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Introduction
The development of affordable housing is often a contest between conflicting assumptions, interests, and fears. Primarily, the contest is rooted in several interrelated factors that contribute to the NIMBY (“not in my backyard”) reaction: anti-government sentiment; anti-poor sentiment; racial prejudice and segregation; and, fear of adverse impacts. It is very important to recognize that the contest over affordable housing is not one-dimensional (Pendall, 1999) and occasionally is not rational (i.e. subject to reason). In some cases concern over adverse impacts as a justification for opposition to affordable housing may be a smokescreen for deeper conflicts over a just society and the role of government. But smokescreen or real, the fear of adverse impacts and questions about the benefits of affordable housing have to be addressed before increased levels of production are achieved.

Although several groups have reported progress in promoting community acceptance of affordable housing, the issues are too complex to simplify in a “best practices” review. We propose a comprehensive review of the NIMBY issue that addresses, in sequence, defining affordable housing and NIMBY, the various dimensions of community opposition, developers’ and advocates’ approaches to overcoming NIMBY, and community approaches to overcoming NIMBY. We will conclude with a critique of development-specific approaches and systematic community approaches, with special attention to the role of fiscal impact in local government opposition to affordable housing.

Outline and Description of Approach

I. Defining Affordable Housing and NIMBY
II. Review of Community Opposition and NIMBY
   a. Perceived Negative Impacts and Community Opposition
      i. Anti-Government Sentiment and Past Failures of Housing Programs
      ii. Anti-poor Sentiment
      iii. Racial Prejudice and Segregation
      iv. Adverse Impact of Affordable Housing
         1. Anticipated Negative Externalities
         2. Research on Property and Neighborhood Impacts of Affordable Housing
   b. Demographics and Community Acceptance
   c. Design and Community Acceptance—New Urbanism
   d. Fiscal Impact and Community Acceptance
III. Review of Developers’ and Advocates’ Approaches to Overcoming NIMBY
   a. Identification of Approaches and Cases
   b. Property Design and New Urbanism
   c. Community Outreach and Public Relations
   d. Tenant Selection and Property Management
   e. Litigation and Threats of Litigation
IV. Review of Community Approaches to Overcoming NIMBY
   a. Fair Share, Inclusionary Zoning, and Affordable Housing Programs
   b. Fair Growth
      i. Smart Growth and Inclusionary Housing
      ii. Workforce Housing
      iii. Fair Growth
   c. Affordable Housing and Schools: The Role of Fiscal Impact in Local Government Decisions
   d. Project versus System Approaches
V. Strategies to Increase the Acceptance of Affordable Housing
**Defining Affordable Housing and NIMBY**

Affordable housing is a vague term that needs to be defined, keeping in mind it is rarely meant to have a precise meaning. Obviously, most housing is affordable to its occupants, which is often interpreted as not exceeding 30% of the household’s income. Only a minority of consumers has serious difficulty in finding affordable housing in the market. Income is the primary determinant of effective market demand and housing statistics show that the upper half of the income distribution generally has little difficulty in obtaining housing in the market place. The situation is complicated with the presence of various special needs, such as physical or mental disabilities, the frail elderly, large families, and rural isolation.

More precisely, “affordable housing” has become the term of preference among housing advocates when referring to publicly assisted housing production. Since the Public Housing program has virtually no funding for new production and the Section 8 production program was discontinued in 1986 (after just ten years of operation), “affordable housing” today mostly refers to units developed under the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (often with additional assistance from the HOME and CDBG programs). Additional programs would include those addressing shelter needs of special populations.

Except for the special needs programs, affordable housing production today is targeted at the working poor and the lower-middle class, not those in extreme poverty. Affordable housing programs are primarily serving those who work one or two minimum wage jobs, clerical workers, and modest wage (or salary) earners in retail trade, services, and the public sector. Popular perception might be quite different, however, particularly when shaped by past housing programs.

Shifts in housing production during the past two decades have further complicated the national and local contexts for affordable housing. Multi-family housing production, the primary source of affordable housing, dropped significantly during the 1990s and continues at low levels compared to growth in demand. During a period of substantial increase in population growth, net foreign immigration, the entry of the “echo” population into the housing market, and real increases in rents, multi-family housing production has remained sluggish. Although the 1986 tax act significantly reduced investment in multi-family housing, subsequent production levels appear inadequate to meet the number of units required for growth and replacement. The now widespread perception among local governments that multi-family housing has a negative impact on the local treasury might be contributing to underproduction of all multi-family housing, whether assisted or not.

