We *negate*.

Our sole contention is the Visible Hand.

The construction industry has propagated the falsehood that America simply doesn't have enough houses. However, the Mint Press News '15 writes that there are six vacant homes for every person lacking a house, indicating that there is no shortage of homes. Indeed, Conerly '17 of Forbes corroborates that housing construction is outpacing demand, with 1.3 million new housing units built despite a demand of only 1.2 million houses. Overall, Emmons '16 of the St. Louis Bank concludes that while nominal housing prices have increased, they have actually declined relative to income growth during the past 25 years.

This trend was not driven by the construction of new homes, but rather, by direct government policies to ensure that even the poorest Americans can access basic housing. Indeed, The CBPP '19 explains that these policies have already provided homes for over 5 million poor residents. **Promoting market-rate housing would reverse all current progress, marking an end to affordable housing in three ways.**

First, demolition derby.

Flanagan '18 of the House Method Magazine writes that the density of existing cities means that there is virtually no land left to build on, and the land that does exist is far too expensive for companies to build a house on. Thus, Austen '18 of the New York Times writes that historically, cities have made room for private housing through demolishing existing, low-income housing. For example, Cramer '17 of the Architect Magazine explicates that in Chicago, private housing groups have brokered deals establishing that construction of one new, market-rate luxury unit comes with the demolition of one rent-controlled unit. Across the country, Vale '15 of CityMetric finds that 250,000 low-income houses have been destroyed at the expense of new luxury housing, directly disrupting the lives of millions as a result.

Second, repealing rent control.

Cosman '18 of the Carey Business School outlines that the housing market has monopolized, with the number of firms in the market declining by 24% since 2006. Painter '18 of the LA Times writes that half of the increase in prices of homes is driven by this consolidation of the market. Unfortunately, Painter warrants that when the market is monopolized, companies are able to limit production and spike prices to maximize their profits.

Fortunately, Wiltz '18 of the Pew Research Center explicates that more and more cities are adopting rent control policies. Painter continues that rent controls set an artificial cap on rents, forcing companies to turn to construction to increase revenues. Blumgart '15 of the PSM verifies empirically that during times of strict rent control, cities in New York, Boston, and New Jersey actually saw increases in supply of housing.

By promoting market-rate housing, the government would definitionally end rent control, as it prevents companies from building housing at market rates. Unfortunately, The Economist details that cities that ended rent control experienced instant rent hikes by 50%.

Third, killing affordable housing programs.

The New York Times ’12 quantifies that over 90% of affordable houses in America are funded through affordable housing programs like the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit. These programs are set to expand dramatically, as Gasson ‘17 of the University of Central Florida confirms that there is strong, bipartisan support to increase funding of affordable housing by 50%. Critically, the RHA ‘17 finds that this expansion will result in 1.3 million new affordable housing units. This improves livelihoods as Ellen ‘16 of New York University corroborates that every 100 units of affordable housing is built reduces neighborhood poverty by 2% by freeing up income previously used on rent for use in the economy.

Unfortunately, by promoting market-rate housing, the government would definitionally have to roll back affordable housing policies, as these create preferential incentives for developers to invest in affordable housing instead of market-rate housing.

Overall, ending government action to stabilize housing has catastrophic implications for the nation’s most vulnerable.

Cohen ‘15 of the San Francisco Examiner explains that when San Francisco prioritized the development of market-rate housing, the number of affordable housing units fell by 45%. Problematically, Quigley ‘18 of the University of California Berkeley quantifies that a 10% increase in rent prices increases the rate of homelessness by 13.6%. Ultimately, the Urban Institute ‘17 explicates that homelessness triggers chronic economic instability that pulls low-income households deeper into poverty, which is why they conclude that homelessness is one of the most extreme forms of structural violence.

Thus, we negate.

