing public services decreases as density increases.

Communities that have adopted low-density-only zoning as a way to control growth have become more exclusive, leading to fewer African American and Hispanic residents, and shifting from multi-family and renter occupancy to owner-occupied, single-family homes. (Pendall, 2000). These rules play a significant role in causing the dominant pattern of sprawl and racial segregation found in most U.S. metro areas (Krefetz, 2001). Pendall urges alteration of low-density zoning while Ed Blakely of the University of Southern California recommends elimination of minimum housing size requirements; prohibitions against multi-family developments, or mobile- or manufactured-home restrictions; high impact fees; outdated city codes making it difficult to rehabilitate older buildings; and gated communities (Urban Land Institute, 1999). Many private landowners would benefit from elimination of exclusionary practices, but local elected officials know they often can maximize their tax base and please their established voting constituents by maintaining regulatory barriers.

The main recommendations from the reviewed literature for addressing exclusionary land-use policies are inclusionary zoning and regional, fair-share housing programs. Under inclusionary zoning, a developer builds affordable units in a new development or contributes to an affordable housing fund. Programs may be voluntary or mandatory, with incentives such as density bonuses or fee waivers offered in exchange for the affordable units. Typically an inclusionary zoning ordinance sets a minimum percentage of units in a development that can be purchased by households earning a selected percentage of the median area income. Inclusionary zoning has been credited with encouraging integrated communities and reducing sprawl by encouraging higher density (through provision of density bonuses for developers). While inclusionary zoning policies have great potential for

increasing regional mobility and the supply of affordable housing for lower-income residents, policies that require a very high percentage of affordable units or that mandate affordable housing plus more parking and landscaping may actually discourage this type of development.

Fair-share housing programs require local governments to zone land appropriate for and develop programs to meet the needs of low-income households. HUD could make its financial aid to local governments contingent on regional planning criteria such as requiring metropolitan regions to establish fair share allocations of low-income housing among communities and requiring every community to zone some land for multi-family housing (Downs, 2,000).

Better Land Use Tools

Compact development must be promoted, but compactness in itself is not enough. Urban growth boundaries and other green space preservation measures by themselves do not ensure that new development is both more efficient and affordable. Land-use regulations should enforce responsible land use and protect the health and safety of individuals while being flexible enough to promote affordable housing options throughout a region.

Other tools that local jurisdictions can use to improve development practices include density bonuses; performance-based or impact zoning (which regulate the impacts of a proposed development or activity rather than zoning land for a specific use); provisions for accessory dwelling units; transit-oriented development; cluster subdivisions; and transfer of development rights. There are multiple markets for infill development with a range of housing types, from multi-family to single-family homes; affordable to high-end housing; and mixed-income and mixed-use developments (Hudnut, 2000). Researchers at the University of North Carolina found in surveys using pictures of development options, consumers preferred higher-density development that combines smaller lots, smaller homes, mixed

housing types, parks and open space, narrower streets with sidewalks, and commercial development (Malizia and Goodman, 2000). While this traditional urban neighborhood may not apply to all communities (low-density, rural areas, for example), planners and elected officials should be aware that a range of density and design options are possible.

Address Gentrification

Gentrification is a primary concern among housing advocates who have opposed smart growth policies. Infill and revitalization of older neighborhoods could cause housing prices to rise as these areas become more attractive to middle- and upper-income workers. Tools like inclusionary zoning and fair-share housing policies are an important step in preventing displacement of lower-income residents from existing neighborhoods. Others suggest tactics for community control of land and housing by using land trusts and the power of eminent domain, as well as provisions for replacement of demolished units as areas are redeveloped (PolicyLink, 2000).

In Portland, the Coalition for a Livable Future has promoted replacement ordinances in order to rebuild affordable housing lost to demolition; condo conversion ordinances in order to regulate conversion of affordable rental housing to ownership and provide protection for tenants; and permanent affordability in exchange for public subsidy as ways to prevent displacement.

Florida Atlantic University/Florida International University's Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems recommends a number of tools to prevent displacement including land assembly by community-based organizations (to join contiguous vacant parcels); land banking to provide affordable development in the future; community land trusts; and a range of affordable housing types and assistance including credit counseling, homeownership incentives, and rental opportunities.