**Community Opposition and NIMBY**

A balanced and reasoned approach to the costs and benefits of affordable housing has to recognize that perceptions of affordable housing have been shaped over time. The performance of affordable housing policy too often has been negative and there have been few clear successes spanning nearly three-quarters of a century. It is disingenuous to expect the general public to readily embrace affordable housing programs when the track record in delivering affordable housing has been so often a failure. One need only look to the Public Housing program for evidence of government failure. Direct government provision is not the only arena of failure. Private, for-profit provision through the Section 8 New Construction and Substantial Rehabilitation Program suffered from lax governmental supervision, allowing diversion of maintenance expenditures to owners’ profits. Again, an affordable housing program became synonymous with poor quality housing.

It is improper to tar the entire stock of affordable housing created by these programs with the same brush. Much of what was created continues to provide decent and affordable housing. But affordable housing policy has been plagued by too many failures to ignore its history.
Although public policy, poor program design, and inadequate administration of housing programs have caused the lion’s share of problems with previous affordable housing programs, personal responsibility and conduct also play roles. There are tenants who vandalize properties, who litter, who take almost no care of their units, and who are hostile toward their neighbors. Housing programs have to be administered such that the people served know their responsibilities and act accordingly. The public will be hesitant to support programs that do not foster personal responsibility. Managers of affordable housing must demonstrate that they are effective in enforcing the lease and do not hesitate to evict tenants who violate community rules.

The experience of the Gautreaux program is instructive (Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum, 2000). The challenge of relocating inner-city public housing residents to suburban locations is somewhat similar to the challenges facing affordable housing production in the suburbs. The Gautreaux program implicitly recognized the issue of tenant responsibility in selection of participants. Applicants had to demonstrate a history of paying the rent on time and of keeping their apartments clean. Large families were excluded. Enough tenants would be relocated to a neighborhood to reduce the stress of being socially isolated, but not enough to threaten the neighborhood.

To some extent the problem of tenant selection is eased due to the shallower subsidies (and higher incomes) associated with contemporary production programs. Most of the affordable housing being produced today is affordable only to the working poor and lower middle class (mainly between 50 to 60 percent of the area median family income). This shift in the demographic composition of affordable housing likely creates greater opportunities for community acceptance. It also emphasizes the need to distinguish among affordable housing “products” in terms of occupancy characteristics as well as design and management.

Fear of adverse neighborhood impacts is the easiest of aspect of the NIMBY reaction to address. Neighborhood impacts can be diverse and difficult to measure, but they are likely to be reflected in impacts on property values, which become a surrogate measure for any combination of negative externalities associated with affordable housing. Simply stated, the fear of adverse impacts is that affordable housing will reduce values of adjacent and nearby properties. Galster (2002) has recently reviewed this literature for NAR.

Physical design at the building and subdivision levels is a two-edged sword for affordable housing. Urban communities long have excluded the most affordable housing product, the manufactured home, due to its stereotyped design features (despite much greater design options in the contemporary manufactured project). Demonstration projects have documented the ability to adapt manufactured housing into subdivision development so that it is indistinguishable from “site-built” housing (HUD, 1997; Mays, 1998). New Urbanism promotes the benefits of a more traditional neighborhood design that incorporates mixed-use and mixed-incomes. At the same time, communities can use design standards to ratchet up costs, making affordable housing more difficult to develop.

Perhaps the strongest source of community resistance relates to the nearly universal assumption that housing in general, and affordable housing in particular, costs more in municipal services than the taxes it generates. This “fiscal-impact” calculus has reached almost mythic proportions, despite rather weak empirical tests. We will review the role of fiscal impact, along with its theoretical and empirical merits, as a source of community opposition to affordable housing.
Developers’ and Advocates’ Approaches to Overcoming NIMBY

A variety of approaches used by developers and advocates to overcome NIMBY can be identified in the literature. In addition to the standard databases, we will review information from several key organizations, such as:

