Quality Infill is NOT an Oxymoron

www.idahosmartgrowth.org
America is Growing

**US Population**
- 200 million in 1968
- 300 million in 2006
- 400 million in 2032
- 500 million in 2050

America adds 100 million people faster than any other nation except India and Pakistan — but *faster* than China.

**Idaho Population Growth 2000-2050**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2050</th>
<th>Growth % of ‘00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1.3M</td>
<td>2.8M</td>
<td>115%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake River</td>
<td>0.9M</td>
<td>2.0M</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Arthur C. Nelson, Presidential Professor & Director, Metropolitan Research Center, University of Utah.*
Future Housing Needs

Looming Large-Lot Oversupply, 2005-2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Supply in 2005</th>
<th>Change in Demand Preference 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attached</td>
<td></td>
<td>39M</td>
<td>+15M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>12M</td>
<td>+40M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>58M</td>
<td>-23M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Figures in millions of units.
- Change in preference based on low-range of preference survey averages.
- Figures for nation; figures for regions will vary.

Source: Arthur C. Nelson, Presentation at New Partners for Smart Growth 2005
Future Building Boom?

US Building Construction Demand 2010 - 2040

Existing 2010

- 155 bl sq. ft. Rebuilt
- 332 billion sq. feet total

New Demand

- 132 bl sq. ft.
- 464 billion sq. feet total

Total Demand by 2040

Total Construction Demand by 2040 = 287 billion sq. ft.

Source: Arthur C. Nelson, Presidential Professor & Director, Metropolitan Research Center, University of Utah.
## Need for Built Space in Idaho

### Housing Growth 2000-2050

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Growth units</th>
<th>Rebuild units</th>
<th>Total units</th>
<th>% of ‘00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>610k</td>
<td>185k</td>
<td>800k</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake River</td>
<td>445k</td>
<td>125k</td>
<td>570k</td>
<td>160%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonresidential Space Need 2000-2050

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Growth units</th>
<th>Rebuild units</th>
<th>Total units</th>
<th>% of ‘00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>520M</td>
<td>920M</td>
<td>1.4B</td>
<td>380%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake River</td>
<td>370M</td>
<td>600M</td>
<td>1.0B</td>
<td>400%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Arthur C. Nelson, Presidential Professor & Director, Metropolitan Research Center, University of Utah.
## Bottom Line

**Construction Demand** 2000-2050

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$500B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake River Corridor</td>
<td>$400B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Arthur C. Nelson, Presidential Professor & Director, Metropolitan Research Center, University of Utah.*
## Households are Changing

### US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH with Children</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH without Children</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Other HH</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IDAHO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH with Children</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH without Children</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Other HH</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Arthur C. Nelson, Presidential Professor & Director, Metropolitan Research Center, University of Utah.
**Share of Growth 2000-2040**

**US**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH Type</th>
<th>Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With children</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without children</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Other</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Idaho**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH Type</th>
<th>Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With children</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without children</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Other</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Arthur C. Nelson, Presidential Professor & Director, Metropolitan Research Center, University of Utah.*
Emerging Urbanity Preferences

US Homes lost $2 trillion value in 2008

New Housing Market Realities
- Sub-prime mortgages are history
- Alt-A mortgages no more
- Conventional mortgages king
- “Jumbo” loans expensive and difficult
- Demand for $1 million+ homes in 30 largest markets has tanked from 10%+ to <5%

Meaning
- Smaller homes, Smaller lots, More renters

Home value loss Source: Les Christie, CNNMoney.com staff writer.
Dec. 15, 2008: 11:02 AM ET
Market Realities/ Meaning Source: Arthur C. Nelson, Presidential Professor & Director, Metropolitan Research Center, University of Utah.
# Demand 2050 (Snake River Corridor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living type</th>
<th>Number of people demanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Boise:</td>
<td>20,000 people (minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary centers:</td>
<td>40,000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-accessible: (walking, transit)</td>
<td>100,000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use, mixed-housing, walkable suburban:</td>
<td>500,000 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= 1/3rd of population in 2050 but ....

= 2/3rds of all new development to 2050

Source: Arthur C. Nelson, Presidential Professor & Director, Metropolitan Research Center, University of Utah.
Quality Infill Report and Recommendations
Introduction

- Literature Review and Committee Process
- Committee Members Goals Related to Infill
Why Infill

- Revitalization
- Saves Money
- Planning Goals
- Protects the Environment
- Transportation Choices
- Infill Consumer
Why Infill?

