

A2 Rent Control

1. Remember, there's a reason why 81% of economists agree that rent-control hurts low-income renters. Rent control incentivizes landlords to upgrade housing into condos or pull properties from the market, while decreasing new construction in the long term. Thus, Diamond from case finds that rent control decreases rental housing supply by 15% while causing a 5.1% city-wide rent increase, and Stanford quantifies that rent controlled buildings see a 25% decline in renter residents. This is crucial because it means when you vote neg.
 - a. Landlords pull properties and force 25% of their residents out of their homes, increasing displacement.
 - b. Housing prices continue to increase across the board, accelerating the crisis, especially for those 70 out of 100 low-income families who don't live in rent controlled buildings.

A2 Displacement

1. Turn - Gentrification decreases displacement by increasing incentives to stay. Gillespie of CNN in 2015 reports that the influx of new businesses to lower-income areas offers new, usually higher-paying jobs for residents. In fact, Cortright in 2015 confirms that low-income households in gentrifying areas see an average increase in income of \$4,500 a year. This incentivize and enables low-income families to stay in gentrified areas. Thus, Freeman quantifies that poor residents are 15% less likely to move in gentrified areas, and Hurst of the University of Chicago furthers that gentrifying areas have 23% less poverty.
2. [AFF] Weighing - Scope. At best, they impact out to the 30 in 100 low income families who have access to housing that is affordable. This is crucial, because if you vote for MRH, you lower prices across the board and prevent more displacement on net. Thus, Kay of the CNU in 2016 confirms that that market rate housing empirically lowers probability of displacement by 20% because of construction lowering prices.

A2 Demolitions

1. Delink - Incentives. Beyer of Forbes in 2016 explains that the US government has made a shift from subsidies to promote MRH but to decreasing restrictive zoning laws, encourages companies to build on vacant land instead of tearing down existing houses. Layfield explains that many of the demolished projects have been largely abandoned, because they were uninhabitable.
2. Delink - We have the land. The Washington Post in 2015 finds that cities cannot run out of space, as cities either just expand the city limits, change restrictive zoning requirements, or literally just build up. Turn - UCLA in 2019 finds that building up

resulted in 22% of the new units being affordable and overall creating six times more affordable housing than units lost to demolition.

A2 Luxury homes only

1. According to Danzinger of Forbes, the high-end housing market is becoming increasingly less profitable, with the median price for low end homes rising significantly faster.
2. W - A lack of housing actually creates more displacement due to a lack of supply. Even if the new housing is luxury, it relieves pressure on the rest of the market which is why the LAO finds that neighborhoods with high construction have 21% less of chance to be displaced than low construction neighborhoods

Outweigh on two counts.

1. Scope. Government-imposed housing affordability in rent-controlled buildings touches maximum 30/100 low-income renters. We can't keep helping only some at the expense of everyone else. [O'Reagan](#) - 100-study meta analysis, increased housing development prevents rent increases, making housing more affordable for the middle and lower class. Seattle - 6% rent drop the VERY NEXT YEAR.
2. Timeframe. We're the only team that doesn't kick the problem down the line. Valdez - root cause of the crisis is a lack of supply. Even if you buy that we increase displacement in the short term, by increasing supply in the long term, we prevent the market from becoming so skewed again and a larger crisis down the road. Don't vote for a bandaid on a bullet wound.

STRATEGY

Weighing

- Scope - government implemented affordable housing doesn't touch the majority of people, we ALWAYS outweigh on scope
- Timeframe - Solving the long term crisis
- AFF - the weighing is pretty clear, we're the only team that outweighs in both the short and the long term
 - [National Low Income Housing Coalition](#) - 7 million affordable housing shortage, which means only 35 out of every 100 needy renters have a home. We can't keep helping only some at the expense of everyone else.
 - IN THE SHORT TERM - [O'Reagan](#) - 100-study meta analysis, increased housing development prevents rent increases, making housing more affordable for the middle and lower class. Seattle - 6% rent drop the VERY NEXT YEAR. Neg doesn't have anything comparable.
 - IN THE LONG TERM - We're the only team that doesn't kick the problem down the line. By pinning the stakes of your housing affordability on the whims of each successive administration and whether or not they want to keep the social safety net, you're doing the poor a disservice. Valdez - root cause of the crisis is a lack of supply. We need to solve that if we don't want to see another housing crisis in the future, and the only way to do so, is by buying more MRH.

AFF

- Supply and demand
 - Supply sufficient squo
 - More supply = lower price, doesn't matter what the current numbers are, it's all relative
 - Not urban area specific
 - Fed study
 - Pretty sure in conclusion it says you can't actually conclude anything from it bc its a computer simulation not the real world
 - According to Badger of the Washington Post in 2016, even after factoring in price hikes, "All existing peer-reviewed academic studies — including work done at Harvard University, UPenn, and UC Berkeley — find that more housing supply results in lower rents and house prices."
 - Luxury homes only
 - High end of the market has stalled
 - Trickle down
- Inclusionary zoning
 - Only 140 houses per year
 - Yeah bc we don't have more MRH

- Material costs too high
 - Bro that was Oregon, policy is working fine across the rest of the country
- Only goes to the middle class
 - Depends by district lol u can't generalize like that??
- Bento
 - His study starts back in 1988 - the market he's talking about is one where you go from having completely unregulated housing to regulated housing, which yeah, hikes prices. But that's not what we're advocating for - we're saying you should go from a tightly regulated, interventionist market to a less regulated one, meaning that prices are going to fall from where they were before due to the increase in supply.
 - Increases prices/decreases supply
 - Yeah, bc you're not promoting market rate housing, you are the squo. Developers don't have an incentive, period, to develop housing. Aff world, even tho IZ policies are in place, suddenly it becomes way more profitable to build than to not.
- Overall - idc if housing is going to upper or middle class, as long as you're cutting down how many people are demanding houses in the market, you're leaving more houses behind for those who truly need them (trickle-down effect/making space)

NEG

- Trump would cut rent-control
 -
- Demolitions
 - Zoning laws instead
 - Parker - vouchers are the first to go
 - "Choice Neighborhood" program
 - This is a grant giving program to provide affordable housing; that goes away when you vote for them
- Gentrification