- The Funders Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities
- National Low Income Housing Coalition
- Fannie Mae Foundation
- HUD’s regulatory barriers clearinghouse web site.
- Building Better Communities Network
- National Multi Housing Council
- National Affordable Housing Management Association
- Department of Justice list of Fair Housing Cases

A strain of literature advocating greater community acceptance of affordable housing investigates (or promotes) the role of physical design (Ross, 2001). New urbanism and livable communities concepts have promoted mixed-use and mixed-income developments. Fairfax County’s “Great House” design is another example of design promoting community acceptance within single-family subdivisions (Regulatory Barriers Clearinghouse Web page). Research on the relationship between design and community acceptance includes Gindroz, Bothwell and Lang, 1998, which looks at how New Urbanist design better integrated residents into a neighborhood and lowered community resistance to public housing.

Strategies promoting community acceptance through outreach and public relations can be identified and reviewed, although empirical research on effectiveness is generally unavailable. For example, the Maine State Housing Authority sponsored an “advertising campaign portraying firefighters, teachers, and nurses as unable to find affordable housing in the communities where they work” and the San Francisco Organizing Project developed the “YIMBY”—Yes In My Backyard—initiative (Bell, 2002). The Managing Local Opposition approach (MLO) developed by the Community Acceptance Strategies Consortium (CASC) is a more comprehensive approach using political and community organizing as well as legal and public relations strategies (Iglasias, 2002). CASC is a San Francisco based consortium that has trained over 200 developers, advocates and local government representatives in gaining acceptance of more than 20 affordable housing developments in the region.

Tenant selection, education and property management can be expected to influence the functioning of affordable housing programs, but documentation of practices is lacking in part due to legal liabilities. There is a fine line between legitimate selection criteria and exclusionary practices subject to legal or political challenge (e.g. US v. Starritt City). Nonetheless, the Gautreaux experience, the Moving to Opportunity Program and the HOPE VI program have stressed the importance of tenant selection and education in the promotion of mixed-income developments. We will review the literature documenting and analyzing these experiences.

Litigation can be used as a last resort or as a preemptory strike to silence potential opposition, particularly when fair housing or disabilities issues are involved. The Mt. Laurel case launched years of litigation and statutory responses in New Jersey. The Olmstead case is pressuring state and local governments to actively address the needs of disabled citizens for independent housing. A few court cases have found local zoning decisions against affordable housing in violation of the Fair Housing or American for Disabilities Acts (Allen, 2002). Local government initially rejected the Westminster affordable housing community outside of Tampa, Florida, until the developer filed a lawsuit (Evans, 2002). Currently, the US Supreme Court is considering City of Cuyahoga Falls v. Buckeye Community Hope Foundation (Allen, 2003; Citrino, Allen and Schaffer, 2002) that challenges the city’s rejection of an affordable housing development. Additionally, there have been various reports of the use of threatened legal action under the Fair Housing Act to silence community opposition to housing developed for various protected classes.
Community Approaches to Overcoming NIMBY
Community approaches to overcoming NIMBY range from incentive programs for developing affordable housing to growth management programs that require affordable housing to be addressed in comprehensive planning. The programs can be fragmented and piece-meal or systemic and integrated.

The most prominent of the incentive programs are known as "fair-share" and "inclusionary." Fair share programs were introduced in the 1970s and were designed to distribute publicly assisted housing throughout a metropolitan community. Listokin (1976) provides a thorough review of these programs. However, fair share programs have been abandoned or substantially weakened recently and no new programs have been introduced (with the exception of court-ordered dispersion programs). Fair share approaches are probably immaterial without a deep-subsidy production program.

Inclusion programs primarily require or encourage developers to include affordable housing in their developments. Increased density is the typical incentive. The premier inclusion program is in Montgomery County, Maryland, where the Moderate Priced Dwelling Unit ordinance dates to 1974 and is credited with creating over 10,000 units in two and a half decades. Developments of 50 or more dwelling units are required to set aside 12.5 to 15 percent of units for occupancy by households with incomes at or below 65 percent of the area median family income. Since 2000, a minimum of income of $20,000 was required for owners.