Increased production of affordable homes and apartments is essential since preservation of

existing affordable units cannot meet demand (see HUD and NLIHC figures on page 5).

Provide Choices and Increased Supply for Lower-Income Workers and Families

Homeownership opportunities for lower- and moderate-income households must be expanded by allowing for smaller new homes; providing support for rehabilitation of homes in existing neighborhoods; aggressively enforcing fair housing and lending laws; and increasing access to housing finance. While inclusionary housing practices can impact the location of affordable housing, local, and especially state and federal governments, must address the pressing need for an increase in the supply of affordable homes, apartments, and mortgages.

Multi-family housing is particularly important to smart growth strategies. Nearly a third of all households are renters, and the number of people who rent by choice is increasing (National Multifamily Housing Council, 2001). The Multifamily Housing Council points out that apartment developments are compatible with smart growth goals by reducing traffic, contributing to a community's economic vitality, and decreasing local infrastructure costs. Pendall says multi-family housing is an important part of the smart growth equation for communities of color since it tends to be rented and that nationally only 45 percent of black and Hispanic residents own their homes compared to nearly 70 percent of non-Hispanic whites (Pendall, 2000). An adequate supply of attached housing is important as well, since it tends to be rented and, when sold, to be more affordable than detached housing.

Include Community-Based Organizations

Community-based organizations (CBOs) are not only an important provider of affordable housing, they can be an important resource to local officials, planners, and for profit developers

in promoting smart growth. Abbott found that consensus building and political will were key to the success of Portland's Metro regional government. A coalition of community-based organizations has been important in promoting affordable housing as a goal of Portland's growth management policies (Harmon, 2001). Karlinsky suggests that CBOs might address at the social and political levels potential community clashes between existing residents and those seeking to invest in older neighborhoods (Karlinsky, 2000).

VI. Affordable Housing and Regional Vision: National Neighborhood Coalition's Recommendations

When community-based organizations and residents of low-income neighborhoods are actively involved in policy development and decision-making, smart growth becomes a potentially powerful tool for both curbing sprawl and revitalizing distressed communities without displacement. Both housing and smart-growth advocates are becoming more aware of the need to link affordable housing to discussions about smart growth and regional growth management. There is an opportunity to build support for regional strategies that address both the housing affordability crisis and the negative social, environmental, and economic impacts of sprawl. The research offers many suggestions to strengthen the affordable housing - smart growth connection. There is no one size fits all approach but a range of tools and strategies are available.

The National Neighborhood Coalition suggests a combination of measures that promote a regional approach to affordable housing and address exclusionary practices that severely limit the availability and affordability of housing for low-income and people of color as the most powerful approach to combating both the supply shortage and the NIMBY (Not In My Backyards) attitudes that are roadblocks to creating healthy, diverse, mixed income communities. Local, state, and national advocates for both affordable housing and smart growth should also consider the following recommendations as they look for ways to make their neighborhoods and regions more livable.

Recommendations For Local, State and Federal Government

Address Exclusionary Development Practices

Federal Incentives NNC proposes that the federal government promote the use of inclusionary zoning at state and regional levels. Rather than direct involvement in local planning, the federal role would be limited to providing incentives (such as grants) to states that revise planning and zoning laws to enable inclusionary zoning at the local level, or directly to local jurisdictions that adopt inclusionary ordinances or regional fair share programs and associated regional planning. Federal incentives could be linked to existing HUD programs or could be a separate initiative designed to encourage a fair-share approach to affordable housing.

Local, Regional, and State Measures.

Local elected officials, planners, and community-based organizations should promote the use of inclusionary zoning and fair-share housing policies. Montgomery County, MD is one of the many examples of local and state governments that have adopted such measures. A combination of voluntary and mandatory measures can be used to increase support for the policies and ensure production of affordable housing. Such policies should address the need for housing affordable at all income levels and particularly moderate, low, and very-low incomes.

While impact fees can be important means of making the true cost of development transparent (such as loss of open space and increased traffic congestion), they also may have an unintended exclusionary effect, particularly when the same fee is applied regardless of unit size or income level. The effect of such fees can be equalized by reducing the charge for smaller homes and apartments or for units that are targeted to lower-income tenants or buyers. Impact

fees, like other land-use tools, must be used within a comprehensive regional strategy that includes provisions for affordable housing.