- Revitalizes Existing Places
- Saves Taxpayer Money
- Meets Planning/Policy Goals
- Protects the Environment
- Provides Transportation Choices
- Positive for Infill Residents

Instances Found in Literature
Consequences of Infill

- Community benefits
- Improves Environment
- Impacts Existing Neighbors
- Effect of Perceptions
Consequences of Infill

- Community benefits
- Improve air/water quality
- Negative impacts
- Effects of perceptions

Instances Found in Literature
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Barriers to Infill

- High Costs
- NIMBY Opposition
- Local Regulations
- Approval Process
- Easier to develop on Fringe
- Cost/benefit
Barriers to Infill

- Higher costs/more constraints
- Opposition to Infill (NIMBYism)
- Local Regulations discourage
- Inefficient Process
- Easier to develop on fringe
- Costs vs. benefit

Instances Found in Literature
Recommendations to Encourage Quality Infill

Develop Guiding Principles in support of Infill to provide policy basis for infill strategies
Develop Guiding Principles

**Washington:**
Infill Development
Completing the community fabric

**Garden City:**
Comprehensive Plan

**Utah:**
Envision
Utah Toolboxes

http://www.mrsc.org/Publications/infill1.pdf
Workshops

Which three of the Recommendations would overcome those barriers and make infill in your community higher quality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>APA</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Treasure Valley</th>
<th>BSU</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reform Zoning &amp; Regulations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Make Infill Compatible</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Create Priority Infill Areas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Educate about Infill</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employ Design Guidelines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Require a Collaborative Process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Streamline Infill Processes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Improve Transportation Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enhance the Public Realm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Prepare Sites for Infill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#1 Reform Zoning Regulations
– to support building forms, densities, and dimensional standards consistent with infill

Create residential "Small lot zones" with reduced parking, setbacks and greater height

Seattle, Washington has designated a "residential small lot zone" with a minimum lot area of 2,500 square feet for a detached single family dwelling. Only one parking space is required which may not be located in the front or street side yard. (Seattle Municipal Code, Ch. 23.43)
#2 Make Infill Compatible

– be respectful of existing neighbors and neighborhood character

Develop guidelines to help infill fit with the neighborhood

Victoria, and Vancouver B.C. Canada have won several national awards for its infill housing projects that demonstrate how to blend well with existing neighborhoods and gain approval in administrative process after extensive public process to define compatibility.
#3 Create Priority Infill Areas
- concentrate incentives and remove barriers in these areas

Adopt appropriate level of service standards and/or lower impact fees in infill areas

King County, Washington has established different road level-of-service standards for different transportation service areas. (King County Code, Ch. 14.70 and 14.75)
#4 Educate About Infill
- include all stakeholders, utilize innovative technologies, e.g. visualizations

Hold public meetings and charrettes at the start of the project not after design is complete

Ten Mile Specific Plan Meridian
#5 Employ Design Guidelines
– develop a set of principles and goals, allow flexibility

Allow appropriate multi-plex homes

Winding Creek, Eagle

Sumner, Washington provides for a number of multifamily residential types that can accommodate multifamily densities (10 to 25 units per acre) while maintaining much of the appearance of conventional single family development.

Townhouses, Boise
#6 Require Collaborative Methods
– ensure stakeholder participation that includes all stakeholders

State Street Corridor Plan, Eight Agencies, Four Neighborhoods Associations, Numerous business owners, Local non-profits

City Ombudsman for Smart Growth, Stimulating Infill and Brownfield Development in the Land-of-Sky Region
#7 Streamline Infill Processes
- coordinate and make transparent between disciplines and agencies

City of Nampa,
Downtown revitalization plan and actions

Vermont Act 250 - state planning measure that developed guidelines for future growth,
#8 Improve

Transportation Choices
- enhance ped/bike facilities,
  transit service and a mix of uses
  and connect local destinations in
  infill areas

Develop Infill incentives near planned transit for promote Transit Oriented Development

Measuring the Success of Transit-Oriented Development;
http://www.globaltelematics.com/apa99.htm
#9 Enhance the Public Realm

- improve and create better public spaces and infrastructure near infill

Infrastructure CIP policy can help facilitate infrastructure on close in projects. Avoid lack of infrastructure improvements as illustrated.

Port Townsend, Washington has designated service tiers to help target growth and services within an overly generous urban growth boundary.
#10 Prepare Sites for infill - through Brownfield clean-up, site assembly, etc.

City and county cooperate to expedite foreclosures, the city gets the delinquent property

Yakima, Washington has consistently pursued a program to acquire individual lots, within a designated target area, which have abandoned buildings or which are vacant and poorly maintained.
Recommendations for Quality Infill

1. Reform Zoning and Regulations
2. Make Infill Compatible
3. Create Priority Infill Areas
4. Educate about Infill
5. Employ Design Guidelines
6. Require Collaborative Methods
7. Streamline Infill Processes
8. Improve Transportation Choices
9. Enhance the Public Realm
10. Prepare Sites for Infill

What concrete steps can you take now to ensure that infill improves the environment in your community?
Questions?

Elaine Clegg
Special Projects Manager
910 Main St., Suite 314,
Boise, ID 83702
www.idahosmartgrowth.org
208-333-80

Find Quality Infill study at:
http://www.idahosmartgrowth.org/index.php/resources/resource/recommended_reading/