Several authors, most notably Rusk (1999), have touted the Montgomery County program and inclusionary zoning in general. However, inclusion has primarily been adopted in communities where land use regulations have artificially increased the cost of housing. Pollakowski and Wachter (1990) estimated that regulatory and scarcity effects related to land use planning in Montgomery County increased housing prices 28 percent. Even if higher prices are the result of the higher quality of life created by development restrictions in Montgomery County, the price impacts remain. From this perspective, inclusion is a perverse response by local government to the housing scarcity it helps create. By inadequately planning and zoning for residential demand, the local government contributes to the high housing costs that prompt the adoption of inclusion. Whether or not one accepts this argument, the impact of inclusion on affordable housing is minor. Even in Montgomery County, with the most widely recognized program in the country, production of "affordable" housing has average less than 400 units per year. Most of these have been for owner occupancy and less than 4000 units continue to be restricted to "affordable" occupancy. The bulk of demand for affordable housing is in the multi-family, rental housing market, where zoning restrictions are most severe. In a market of over 350,000 housing units, the gross impact of the program is below 3 percent and the net impact is only 1 percent.

We will address the role of incentive programs in promoting community acceptance, as well as their potential to contribute to the scarcity of affordable housing. For example, to the extent that the MPDU program takes Montgomery County officials and planners off the housing-scarcity hook, it might be a disservice to very goal of affordable housing it supposedly advances.

Workforce housing is a potentially potent argument to promote acceptance of affordable housing. School teachers, police officers, licensed practical nurses, retail salespersons, janitors and construction workers are often priced out of the housing markets in the communities they serve. There have been increased efforts, locally and nationally, to promote workforce housing as an issue (Bell, 2002).

A few states, such as New Jersey and Oregon, require localities to prepare plans for regional growth that accommodate projected growth in affordable housing demand (Lang and
Hornburg, 1997). Although they differ substantially in origin and structure, these programs require projections of residential demand for various market segments, which in itself is a challenge (Danielson, Lang and Fulton, 1999). In effect, they mandate that local governments plan for anticipated growth by accommodating market demand (Koebel, 2003). This approach might be called “fair growth”—which does not necessarily require “fair share”. There is some evidence that the combination of urban containment boundaries and requirements for adequate housing supply has reduced income disparities within communities (Nelson and Sanchez, 2003).

Nonetheless, a key component of community resistance to affordable housing remains to be addressed by advocates or academics: the fiscal impact of residential development. The National Multi Housing Council (2002) has recently challenged the validity of assuming a negative fiscal impact from affordable housing. However, little research has been done on the impact of “fiscal impact” on local government decisions about affordable housing or on the empirical validity of the models used. Since education is the largest expense of local governments, the models are highly dependent on assumptions about the number of children associated with an affordable housing development. In addition, various indirect tax revenue streams (such as sales and property taxes associated with retail business) highly dependent on the resident population can be easily underestimated or ignored in calculating fiscal impact. Our review of fiscal impact will highlight its role in community resistance and identify the empirical research needed to adequately test the impact of residential development.

Strategies to Increase the Acceptance of Affordable Housing
Our review will conclude with a summary of our critique of the NIMBY issue, the bases for community resistance, and strategies to increase the acceptance of affordable housing. We will distinguish between project-based strategies and systemic, community strategies and identify the importance of integrating both levels of promotion. We will also identify key empirical questions that need to be addressed to provide a solid foundation to promote affordable housing.

Benefits to NAR Members
An inadequate supply of affordable housing directly impacts REALTORS® by limiting development opportunities, shifting housing markets into rural areas, creating shortages in market segments, and fueling anti-growth sentiment. If development is limited to high-end, single-family housing, REALTORS® will be harmed as sales and leasing agents, property managers, and developers.

Contribution to the Literature
By placing affordable housing and NIMBY in a broader context and critiquing “best practices” at the project and community levels, this paper will fill a key gap in the current literature, which is fragmented and confuses advocacy with impact. As noted, our approach will identify the key elements of community opposition, including the role of fiscal impact. We will also separate advocacy and evidence, and identify key gaps in current knowledge. We intend to follow this paper with additional papers addressing community acceptance of affordable housing, the verification of fiscal impact, and the development of “fair-growth” models.