States can play a lead role in supporting inclusionary zoning practices by adopting enabling legislation, as has been done in California and New Jersey, or requiring municipalities to demonstrate how they will accommodate the need for affordable housing. In California, municipalities must show through both a housing plan and a land-use plan how they will accommodate their share of the region's need for new housing for all income levels.

Encourage Planning for Regional Affordable Housing and Smart Growth

NNC encourages an integrated approach to housing and smart growth that looks at housing in the context of whole communities, and communities in the context of larger regions. Smart growth provides an important opportunity to make connections between housing, jobs, transportation, open space, and schools. A holistic approach to smart growth, affordable housing, and community development will, ultimately, help strengthen communities and build a better support system for affordable housing programs.

State and Federal Incentives for Regional Planning. States should provide incentives for local governments, planners, and affordable housing providers to coordinate efforts to make regional affordable housing strategies an integral part of smart growth. Housing policies should balance affordable housing needs and availability at the neighborhood level with regional inclusionary housing strategies. Each local jurisdiction should be encouraged to provide its fair share of affordable housing. States can use point criteria for distribution of affordable housing tax credits to stimulate production of new affordable housing in proximity to transit, schools, and commercial areas.

The federal government should help local governments plan cooperatively for regional

affordable housing and smart growth. Through a number of programs HUD can promote regional affordability by rewarding local governments that cooperate regionally to provide affordable housing and involve community based-organizations in the process.

Local and state governments also must examine the unintended consequences of attempts to curb sprawl in outlying areas. According to the Housing Assistance Council, smart growth strategies that deny state and federal pass-through housing funds to rural areas as a way to slow growth tend to backfire. When rural areas are cut off from funding, development still occurs, but it tends to be affluent, large-lot development that doesn't require subsidies. Sprawl is not curbed and affordability is lessened (Rose, 2001). For example, One Thousand Friends of Maryland's Brad Rogers points out that in Maryland, "state funds are restricted for even such beneficial purposes as including affordable housing in an otherwise high income subdivision. There is a concern that this could exacerbate economic segregation, because the vast majority of affordable housing in Maryland is made possible through state funds" (Rogers, 2001).

Promote Better Planning and Land Use Tools at the Local and Regional Levels.

Government should provide incentives or direct resources for better planning and land use at the neighborhood and regional levels, including infill development; historic building preservation; amended building codes that promote redevelopment of existing affordable housing stock; mixed-use projects; brownfield redevelopment; mixed-income housing; transit-oriented development; and more compact design. States can play a critical role here: after Oregon adopted planning guidelines requiring localities to revise their zoning to reflect demographic changes and economic realities, Portland's average lot size was significantly reduced and the amount of land zoned for multi-family housing there quadrupled (Richmond, 1997). Non-profit housing sponsors can benefit by tapping these smart growth tools

and finding common ground with for-profit developers on inclusionary zoning and regulatory reform that allows for more compact development.

Keep the Community Involved: Promote the Role of Community- Based Organizations and Residents

The importance of including residents and community-based organizations representing low-income, central city, inner-ring, and rural communities in planning for smart growth cannot be overstated. Sprawl has bled central cities and older neighborhoods of tax base, people, and jobs. It has failed to provide adequate affordable housing, schools, public transportation or services to low-income neighborhoods and communities of color. Without the full participation of these residents from the beginning of any smart growth planning process, they may lose yet again.

Community development corporations, neighborhood associations, faith-based groups, labor unions, and other community organizations possess an intimate knowledge of neighborhood needs, attitudes, and concerns. They also possess the unique skills and expertise needed to develop and restore housing in older neighborhoods. These organizations should be included as partners in developing neighborhood and regional smart growth strategies that begin with affordable housing and anti-displacement measures. CBOs, nonprofit affordable-housing developers and intermediaries can help both define affordable housing needs and devise strategies to address them. These organizations can lead in building political consensus by joining regional coalitions and advocating for fair share housing as a central component of regional smart growth.

Community involvement from the beginning of a planning process can reduce resistance to affordable housing in those communities that are predominantly middle- or upper-income. Caren Dewar and Joanne Barron of the Metropolitan Council in Minneapolis-St. Paul say that encouraging people to engage in planning for

the future of their communities allows them to focus on the benefits of affordable housing rather than on their fears.

