

2004

THE RAPPAPORT REVIEW

An Anthology
On Topics of Interest
To Greater Boston

FEATURING

The Chelsea Experiment
Separate, Unequal, and Stigmatized
Development Through Transit
A Good Start
The Missing Link
The Politics of Rehabilitation
New Hope and New Politics
Correcting Corrections

AND MORE REPORTS ON TIMELY ISSUES

DEVELOPMENT THROUGH PUBLIC TRANSIT

Public transit can define a neighborhood. Ease of car-free travel with a mix of residences and business can make for a vibrant urban village in a pedestrian-friendly setting. Boston's history has made it unique among American cities in its degree of transit-oriented development. And a number of recent developments have reinforced this character. But the absence of a formal agency or dedicated review process leaves responsibility to individual designers and planners.

BY JENNIFER HALL

Boston owes much of its charm to its expansive pedestrian spaces, extending from the compact downtown core to outlying neighborhoods along nineteenth century trolley lines. While the city has changed since the emergence of private automobiles, numerous newer projects have built on Boston's transit-oriented legacy. These developments energize transit-station areas, create new centers of activity, and enliven the public realm.

Developed in the 1980s, transit connections at Copley Place and Tent City nurture a thriving mix of hotel, entertainment, office, retail, residential, and community uses. Since the mid-1990s, new downtown housing developments have reintroduced mixed uses to the pedestrian-friendly area at the heart of the regional transit network. The evolving South Boston Waterfront is perhaps the premier example of current transit-oriented development (TOD) in Boston. As a mixed-use extension of the city center, most of the 1,000-acre waterfront district is within a one-quarter mile walk of the new Silver Line transit service to South Station and Logan Airport. Frequent, high-quality transit and a limited parking requirements for developers has attracted high-end residential, office, retail, and hotel projects. Significant public investments – including a well-planned street grid, new waterfront open space, federal courthouse and convention center – have laid the framework for Boston's newest pedestrian-friendly, transit-oriented district.¹

These TOD successes, however, are not the result of a comprehensive transit-oriented development strategy. The Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA), as authorized by the Massachusetts Legislature and the Boston City Council, "is responsible for all planning and zoning functions as well as economic and industrial development efforts."² As the city's land-use planning agency, the BRA has used its wide-ranging powers to profoundly influence the evolution of the city. Many BRA regulations and institutional values – such as lower parking requirements, provision of high-quality public spaces, and support of neighborhood main street businesses – support transit-oriented devel-

opment. Yet the city has not yet defined or codified its TOD policy. Successful projects depend on the vision of conscientious developers, persistent city planners and designers, and vocal community residents and activists. By the same token, poorly conceived projects can undermine hard-won successes. If Boston is to remain a transit-oriented model for innovative new development, a commitment to clearly articulated TOD policies is needed.

SPRAWL AND TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

Urban sprawl has generated concern about traffic problems, infrastructure costs, ecological impacts, and public health. In the face of strong population growth and rising housing costs, many planners promote an alternative “smart growth” vision for expanding communities. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “smart growth is development that serves the economy, the community, and the environment.”³ This nuanced view of growth attempts to achieve healthy communities, economic development and job growth, strong neighborhoods, and transportation choices.

Transit-oriented development – sometimes also referred to as “transit-focused development,” “transit-based development,” “transit-supportive development,” or “transit villages”⁴ – offers one strategy to counter sprawling regional development patterns. TOD advocates cite specific attributes which contribute to successful transit-oriented designs: high-quality transit service, multimodal enhancements for bicyclists and pedestrians, human-scaled buildings, attractive public spaces, concentrated development, and diverse land uses.

Many attributes of modern transit-oriented development efforts evoke the intrinsic qualities of urban areas that grew up along trolley and streetcar lines in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Boston’s enduring block patterns, “emerald necklace” parks, and vibrant neighborhoods are now the envy of newer, sprawling American cities which are struggling to “retrofit” car-oriented urban areas with higher-density “infill” development on vacant and underutilized sites. TOD efforts within the central city can help to ease regional pressures which fuel sprawl in outlying communities. Boston’s existing infrastructure and an extensive public transit network is a tremendous asset for attracting new development and driving economic growth.