C1. *Affordability*

Uniqueness:

MPN - 6x as many vacant homes as people looking for houses
Conerly - housing construction outpacing demand, 1.3 mil new units when demand is only 1.2 mil
Emmons '16 - rent prices going up slower than income rising → affordability increasing across the board now

AFF kills affordability in three ways

First, Demolition Derby

Flanagan '18 - no space to build new houses
Austen '18 - historically destroy low-income housing to make space for MRH
Cramer '17 - in Chicago private deals have been been brokered where 1 market-rate house is built in place of 1 affordable house
Vale '15 - 250k houses demolished

Second, Rent Control

Cosman '18 - 24% reduction in number of firms, consolidation
Cosman '18 - 681,000 more houses if not regulated
Painter - 50% of the increase in prices is because of monopolization
NEG solving--
Wiltz '18 - rent control on the rise across the country
Painter - rent control expands supply because it forces them to build new units
[new] Blumgart of the PSM '15 finds that during times of strict regulations, New York, Boston, and New Jersey all actually increased home construction.
Economist - 50% increase in rent prices after deregulation

Third, Killing affordable housing

NYT - subsidies are responsible for 90% of all affordable homes in the US
Gasson UCF - Congress set to pass subsidies that will increase in affordable housing 50% in the status quo
RHA - 1.3 million units about to be built
Urban Institute - 21% decrease in childhood poverty with this
Ellen - every 100 units decreases neighborhood poverty by 2%

! = housing affordability

Cohen - after SF promote MRH, affordable housing went from 59% to 14%
Quigley - 10% increase in rent prices = 13.6% increase in homelessness
Urban Institute - pushes them deep into poverty and is the worst form of structural violence

--LIHTC Cards--

"Opinion | A Tax Credit Worth Preserving." The New York Times, 21 Dec. 2012, www.nytimes.com/2012/12/21/opinion/a-tax-credit-worth-preserving.html. // AK

Created by Congress in 1986, the credit is available to investors prepared to sink money into new or rehabilitated low-income housing. It is responsible for about 90 percent of all the affordable housing that is built in this country, and has provided more than 2.5 million rental units since its inception. It also produces as many as 100,000 jobs each year.

Gasson '17. Gasson, David. "PNRC NAHRO | Senators Reintroduce the Bipartisan Affordable Housing Credit Improvement Act." www.pnrcnahro.org/senators-reintroduce-the-bipartisan-affordable-housing-credit-improvement-act/. // AK

Yesterday, **Senator Maria Cantwell (D-WA) and Senate Finance Committee Chairman Orrin Hatch (R-UT) introduced the Affordable Housing Credit Improvement Act of 2017 (S. 548), a comprehensive bill that would strengthen and expand the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (Housing Credit).** This legislation is very similar to the version of the Affordable Housing Credit Improvement Act (S. 3237) introduced by the same Senators last year, but with minor modifications.

Earlier this week, Senator Cantwell released a new report that chronicles the nationwide shortage of affordable housing. In her press release, Senator Cantwell said, "[w]e are facing pressures from all sides: demand for rental housing has increased by 21 percent, but we are building units at the lowest rate since the 1970s. If we do not act to increase the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit-our best way to build new affordable homes-by 2025 over 15 million Americans could be spending half of their income on rent. This is unacceptable."

S. 548 seeks to take steps towards addressing the affordable housing deficit by increasing the overall Housing Credit authority by 50 percent. The legislation also includes other provisions that would streamline and modernize the Housing Credit, increase financial feasibility for projects, and encourage development in underserved areas. The legislation would also support the development of rental units that use the Housing Credit in conjunction with multifamily Housing Bonds, which currently provide important financing to about 40 percent of all Housing Credit apartments.

RHA '17. Kimura, Donna. "Senators Reintroduce LIHTC Bill." Housing Finance, 8 Mar. 2017, www.housingfinance.com/policy-legislation/senators-reintroduce-lihtc-bill_o. // AK

S. 548 has bipartisan support on the Hill and there are currently eleven other original co-sponsors to the bill: Senate Finance Committee Ranking Member Ron Wyden (D-OR), and Senators Susan Collins (R-ME), Dean Heller (R-NV), Lisa Murkowski (R-AK), Todd Young (R-IN), Charles Schumer (D-NY), Michael Bennet (D-CO), Cory Booker (D-NJ), Patrick Leahy (D-VT), Jeff Merkley (D-OR), and Brian Schatz (D-HI). Also recently, over 2,000 organizations across the country, including NAHRO, signed on to the ACTION Campaign's letter to Congress in support of S. 548.

The legislation (S. 548) is similar to a 2016 bill introduced by the senators.

It **seeks to increase the annual housing credit authority by 50%, phased in over five years, and raise the small state minimum by 50%**, also phased in over five years. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that this provision would cost $4.1 billion over 10 years.