At the same time, community-based organizations (CBOs) should recognize the importance of educating themselves and the neighborhood residents they serve about the opportunities and responsibilities that come with smart growth. CBOs must reach out to other organizations and stakeholders, including planners, local officials, and business, to make sure that neighborhood and regional planning processes adequately address affordable housing needs. They also can help residents become involved in the planning and decision-making process about the type of development that is wanted by, and appropriate for, their community.

Increase Federal, State, and Local Funding for Affordable Housing

Smart growth should be a central component of HUD's strategies and programs for promoting affordable housing. Programs like the Community Development Block Grant, HOME, HOPE VI, and Enterprise Communities/Empowerment Zones already are directing resources to distressed areas. When used in coordination with regional land-use strategies to control sprawl, these policies can become a powerful force for smart growth. Funding should be increased for these programs and others, such as the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, which has a proven track record of providing affordable housing. The USDA/ Rural Housing Service Section 502 direct loan program has been one of the most successful affordable housing programs for rural areas. The program also promotes compact development and protects wetlands, sensitive environments, farmlands, and historic places.

To address the current housing crisis, many national affordable housing and smart-growth advocates and local affordable housing developers are calling for federal support to help produce new affordable rental housing. NNC

supports dedicated funding for production of affordable housing as an important tool to promote local and regional affordable smart growth. States can also establish dedicated revenue sources for affordable housing. Vermont and Florida both have used trust funds to expand funding for affordable housing (see Page 10). The Center for Community Change estimates that there are more than 130 Housing Trust Funds now operating nationwide.

Another program states and local governments can use is a redevelopment set-aside, such as California's Redevelopment Law that requires 20 percent of tax increment revenue to be used to provide housing for low- and moderate-income households. Beyond direct methods of financing affordable housing, federal, state, and local funds can be used to build infrastructure that supports affordable housing. Non-profit and private-sector affordable housing developers could receive support through such programs. For example in Florida, local governments may waive or pay impact fees and expedite all permitting for affordable housing (Ross, 2001).

Recommendations For Community-Based Organizations, Nonprofit Housing Developers and Smart Growth Advocates:

Build New Alliances

Environmentalists and other smart growth supporters are recognizing the importance of making affordable housing a central component of smart growth. Other constituencies, including employers, labor, faith-based organizations, and anti-poverty advocates, have a stake in making sure approaches to growth incorporate affordable housing strategies. There is an opportunity to build new coalitions with these constituencies, and a broader base of support for current affordable housing programs and new approaches to providing housing choices for peo-

ple at varying income levels. Abbott points out that consensus building has been key to the success of Metro's planning efforts in Portland. Conflict negotiation and consensus-building efforts have caused changes in zoning and affordable housing policies in Norfolk, VA, and Hartford, CT (Field, 1997). Karlinsky suggests that community-based organizations and intermediaries can play an important role in these efforts by facilitating discussions and helping resolve conflicts between existing residents and those who want to reinvest in older neighborhoods. CBOs can help forge new relationships by educating neighborhood residents and organizations about the connections between affordable housing and smart growth policies as well as between neighborhood concerns and regional growth dynamics.

Link Affordable Housing to Smart Growth

Few of the hundreds of smart growth ballot measures and legislative proposals in recent years have addressed affordable housing. This missed opportunity is significant. Providers of, and advocates for, affordable housing can't afford to sit on the sidelines as others in their region or state make decisions regarding future growth and development. Local, state, and national advocates must make a concerted effort to link housing to growth discussions.

Advocating for smart growth measures that include affordable housing at their core can be part of a larger effort to move toward more comprehensive community development. Community development corporations and other community organizations can embrace smart growth as a way to move beyond traditional housing-focused neighborhood work to encompass a wider spectrum of issues including transportation, open space, schools, and environmental justice.

Affordable housing advocates have legitimate concerns about gentrification and displacement stemming from smart growth. As authors point out, without concerted efforts to preserve and expand affordable housing stock, measures to control outward growth and direct development into central cities and older neighborhoods may raise housing costs. At this time, however, little research has been done about the effects of smart growth on housing costs. As smart growth measures continue to be implemented, impacts on affordable housing (and other outcomes) should be assessed.