We are well experienced in communicating research findings to professional and lay audiences, as well as to academic audiences.
Timeline
Week 0  Contract signed.
Week 1-4  Identification of relevant literature
Week 5-6  Identification of leading “best-practice” cases
Week 6-10  Review and critique developer and advocate approaches
Week 10-14  Review and critique community approaches
Week 14-17  Review and critique fiscal impact
Week 18-25  Preparation of journal article and NAR report
Week 26  Draft journal article and NAR report delivered for review
Week 30  Final journal article and NAR report delivered

Management and Staffing
The co-authors are well-established researchers and authorities on affordable housing. They are both on the Virginia Tech faculty and direct the Virginia Tech Center for Housing Research and Metropolitan Institute, respectively. This is a truly collaborative effort in which Drs. Koebel and Lang will have mutual responsibility for overall performance and content. Within this context, Dr. Koebel will have lead responsibility for Section III (Review of Developers’ and Advocates’ Approaches to Overcoming NIMBY) and Dr. Lang will have lead responsibility for Section IV (Review of Community Approaches to Overcoming NIMBY). They will have joint responsibility for the other sections of the report. Dr. Koebel will serve as the contact for communication with NAR.

A graduate research assistant working for the Center for Housing Research or the Metropolitan Institute will assist Drs. Koebel and Lang and will be directly supervised by them.

Dr. Koebel has over 20 years experience in senior management at research institutes. He has written numerous reports and articles on housing market trends, affordable housing, and housing policies and programs, and has worked extensively with developers, state and local agencies, and housing advocates in the provision of affordable housing. He is responsible for Virginia Tech’s overall performance under the multi-year, Affordable Housing and Building Technology Indefinite Quantity Contract with HUD’s Office of Policy Development and Research and is the principal investigator on several federally funded research projects addressing the development of affordable housing. He is a member of HUD’s research cadre program and is currently critiquing the Worst Case Housing Needs Report to Congress for HUD. His publications include Shelter and Society: Theory, Research and Policy for Nonprofit Housing (SUNY Press) and Urban Redevelopment, Displacement, and the Future of the American City (Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond). Dr. Koebel is a past editor and current member of the editorial board of the Journal of Urban Affairs and is the co-editor of the SUNY Press Series in Urban Public Policy. In 2002, he was appointed the first University Research Fellow of the Virginia Association of Realtors.

Dr. Lang is Director of the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech in Alexandria, Virginia. He is also an Associate Professor in Virginia Tech’s graduate Urban Affairs and Planning program. Dr. Lang serves as an Associate Editor of the scholarly journal Housing Policy Debate, which is published by the Fannie Mae Foundation. Prior to joining Virginia Tech, Dr. Lang was Director of Urban and Metropolitan Research at the Fannie Mae Foundation in Washington, DC. Dr. Lang has advised numerous organizations on urban and metropolitan issues including the Brookings Institution’s Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, The Regional Plan Association, the Community Association Institute, and Fannie Mae. Dr. Lang received a Ph.D. in Urban Sociology from Rutgers University, where he also taught sociology and urban studies as a Visiting Assistant Professor. He was a research associate at the Center for Urban Policy Research at Rutgers University and co-authored two Rutgers Regional Reports. Dr. Lang’s research specialties include
demographic and spatial analysis, housing and the built environment, metropolitan governance and regulatory issues, and urban topics such as downtown development and gentrification. He has authored over 50 professional publications on a wide range of topics, and has developed many new urban planning concepts such as “Fair Growth” and “Edgeless Cities.” Dr. Lang’s research has been featured in the USA Today, New York Times, Washington Post, Los Angeles Times, US News and World Report and reported on by NPR, CNN, MSNBC and ABC World News Tonight. He recently analyzed the 2000 Census as a consultant to the USA Today. Dr. Lang’s latest work includes the book Edgeless Cities: Exploring the Elusive Metropolis, which is published by the Brookings Institution Press. He is also co-author, along with Bruce Katz, of an edited book entitled Redefining Urban and Suburban America: Evidence from Census 2000, which will also be available from the Brookings Institution Press. Dr. Lang is currently working on a new book entitled Boomburbs: Inside America’s New Super Suburbs.
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"Houses: Everybody Gets One Before Anybody Gets Two" Planning in Virginia, November, pp. 9-11

"Poor Families and Poor Housing: The Search for Decent Housing in Virginia's Private, Unassisted Market" with Mary Ellen Rives. Virginia Center for Housing Research and the Virginia Housing Development Authority.
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“Fair Housing Programs for Small Metropolitan and Non-metropolitan Urban Areas.” Principal Investigator. Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
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