The proposal would help create or preserve approximately 1.3 million affordable homes over 10 years, an increase of 400,000 more units than is possible under the existing program, according to Cantwell.

If passed, the bill would be one of the most significant updates to the LIHTC program in its 30-year history.

"At a time of great uncertainty for affordable housing, **this legislation is a powerful step Congress can take to expand housing options for low-income families in New York and across the nation**," said Jolie Milstein, president of the New York State Association for Affordable Housing. "The federal government must not ignore its obligation to strengthen LIHTC and protect it from diminishment under new tax policies."

Urban Institute '16. Cunningham, Mary K. "Reduce Poverty by Improving Housing Stability.", 26 June 2016, www.urban.org/urban-wire/reduce-poverty-improving-housing-stability. // AK

How much could increasing housing benefits reduce poverty among children? **Urban Institute research shows that increasing access to housing vouchers to a targeted group of about 2.6 million poor, rent-burdened households with children could reduce child poverty by as much as 21 percent** (a bigger impact than we see by expanding transitional jobs, child support, the earned income tax credit, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits, or increasing the minimum wage to $10.10). Housing isn't a panacea—it will take a lot more to end poverty—but it's a good place to start, and one that is supported by the evidence.

Flanagan, '18. Flanagan, Tema. "Growing Cities and Affordable Housing: The Effects of Rapid Urban Development" 12/21/2018. House Method Magazine

For one thing, **the density of existing cities can mean that there's a limited supply of undeveloped land or space for building new housing stock within city limits.** What undeveloped land does exist comes at a steep price, meaning developers are much more likely to maximize profits by building higher-end housing units. In fact, as Leach points out, in some urban areas—most notably in cities on the West Coast—the price of land can get so high that the assessed land value far eclipses the assessed value of any house that might be built on it.

Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, November 2016, "Housing Has Become More Affordable over the Long Term" // EK
https://www.stlouisfed.org/on-the-economy/2016/november/housing-more-affordable-long-term
Emmons noted that apartment rents and house prices increased faster than inflation in every city examined. Still, per capita personal income grew faster than apartment rents and house prices in every case except one: Los Angeles, where house prices and income grew at essentially the same rate. Conclusion: **Emmons concluded by saying that the recent rise in housing costs has not reversed the trend of housing's becoming more affordable over the past 25 years.** He wrote: "To be sure, some families and some regions face significant housing affordability challenges. **But long-term data suggest that housing markets in most major cities remain reasonably effective in providing affordable rented and owned housing for the average family."**

Gary Painter, latimes, 10-31-2018, No, rent control doesn't always reduce the supply of housing, https://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-painter-rent-control-economist-20181031-story.html, 2-26-2019, AK
"But here's a simplified Econ 101 lesson that comes shortly thereafter: **Price controls can actually spur an increase in supply.** When housing developers have too much power in the

market, they can maximize profits by raising rents on the apartments they already own. But if **rent control [makes]** limits that option, **developers** have to **go to Plan B if they want to make more money: Build more units.**"

Gary Painter, latimes, 10-31-2018, No, rent control doesn't always reduce the supply of housing, https://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-painter-rent-control-economist-20181031-story.html, 2-26-2019, AK

"A recent paper shows that, **compared to the composition of the home building industry in 2006, there are 24% fewer firms accounting for 90% of the building nationwide. The study further suggests that about half of the increase in housing prices over the last decade can be attributed to industry consolidation among home builders."**

The fact that real estate developers have funded an anti-Proposition 10 campaign to the tune of $45 million suggests that they are eager to defend their market power. If California were a truly competitive housing market where home builders operated with slim margins, they'd load up their cranes and build in some other state. But it's clear these developers benefit from the status quo and are fighting hard to keep it.

Conerly, Bill. "Housing Forecast 2018-2019: Declining New Demand." Forbes, 20 Sept. 2017, www.forbes.com/sites/billconerly/2017/09/20/housing-forecast-2018-2019-declining-new-demand/#50ae371158c6.