NNC and its members are working with the Smart Growth Network to develop a report on policies and strategies that foster both smart growth and affordable housing. Smart Growth America, a national coalition of smart growth advocates, also is conducting research on the relationship between smart growth and affordability.

VII. Conclusions

Housing is a keystone of a healthy community. Quality, affordable housing - along with good schools and public safety - is an important indicator of a community's vitality and ability to attract residents of all ages and income groups. As the nation's population continues to grow and become more diverse, housing will play an increasingly important role in shaping opportunity and building community. Too many low-income and people of color are living in substandard housing, and in neighborhoods of concentrated poverty and isolation from economic opportunity and the mainstream of society. Racially segregated and economically isolated communities impose a high economic and social cost in terms of poverty, crime, health, and poor educational outcomes. Alternatively, mixed income communities are more stable, have more political and financial resources, less need for expensive social services, and provide a safer, healthier environment for children and families.

A strong commitment to affordable housing with linkages to jobs, schools, transportation, and a healthy environment are the underpinnings of a sustainable approach to development and to providing more people with greater opportunities for escaping poverty. Community, neighborhood and faith based organizations play a crucial role in forging these linkages.

As interest in smart growth has increased, so have concerns about its potential negative impacts on affordable housing. While smart-growth advocates argue that more compact development may ultimately increase affordability, others maintain that urban growth boundaries and other smart-growth tools drive up housing prices by restricting land supply. Community-based organizations and affordable-housing advocates are concerned that directing growth into existing urban, suburban and rural communities may displace current residents.

Existing literature indicates smart growth policies generally have not adversely impacted

the affordable housing supply. However, more can be done to promote regionally available affordable housing through inclusionary zoning, regional fair-share programs, enforcement of fair housing laws, and preservation of existing affordable housing stock. Most growth management and smart growth programs focus on preserving green spaces, farmland, and natural resources instead of using regional planning to balance these concerns with preserving or producing affordable housing. Regional affordable housing strategies must be an integral part of any smart growth strategies. Efforts to stop sprawl and direct growth into existing areas will not automatically create affordable housing opportunities; there must be a conscious commitment to affordable housing preservation and production on the part of local governments and regional planning bodies. Smart growth policies also need to be proactive, taking steps to address the racial and social inequities caused by sprawl.

Additional research is needed to determine the effects of comprehensive smart growth strategies on low-income communities, people of color, and housing affordability. Resolving these issues is important for building relationships and cooperation between smart growth advocates and affordable housing activists to create a stronger, more inclusive movement for more sensible growth practices. It is imperative if we are to maintain affordability and prevent displacement of lower-income residents as growth is directed toward our towns, central cities, and inner-ring suburbs.