One of the biggest obstacles to transit-oriented development in Massachusetts is public distaste for density. Fear of density has resulted in opposition to transit-oriented development in Holbrook and Kingston, at the Oak Grove Orange Line station in Malden and Melrose, and in South Shore communities along the Greenbush commuter line.⁵ Residents are often skeptical of growth and resistant to change. They believe density exacerbates traffic and parking shortages, and that affordable multifamily housing will increase crime. Still, communities willing to embrace transit-oriented development can realize potential benefits. Massive surface parking lots can be transformed into mixed-use developments that attract both new residents and commuters to local businesses--helping to revive neglected areas. Walkable communities with frequent transit service can also improve residents’ quality of life and increase their disposable income.

Research by Todd Litman at the Victoria Transport Policy Institute concludes: “Expenditures on automobiles, fuel and roadway facilities provide relatively little regional economic activity because they are capital intensive and are mostly imported from other areas.”⁶ A study in San Antonio, Texas found that a 1-percent shift of regional travel from automobile to transit could create 226 additional regional jobs and increase regional income by \$2.9 million or about 5 cents for each mile shifted.⁷

Using public transit saves individuals money. Nationally, transportation expenses account for 12

to 25 percent of total household spending.⁸ Areas with lower car ownership rates have more available consumer credit and boast mortgage approval rates 5 to 24 percentage points higher than regions with poor mass transit service.⁹ Channeling household income toward home ownership is a better wealth-building strategy than buying a car. In the 1990s home values nationwide increased by an average of 3.2 percent annually, while vehicles had an average annual depreciation of 8 percent.¹⁰ In the Boston area 14.5 percent of a typical family's budget – equivalent to \$5,506 annually – is devoted to personal vehicle expenses. Public transit expenses – \$281 annually – represent only 0.74 percent of a typical family budget. All Boston households regionally spend a total of \$13.7 billion on transportation, only 4.9 percent of which is for public transit expenses.¹¹

Smart-growth opponents often argue that anti-sprawl measures restrict the supply of developable land, driving up regional housing costs. But TOD is pro-development. While TOD is not likely to be the sole solution to Boston's affordable housing shortage, it does have the potential to serve moderate-income families. In recent years the Institute for Location Efficiency has worked with Fannie Mae to develop home mortgage programs targeted to buyers in areas served by public transit.

In the Boston area the Take the T Home Mortgage Program helps qualified transit riders purchase homes. MassHousing, the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), and community banks offer 100 percent financing and no down payment to qualified borrowers buying housing near public transportation. Homebuyers must show proof of being a regular transit rider for a minimum of 10 months (or membership in a car-sharing system such as Zipcar) and must have a household income at or below 130 percent of the area median income. Community banks set the loan terms and MassHousing provides insurance. By allowing higher percentages of a borrower's income to be allocated to housing and other debt (38 percent and 45 percent, respectively), the mortgage program can increase home purchase power by as much as \$50,000.

The generous terms of the Take the "T" program recognize that transit-accessible homes "not only have higher prices, but also appreciate faster under strong economic conditions and hold values better under weaker economic conditions than other residential properties."¹² Extensive research in communities nationwide has verified this positive link between property values and access to public transit. A 1994 study of MBTA's Fitchburg commuter rail line concluded that single-family home values in communities with a rail station were 6.7 percent higher than home values in areas lacking stations.¹³ Another analysis looking at Boston area home prices between 1995 and 2001 showed that median single-family home prices nearly doubled in 19 communities after they gained commuter rail service.¹⁴ Other findings from around the country are summarized in the appendix.

MAJOR PLAYERS FOR TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

Seven kinds of players are important for transit-oriented development, including different levels of government, developers, community advocates, and regional-planning agencies.