The ability to live on one's own, whether that means moving out from parents or from an ex-spouse, ties to employment and wage rates. As we noted in our article on the consumer spending forecast, job growth has been moderately slow, and wage inflation has not accelerated. I expect wage rates to improve next year, but not soon enough to change the trend in household size. **So new demand for housing units will be (under these assumptions) 1.183 million units. For comparison purposes, so far this year we are on pace to build 1.287 million single family houses, apartment and condo units, and manufactured homes. Looks like we're building too much, at least nationwide.**

Cosman '18 - 24% reduction in firms, consolidation

Cosman, Jacob. 2018. https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/5fcb6a_0ce1861c297f46b5b612ac9932478f40.pdf

//TP

Under this set of assumptions, the median number of firms accounting for 90% of production across all markets in the United States from 2006 through 2015 fell from 6.25 to 4.78 — i.e., a decrease of 24%. Weighting the markets by pre-period population (as measured in the 2015 five-year American Community Survey estimates) does not appreciably alter this result. Table 7 shows the predicted impact on markets across the United States at the quartiles of the distribution of predicted levels of 2006 competition. All changes in outcome variables are relative to the predicted levels of 2015 competition. As shown, the impact is relatively uniform across the distribution of competitive intensity.

Cosman '18 - monopolization has lost 681,000 houses in supply pipeline

Cosman, Jacob. 2018. https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/5fcb6a_0ce1861c297f46b5b612ac9932478f40.pdf
//TP

These estimates imply that the decrease in competition has impacted housing markets in economically meaningful ways. The total value of private residential construction in 2015 was $423 billion (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017b)**. Estimates from Table 7 indicate that absent the decrease in competition, the total value of housing would be on the order of $144 billion greater.** The $144 billion difference in construction value is equivalent to 19% of the value of net private fixed investment in the United States economy in 2015 (Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2017a). Moreover, this is equivalent to 0.8% of 2015 GDP. This is comparable to the scale of the decline in residential investment Leamer (2007) identifies prior to previous recessions. In 2015, 529,000 new single-family units intended for sale started construction and 398,000 new multi-family units intended for sale or rent started construction for a total of 857,000 new units under construction (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017a). Also, in 2015 12% of all housing units in the United States were vacant U.S. Census Bureau (2018) which yields an estimate of 960,000 housing units under construction or vacant and unsold. **Estimates from Table 7 suggest that under this counterfactual level of competitive intensity the number of units in the supply pipeline would increase by approximately 681,000 units.**

Coalition '18| Housing Subsidies lift 2.9 million out of poverty

National Low Income Housing Coalition, September 7, 2018, "Housing Subsidies Lift 2.9 Million Out of Poverty" // EK

https://nlihc.org/resource/housing-subsidies-lift-29-million-out-poverty

The Census Bureau's Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM) addresses the shortcomings of the official poverty measure, which excludes non-cash government benefits from household income. The SPM takes into account non-cash benefits for low income households such as housing subsidies, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the National School Lunch Program, the Supplementary Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). The SPM also subtracts necessary expenses from household income, such as child care, medical, and work-related expenses. The supplemental poverty rate of 13.9% in 2017 was not statistically different from the 2016 rate, indicating no apparent change in poverty when using a more nuanced measure. **The SPM also shows that housing subsidies lifted 2.9 million people out of poverty. Housing subsidies reduced the supplemental poverty rate by 1.2 percentage points for children under 18, 0.7 percentage points for adults 18-64, and 1.3 percentage points for seniors 65 and older.**

Khouri '18| 5% hike in LA led to a 4% increase in homelessness

Khouri, Andrew, June 13, 2018, LA Times, "High cost of housing drives up homeless rates, UCLA study indicates"

https://outline.com/4KmZPU

Sky-high housing costs are a significant factor behind California's homeless crisis, according to a new analysis from UCLA. In a study contained in the latest UCLA Anderson Forecast, released Wednesday*, UCLA found that higher median rent and home prices are strongly correlated with more people living on the streets or in shelters.* The research backs other studies that have found a similar relationship. Last year, Zillow released a study that showed that *a 5% rent hike in L.A. County — where more than 50,000 are estimated to be homeless — would cause 2,000 additional people to lose their homes.* In April, according to Zillow, the median rent for a vacant apartment in the county was $2,462, up 1.9% from the previous year. In 2017, rents climbed an average of 4.3% and in 2016, 6.5%. The median home price in April was $608,800, up 9% from a year earlier.