Bibliography

- 1000 Friends of Oregon, World Wide Web Page. Affordable Housing, <http://www.friends.org/house.html>.
- Abbott, Carl. "The Portland Region: Where City and Suburbs Talk to Each Other - and Often Agree". Housing Policy Debate 8, Issue 1 (1997):11-51.
- American Planning Association. World Wide Web Page, Planning Research Highlights. <http://www.planning.org/plnginfo/highlite.html>.
- Angelides, Philip. "Smart Investments: From Ideas to Action." Debt Affordability Report, California State Treasurer's Office. Oct. 2000.
- Anthony, Jerry. "Impacts of Florida's Growth Management Act on Housing Prices and Affordability: Questions for Statewide Smart Growth Policies," Draft, Fannie Mae Fair Growth Conference, Nov. 2000.
- Axel-Lute, Miriam. "A Meeting of Movements." Shelterforce. National Housing Institute, Jan./Feb. 1999, www.nhi.org/online/issues/103/axellute.html.
- Blakely, Ed. "Smart Rules for Smart Growth: Housing as if Tomorrow Matters." Housing in the 21st Century: A Symposium Sponsored by the Urban Land Institute and the Center for Housing Policy. http://www.uli.org/Pub/Media/A_issues/A_HoL3_Sym.pdf. 1999.
- Burchell, Robert. "Economic and Fiscal Costs (and Benefits) of Sprawl." The Urban Lawyer, Spring, 1997:159-181.
- Burchell, Robert W. and Catherine C. Galley. "Inclusionary Zoning: Pros and Cons." New Century Housing, 1 Issue 2: October 2000.
- Burchell, Robert W., David Listokin and Arlene Pashman. Regional Housing Opportunities for Lower-Income Households: A Resource Guide to Affordable Housing and Regional Mobility Strategies. Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research. For the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research. 1994.
- Center for Community Change. News From the Housing Trust Fund Project. Winter 2000-2001.
- Clarion Associates of Denver, Colorado. "Reducing Housing Costs Through Regulatory Reform: A Handbook for Colorado Communities." Prepared for the Colorado Division of Housing. June 1998.
- Danielson, Karen A., Robert Lang and William Fulton. "What Does Smart Growth Mean for Housing," Housing Facts and Findings, 1 No. 3: Fall 1999.
- Dewar, Caren and Joanne Barron. 2001. "Building a Regional System to Support Livable and Competitive Communities: A Response to the Affordable Housing Crisis." Presented at the American Planning Association Conference, New Orleans, LA. March, 2001.
- Dimond, Paul "Empowering Families to Vote with their Feet." in Reflections on Regionalism, Bruce Katz, ed. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. 2000.
- Downs, Anthony. "Housing Policies in the New Millennium." Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution. Presented at HUD Conference on Housing Policy in the New Millennium. Washington, D.C.: October 3, 2000.
- Downs, Anthony. New Visions for Metropolitan America. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1994.
- Downs, Anthony. "Some Realities about Sprawl and Urban Decline." Housing Policy Debate, 10, Issue 4 (1999): 955-974.
- Downs, Anthony. "What Does 'Smart Growth' Really Mean?" Planning Practice. American Planning Association. <http://www.planning.org/PUBS/plng01/april012.htm>. 2001.
- Field, Charles G. "Building Consensus for Affordable Housing." Housing Policy Debate, 8, Issue 4 (1997): 801-832.
- Florida Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems. "Development Without Displacement Handbook." Prepared for the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. August, 2000.
- Harmon, Tasha. "Oregon." In The Nimby Report: Smart Growth and Affordable Housing. National Low-Income Housing Coalition/LIHIS, Spring, 2001.
- Housing Assistance Council, World Wide Web Page, <http://www.ruralhome.org/pubs/infoshts/inforha.htm>.
- Hudnut, William. Commentary: Is urban infill development helpful or harmful? Urban Land Institute, World Wide Web Page. Bill Hudnut's Commentary, III, No. 3. http://www.uli.org/Pub/Pages/a_issues/Hudnut/Vol_03_No_03.htm.
- Karlinsky, Sarah. "Community Development Corporations and Smart Growth: Putting Policy into Practice." Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University/Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, 2000.
- Krefetz, Sharon Perlman. "The Impact and Evaluation of the Massachusetts Comprehensive Permit and Zoning Appeals Act: Thirty Years of Experience with a State Legislative Effort to Overcome Exclusionary Zoning." Western New England Law Review. Vol. 23. March, 2001.
- Lawrence, Barbara. "New Jersey." In The Nimby Report: Smart Growth and Affordable Housing. National Low-Income Housing Coalition/LIHIS, Spring, 2001.

