Zach and I affirm Resolved: The United States should promote the development of market rate housing in urban neighborhoods.

Our Sole Contention is Economic Integration

Gentrification is causing a housing crisis in the US as Owens of Princeton explains that about 1 percent of families every year in the U.S. had been displaced by changing neighborhood conditions.

Miller of the Brookings Institute warns that for every 100 low-income renters in the nation, there are only 39 units that are available.

Olympia Management confirms that 19 million households are thus housing insecure.

The promotion of market rate housing solves this problem in 3 ways.

The First is by Increasing Supply

Badger of the Washington Post explains that market rate housing reduces displacement in urban areas by easing competition for scarce homes.

Gonzalez of The Issue explains the warrant behind this writing that when there is a large amount of demand in an area, housing developers need to be able to quickly respond by increasing supply. However, strict land-use regulations that limits the development of market rate housing distorts the market and raises prices artificially high.

Without increasing supply, Yglesias of Vox explains that developers target the highest sector of the market in order to maximize profit and renovate or rebuild low income residences into more expensive homes, worsening displacement and pricing minorities out of an area.

Hence why he concludes building more market rate housing decreases housing cost.

The Second is through Inclusionary Housing

The Furman Center at NYU in 2018 writes that inclusionary zoning is an affordable housing tool that links the production of affordable housing to the production of market-rate housing.

Riggs ‘16 of the Urban Land Institute writes that through inclusionary zoning, cities require or encourage developers to create below-market rental apartments in connection with local approval of a proposed market-rate development.

In other words, inclusionary zoning regulations mandate development of market rate housing to be accompanied by below-market-rate or affordable housing.

Thaden of the Lincoln Institute contextualizes the impact writing that these programs exist in New York, Boston, San Francisco, Los Angeles and 373 other jurisdictions.

The impact has been huge as Bachrach ’17 of UCLA found that with the promotion of market rate housing 13 times as more units built than were demolished and there were 6 times as many affordable units after construction than before.

The Third is by Ending Rent Controls

Leshnower of the Spruce explains that market rate housing by definition are homes without rent controls.

This is critical as Misra of City Lab ‘18 found that rent-controlled apartments are 10% more likely to be converted into condos or renovated drastically because it is more profitable for landlords to convert them to things like Airbnbs or condos. As a result, the number of renters decreased by 15%.

Murphy ‘17 of mercury news finds rent controls in San Francisco only drove low-income tenants out of their homes and raised citywide rent by 7%.

Beyer of Forbes contextualizes the impact writing that the majority of the nation’s most expensive cities are rent controlled.

Overall these three reasons are why Taylor of the LAO explains that low-income neighborhoods with a lot of new market rate housing has witnessed about half the displacement of similar neighborhoods that haven’t added much new housing.

This is critical as displacement reduces economic integration cutting the poor off of from two direct benefits.

The First is Jobs

Buntin of Slate Magazine explains that integrated neighborhoods contain better job opportunities compared to others because the rich bring entrepreneurship and business prospects with them.

Meltzer of the St. Louis Reserve Bank consequently indicates that the number of available local jobs increases by 19% post-integration.

Thus, Hurst enumerates that poor communities that are in closer vicinity to rich neighborhoods experience a 23% reduction in poverty.

The Second is Infrastructure

Leonard of the Brookings Institution explains that richer residents brings with it political influence and more consideration from the government.

Chapple of UC Berkeley explains that as this occurs infrastructure projects such as public transportation, improved education, and better roads are created to provide more attractive amenities to reel in new residents.

Gibson of Georgia State University furthers that a 3% increase in infrastructure spending would increase the wealth level of America's poorest citizens by 147%, decreasing income inequality by 11%.

Thus we affirm.