Quigley, UC Berkeley

https://m.oregoncf.org/Templates/media/files/publications/homelessness_in_portland_report.pdf

Economists John Quigley and Steven Raphael were among the first to demonstrate that housing affordability—rather than personal circumstances—is the key to predicting the relative severity of homelessness across the United States. 4 **They estimated that a 10 percent increase in rent leads to a 13.6 percent increase in the rate of homelessness.** Consistent with Quigley and Raphael's findings, our analysis indicates that median rents across the top U.S. metropolitan regions explain 51 percent of the variance in rates of homelessness in 2017.

Cohen '15 - focusing on MRH decreased affordable housing by 45% in Cali

Peter Cohen and Fernando Martí on June 14, 2015 1:00 am. "Don't Believe the Hype: Affordable Housing Does NOT Depend on Market Rate Development." *The San Francisco Examiner*, www.sfexaminer.com/dont-believe-the-hype-affordable-housing-does-not-depend-on-market-rate-development/. //TP

Moreover, The City's housing production data shows how false the argument is that somehow affordable housing is dependent upon market-rate development**. In 2011, at the low-point of market-rate housing production, The City produced (i.e. paid for) 207 affordable housing units, which was 59 percent of all housing built that year! While market-rate development was stalled because of a lack of finance capital from investors (who seem to refuse to finance any construction unless they can be guaranteed at least 25 percent returns on their investment), The City with its public funding sources continued to invest in affordable housing production. By contrast, there were 3,454 housing units built in 2014 of which 490 were affordable housing units, a mere 14 percent of total production. In**

other words, the "housing balance" was terrible. Affordable housing on balance got worse, not better, as the real estate market boomed. With market-rate housing not even paying its way to mitigate the affordable housing demand it creates, this outcome is not a surprise.

Urban Institute '16 - LIHTC reduce childhood poverty by 21%

Cunningham, Mary K. "Reduce Poverty by Improving Housing Stability." *Urban Institute*, 27 June 2016, www.urban.org/urban-wire/reduce-poverty-improving-housing-stability. //TP

How much could increasing housing benefits reduce poverty among children? **Urban Institute research shows that increasing access to housing vouchers to a targeted group of about 2.6 million poor, rent-burdened households with children could reduce child poverty by as much as 21 percent** (a bigger impact than we see by expanding transitional jobs, child support, the earned income tax credit, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits, or increasing the minimum wage to $10.10). Housing isn't a panacea—it will take a lot more to end poverty—but it's a good place to start, and one that is supported by the evidence.

Economist - deregulation increased rents by 50%

"The Morning After." *The Economist*, The Economist Newspaper, n.d., www.economist.com/united-states/1998/04/30/the-morning-after. //TP

There were dire predictions of hardship when rent control was abolished. Some of them came to pass. Cambridge (home of Harvard University), which had roughly 16,000 rental units under the strictest regulations in the state, recently reported that nearly 40% of tenants in regulated flats moved out after rent control ended. **From a modest survey of 1,000 households, city officials concluded that decontrolled rents overall jumped by more than 50% between 1994 and 1997 (from an average of $504 a month to $775), outpacing market rates.** Over the same period, complaints of eviction also rose by 33%.

Ellen '16| Adding 100 units decreases poverty by 2%

Ellen, Ingrid, Journal of Housing Economics, 22 June 2016, https://www.prrac.org/pdf/EllenHornORegan_JHE2016_LIHTCPovConc.pdf

In moderate poverty tracts, we see almost no connection to subsequent poverty rates. In high-poverty neighborhoods, however, the impact of an additional LIHTC development is negative and of a substantial magnitude: **our estimates suggest that adding a 100- unit development to an average tract is associated with a decline in poverty of approximately 2 percentage points, which appears to be due to spillovers**.