- Malizia, Emil, and Jack Goodman. "Mixed Picture: Are Higher-Density Developments Being Shortchanged by Opinion Surveys?" *Urban Land*, July 2000.
- Myers, Phyllis and Robert Puentes. *Growth at the Ballot Box: Electing the Shape of Communities in November 2000*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. 2001.
- National Association of Home Builders. Statement of Policy on Smart Growth, www.nahb.org/main_features/smartpolicy.html.
- National Association of Realtors, Smart Growth resources, www.nar.realtor.com/gov/smartgrowth. Meeting the Challenge of Growth: A Blueprint for Realtor Action. 2000.
- National Multi Housing Council: Growing Smarter with Apartments: Toward More Livable and Prosperous Communities, <http://www.nmhc.org/smart/brochure/body.html>.
- National Neighborhood Coalition, "Connecting Neighborhood and Region for Smarter Growth." Washington, D.C.: NNC. 1999.
- National Neighborhood Coalition. Smart Growth, Better Neighborhoods: Communities Leading the Way. Washington, D.C.: NNC. 2000.
- Nelson, Arthur C. "Smart Growth and Housing Policy." Atlanta, GA: Georgia Institute of Technology. Presented at HUD Conference "Housing Policy in the New Millennium." Washington, D.C. October 3, 2000.
- Pattison, Charles. "Florida." In The Nimby Report: Smart Growth and Affordable Housing. National Low-Income Housing Coalition/LIHIS, Spring, 2001.
- Pendall, Rolf. "Local Land Use Regulations and the Chain of Exclusion." Journal of the American Planning Association. Spring 2000. 66(2):125-142.
- Pendall, Rolf. Cornell University, Department of City and Regional Planning. Telephone interview, June, 2001.
- Phillips, Justin and Eban Goodstein. "Growth Management and Housing Prices: The Case of Portland, OR." Contemporary Economic Policy 18, no. 3 (July 2000): 334-344.
- PolicyLink. Briefing Book: Strategies and Examples of Community-Based Approaches to Equity and Smart Growth. Oakland, CA. 2000.
- Richmond, Henry R. 1997. Comment on Carl Abbott's 'The Portland Region: Where City and Suburbs Talk to Each Other - and Often Agree.' Housing Policy Debate 8, no 1 (1997):#53-64.
- Rogers, Brad. "Maryland." In The Nimby Report: Smart Growth and Affordable Housing. Washington, D.C.: National Low Income Housing Coalition/LIHIS, May 2001.
- Rose, Amy. Housing Assistance Council. Telephone interview, May, 2001.
- Ross, Jaimie. "Growing Smarter Through Affordable Housing." In The Nimby Report: Smart Growth and Affordable Housing. National Low-Income Housing Coalition/LIHIS, Spring 2001.
- Rusk, David. Inside Game, Outside Game. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. 1999.
- Smart Growth Network, <http://www.smartgrowth.org>.
- Samuel R. Staley, Jefferson G. Edgens, and Gerard C.S. Mildner, Reason Public Policy Institute. "A Line in the Land: Urban-Growth Boundaries, Smart Growth, and Housing Affordability." Policy Study no. 263, November 1999. <http://www.rppi.org/urban/ps263.html>.
- Turner, Margery Austin, and Mark Rubin. "Towards a Balanced Housing Strategy for DC and Its Region." Washington, D.C.: Center for Metropolitan Housing and Communities, Urban Institute, August 2000.
- US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Office of Policy Research and Development. "Rental Housing Assistance, The Worsening Crisis: A Report to Congress on Worst Case Housing Needs." Washington, D.C., 2000.
- Young, Bob. "Portland's Housing Myth." Willamette Weekly, Jan. 13, 1999. <http://www.wweek.com/html/poltics011399.html>.

About the National Neighborhood Coalition

The National Neighborhood Coalition was founded in 1979 to provide a national voice for neighborhoods. NNC brings together the leading national organizations involved in affordable housing, neighborhood revitalization and social equity. Our mission is to promote socially and economically vibrant neighborhoods and strong and effective partnerships between community-based organizations and the public and private sector.

The National Neighborhood Coalition (NNC) launched its Neighborhoods, Regions, and Smart Growth project in July 1999. During the past two years, NNC has looked at the relationship between smart growth and low-income neighborhoods and the role of community, neighborhood, and faith-based organizations in connecting neighborhood revitalization and smart growth. NNC developed a set of Neighborhood Principles for Smart Growth that promotes regional equity and a strong community voice. NNC also published "Smart Growth, Better Neighborhoods, Communities Leading the Way," a set of case studies that document the efforts of community-based organizations to balance better regional growth policies with neighborhood-focused revitalization.

National Neighborhood Coalition Publications

"Smart Growth, Better Neighborhoods: Communities Leading the Way" - This study examines the ill effects of unchecked growth on low-income neighborhoods and communities of color and proposes strategies for community involvement in smart growth and development. The publication includes fifteen case studies of community-based organizations and coalitions working to connect neighborhood revitalization to regional growth issues.

"Connecting Neighborhood and Region for Smarter Growth" - A review of community development and smart growth literature, including an extensive annotated bibliography.

The Voice - The newsletter of the National Neighborhood Coalition is published ten times a year and includes summaries of NNC forums, issue updates from NNC members, news and information for and about NNC and its members, and listings of job openings, conferences, publications, grants, and other resources. Subscriptions start at \$25/year.