Again, to provide an example, in a tract of 4000 people, 1500 of whom are poor (poverty rate of 37.5%), adding 100 individuals to the tract, 48 of whom are poor (the average poverty rate in developments located in high-poverty neighborhoods), would directly increase the poverty rate by 0.3 percentage points. Spillover effects must therefore explain the longer-run decline in poverty. Specifically, an additional 225 non-poor individuals would have to be drawn to the neighborhood to produce a decrease in the poverty rate of 2 percentage points

Mint '15| Empty Homes outnumber homeless 6 to 1

Mint Press News, July 2, 2015, MNPD

https://www.mintpressnews.com/empty-homes-outnumber-the-homeless-6-to-1-so-why-not-give-them-homes/207194/

Empty Homes Outnumber The Homeless 6 To 1, So Why Not Give Them Homes? MINNEAPOLIS — Millions of Americans experience homelessness every year, and yet they're outnumbered by vacant homes and government-owned buildings. A growing number of activists are calling for these empty spaces to be filled with the humans living on America's streets. According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness, almost 600,000 people experience homelessness on any given night in the United States as of January 2014. About 15 percent of those people are the "chronically homeless," while the rest may lose their homes temporarily but find some form of recovery that keeps them off the streets on a long-term basis. Writing for Amnesty International in 2011, Tanuka Loha, then-director of Amnesty's Demand Dignity program, put the numbers into a larger, annual perspective, and compared them to the shocking number of vacant homes left after last decade's financial crash. "Since 2007, banks have foreclosed around eight million homes. It is estimated that another eight to ten million homes will be foreclosed before the financial crisis is over. This approach to resolving one part of the financial crisis means many, many families are living without adequate and secure housing. In addition, approximately **3.5 million people in the U.S. are homeless**, many of them veterans. It is worth noting that, **at the same time, there are 18.5 million vacant homes in the country.** Most empty homes sit vacant after foreclosures, leaving them owned by banks that are loathe to part with them. The numbers appear to be similar in Europe, according to Rupert Neate, writing for the Guardian in 2014. Neate interviewed David Ireland, chief executive of the Empty Homes charity. "Homes are built for people to live in, if they're not being lived in then something has gone seriously wrong with the housing market," Ireland told Neate. According to the Guardian, European Union figures show that there are 4.1 million homeless living across Europe, while there are 11 million empty homes across the continent. Back in the U.S., another report last year highlighted the 77,000 empty government buildings that could be refitted to house the homeless. According to Matt Lemas, writing in Ryot, while some existing legislation allows for these kinds of conversions, it requires local pressure and pro-active legislators to be effective.

Wiltz '18 – rent control on the rise

Wiltz, Teresa. "Rent Control Is Making a Comeback. But Is That a Good Idea?" Pew Research Center. November 2018. https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/blogs/stateline/2018/11/28/rent-control-is-making-a-comeback-but-is-that-a-good-idea //RJ

After decades of being dismissed by economists as a has-been, rent control is making a comeback. It's a high-stakes resurgence, fueled by a rapidly worsening housing crisis — but it faces strong opposition from the real estate industry. In the past year, **an energized renters' rights movement has won approval of rent control measures in Berkeley, Chicago, Washington, D.C., and Westchester County, New York.** In March, New York City's mayor, Bill de Blasio, signed legislation extending rent regulation laws through April 2021. The issue also is attracting attention in statehouses. Lawmakers in Hawaii, Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey and Washington state have considered rent control bills in the last two years. Some of the measures would overturn existing bans on rent control; others, as in Hawaii, would establish rent control in the state or expand existing laws.

Austen '18| Cites have made way for private housing by demolishing public housing

Austen, Ben, February 2018, New York Times Magazine, // EK

https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/06/magazine/the-towers-came-down-and-with-them-the-promise-of-public-housing.html

For other cities, demolition still remained a political and practical impossibility**. In previous decades when slums were cleared, those displaced were sent into public housing. Now where could tens of thousands of people**

from the projects be sent? But the aversion to social safety-net programs only came to root more deeply in the American mainstream. After retaking Congress in 1994, Republicans said they planned to scrap the federal housing agency entirely. President Clinton, promoting his cuts to the welfare system and proclaiming “the era of big government is over,” pre-emptively reorganized HUD. The agency promised to “infuse market discipline” into public housing. The anti-urban impulse that had sent middle-class families to the suburbs had reversed itself, and young professionals were flocking to city centers near their jobs and one another. In 1990, Chicago’s population started to tick up for the first time in 40 years; the area surrounding Cabrini-Green added 4,000 white residents during the previous decade, and vacant lots that had sold for $30,000 a few years earlier were being snapped up for five times that amount. **As the fortunes of cities changed once again, public housing experienced a new pressure. HUD began to award municipalities tens of millions of dollars in grants to tear down their public-housing high-rises and replace them with much smaller developments that mixed public-housing families with higher-income renters and market-rate owners**. Proposals to preserve some of the towers, filling in the cleared land around them with a variety of housing types, were rejected. **Many low-rise developments in rejuvenating areas were targeted as well.** A majority of the relocated public-housing residents were given Section 8 vouchers to rent from landlords in the private market. Nationwide, 250,000 public-housing units have been demolished since the 1990s. **Atlanta, Baltimore, Columbus, Memphis, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Tucson — just about every American city got in on the action.** But no city knocked down as many as Chicago.

Cramer ‘17| Chicago demolishing on a 1 to 1 ratio – gets rid of affordable homes

Cramer, Ned, Architecht Magazine, January 10, 2017, // EK

https://www.architectmagazine.com/design/editorial/the-housing-deficit_o

A major shortfall of privatization is that the market isn’t keeping pace with demand—not even close. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, the majority of America’s poor families devote more than half their take-home pay to rent. They have no alternative: The coalition estimates a nationwide shortage of 7.2 million “affordable and available” units for a population of 10.5 million low-income renters. In 2012, The Washington Postreported that there were 66,297 households on the D.C. Housing Authority wait list, and a wait time of 43 years for a studio apartment. The CHA claims to be “rehabilitating or redeveloping the entire stock of public housing in Chicago.” **The statement, from the agency website, is misleading. Like other local housing agencies, the CHA is no longer in the business of building public housing, any more than it is replacing the “entire stock” of affordable units one for one**. **Instead, the CHA has spent $1.5 billion in federal funds on what amounts to slum clearance, to make way for private developers to build market-rate housing.** In such deals, developers do have to include some affordable units, the idea being that cleaner, safer living conditions and prosperous neighbors will have a salutary effect on those lucky enough to get a spot. If the social experiment goes awry, no worries: The deals are generally brokered so the affordable units revert to market rate, sometimes in as few as five years.

A2 Dec Competition Between Rich and Poor

1. Defense. Austen ’18 of the New York Times explains that because of high land prices and limited availability, new market rate housing comes at the cost of destroying old low-income units. Thus, although supply for the rich may increase, it takes homes away from the poor, trapping them further in poverty.

2. Defense. Cosman ‘18 of the Carey Business School finds that in areas with market rate housing, competition between developers is extremely limited, lowering the availability of housing. However, as rent control policies expand, the supply increases and solves for their impact.

Vale ‘15| 250,000 public housing units have been destroyed in cities

Vale, L, CityMetric, February 2015, “**In the US, mixed housing developments aren't working for low-income families” // EK**

https://www.citymetric.com/horizons/us-mixed-housing-developments-arent-working-low-income-families-698

Over the past 20 years, the United States federal government and local housing authorities have replaced hundreds of troubled public housing projects with mixed-income developments. Has it worked? It depends who you ask: scholars, elected officials, housing developers, and low-income residents continue to disagree. A key area of contention has to do with the term “mixed-income” – which, though widely used, is rarely defined. In our research into public housing, we’ve concluded that if policymakers fail to agree on a clearer definition of mixed-income housing's aims and attributes, the sought-after benefits of public housing reinvention will remain elusive. **Beginning in the early 1990s, policymakers proposed demolishing low-income public housing projects and replacing them with mixed-income housing**. The idea was that this would reduce concentrated poverty and revitalize deteriorating neighborhoods. Between 1993 and 2010, Congress appropriated more than $6bn to fund these efforts through the US Department of Housing and Urban Development’s HOPE VI (Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere) program. **Today, “the projects” are now far less visually prominent in many cities, as more than 250,000 public housing units – including some of the most notorious high-rise complexes, like Chicago’s Robert Taylor Homes and Detroit’s Frederick Douglass Homes – have been demolished.**

Blumgart

https://psmag.com/economics/in-defense-of-rent-control

Rent control is basically dead. **The policy is long gone in big cities like Chicago and Boston, and advocates are on the defensive in San Francisco and New York City, where there are only 27,000 units left down from more than two million in the 1950s. In the latter case, at least, 47 percent of the city’s housing stock is still rent stabilized—meaning that the price of covered units can only be raised a set percent every year. But even that is a 12 percent decline from 1991.**