For more information about the National Neighborhood Coalition:

<http://www.neighborhoodcoalition.org>

1030 15th St. NW, Suite 325, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 408-8553

Other Resources

[American Planning Association, www.planning.org](http://www.planning.org) - The American Planning Association is conducting research that will result in a Planning Advisory Service Report entitled Regional Approaches to Affordable Housing. This report will focus on alternative strategies that states, regional agencies, local governments, and nonprofit organizations can pursue to encourage the production of a full range of housing types across a metropolitan region.

1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036 Myers, Phyllis and Robert Puentes. Growth at the Ballot Box: Electing the Shape of Communities in November 2000. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. 2001.

(202) 872-0611

[PolicyLink, www.policylink.org](http://www.policylink.org) - PolicyLink's Beyond Gentrification Tool Kit is designed to help communities plan for and steer new investments to their communities while avoiding displacement. PolicyLink and the Brookings Institution have also published Dealing with Neighborhood Change: A Primer on Gentrification. (See the Brookings Institution web page, <http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/>).

101 Broadway, 3rd Floor, Oakland, CA, 94607, (510) 663-9684

[Smart Growth Network, www.smartgrowth.org](http://www.smartgrowth.org) - The Smart Growth Network (SGN) helps create national, regional, and local coalitions to encourage metropolitan development that is environmentally, economically, and socially smart. It provides a forum for facilitating smart growth in neighborhoods, communities, and regions across the United States.

777 N. Capitol St. NE, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20002-4201, (202) 962-3591

[Smart Growth America, www.smartgrowthamerica.com](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.com) - SGA is a nationwide coalition promoting a better way to grow; one that protects farmland and open space, revitalizes neighborhoods, keeps housing affordable, and makes communities more livable.

1100 17th St. NW, 10th Floor, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 974-5157

National Neighborhood Coalition Board of Directors

Co-Chairs:

Thomas Shellabarger, United States Catholic Conference†
Susie Sinclair-Smith, Local Initiatives Support Corporation†

Founding Chair:

Raul Yzaguirre, National Council of La Raza

Vice Chairs:

Ken Grossinger, AFL-CIO‡
JoAnn Kane, McAuley Institute
Roy O. Priest, National Congress for Community Economic Development
British Robinson, Jesuit Conference USA†

Treasurer:

John Leith-Tetrault, National Trust for Historic Preservation

At-Large Members:

Mildred Brown, ACORN
Jane DeMarines, National American Indian Housing Council
Richard Dines, National Co-op Business Association

Ron Field, Volunteers of America
Allen Fishbein, Center for Community Change
Debby Goldberg, Center for Community Change
William Grinker, Seedco
Jeff Nugent, Development Training Institute‡
Irene Packer, National Puerto Rican Coalition
Brian Peterkin-Vertanesian, National Association of Community Action Agencies
Andy Rivas, Catholic Charities USA
Geraldine Schafer, National Council of La Raza †
Marcia Sigal, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials†
Bill Spriggs, National Urban League
Stockton Williams, The Enterprise Foundation†
Steve Tuminaro, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Carol Wayman, National Congress for Community Economic Development
Ellie Wegener, Employment Support Center
Nancy Willis, Unitarian Universalist Affordable Housing Corporation†

† *Indicates member of Smart Growth Committee*

‡ *Smart Growth Committee Co-Chair*

Smart Growth Committee Members

Noreen Beatley, Enterprise Foundation
Marcie Cohen, AFL-CIO Housing Investment Trust
Peter Hawley, American Planning Association
Mafruza Kahn, Good Jobs First
Greg LeRoy, Good Jobs First
Nhadine Leung, Seedco
Jane Maloney, Habitat for Humanity International

Elizabeth Pianca, National Trust for Historic Preservation
Shelley Poticha, Congress for the New Urbanism
Amy Rose, Housing Assistance Council
Walt Rybeck, Center for Public Dialogue
Julie Seward, Local Initiatives Support Corporation
Marvin Silver, UCC: Public Life and Social Policy
Colleen Wagner, National Assoc. of Comm. Action Agencies

National Neighborhood Coalition Staff

Betty Weiss, Executive Director
Janice Clark, Program Coordinator
Leah Kalinosky, Coordinator, Neighborhoods, Regions & Smart Growth Project
Greg Millwater, Intern