MASSACHUSETTS BAY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MBTA)

Because transit-oriented development is predicated on frequent, high-quality transit service, transit agencies are often the drivers of TOD initiatives in the United States. As early as 1995 Chi-

cago's Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) published its "Guidelines for Transit-Supportive Development" and positioned TOD as a way for developers to access the buying power of Chicago's 2.8 million residents, 95 percent of whom live within a five-minute walk of regular bus or transit service.¹⁵ Since 1997 changes in Federal Transit Administration funding rules have encouraged local transit agencies to pursue joint development projects, "offering agency-owned property that is physically or functionally related to a transit stop for private or public/private development."¹⁶ Such projects have potential to increase ridership and generate new revenues. The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) has completed 54 joint development projects valued at over \$2 billion, producing up to \$10 million in additional annual revenue for the Metro system.¹⁷

Boston's regional public transit provider, the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), is an essential partner in transit-oriented development efforts. The MBTA is motivated to participate in TOD efforts because it is under a state mandate to sell surplus land to raise revenue. Such land sales, often of prime parcels adjacent to transit stations, are very attractive for developers. At the request of Governor Mitt Romney's Office of Commonwealth Development, the MBTA is completing a comprehensive inventory of buildable parcels near stations. Former MBTA parking around the Red Line Ashmont station is currently in the process of being redeveloped. At the North Quincy station a 99-year lease secured in June 2003 allows for the construction of 240 new residential units. And up to 80 housing units are envisioned over the Fitchburg Commuter Rail line near Porter Square. Other significant land and air rights parcels include portions over the Orange Line near Northeastern University, over the buried Green Line near the FleetCenter, and on parking lots at the Wonderland Blue Line station in Revere.¹⁹ The new interest in TOD and smart growth has led the MBTA to double its estimated 2004 real estate revenue to \$15 million.²⁰

The MBTA faces significant challenges pushing TOD. All MBTA joint development projects require local jurisdictions to approve zoning. "Not-in-my-backyard" attitudes and tricky real estate deals can be further complicated by surprised citizen's fear of being cut out of the planning process. Advocacy groups such as New York's Straphangers Campaign, which monitors and reports on subway service in an annual "State of the Subway" report, are noticeably absent in Boston. The MBTA also faces a capital-improvements backlog and is overextended by Central Artery/Tunnel project mitigation commitments and ambitious commuter rail expansion plans.

THE MPO AND MAPC

The Boston Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) oversees the regional transportation planning process for the federally-funded transportation program. The MPO does financial planning, environmental justice analysis, and air-quality monitoring for the 101 cities and towns in the 1,400 square-mile area encircled by I-495. The 2004-25 Boston Region MPO Transportation Plan describes a vision for expanded service for the system serving 3 million residents.²¹ The MPO is made up of seven government agencies, the city of Boston, six other municipalities, and a public advisory committee.

One of the represented agencies, the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), serves as Boston's regional planning agency. Created by the Massachusetts Legislature in 1963 and covering the same geographical area as the MPO, the MAPC is charged with regional planning, economic development, data collection and development of geographical information system (GIS) capabilities.²²

While both the MPO and MAPC support transit-oriented development as a smart growth strategy, neither has the political power to coordinate actual projects or set policy. In addition, the two regional bodies do not cover some the exurban communities most vulnerable to sprawl. Achieving a consensus among such a large number of independent municipalities and agencies have proven difficult.

The MPO's Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) and the MAPC perform important research and support roles for TOD efforts driven by municipalities and the MBTA. In 1999 MAPC completed a build-out analysis of maximum development allowed under existing local zoning regulations. The analysis sought to estimate "future demands on public infrastructure and the environment" and to help communities understand "the implications of current land use practices."²³ The build-out analysis was used by several municipalities to evaluate possible zoning changes.

An unrealized opportunity where Boston's regional bodies can help to further TOD is in transportation funding. The metropolitan planning commission for the San Francisco Bay Area has adopted a Housing Incentive Program using federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funding. Modeled on an award-winning San Mateo County program, incentives reward local jurisdictions for building housing within one third of a mile of a transit station. Projects with 25 units per acre receive \$1,000 per bedroom; 40 units per acre, \$1,500 per bedroom; and 60 units per acre, \$2,000 per bedroom. An additional \$500 per bedroom can be earned for affordable units. Local jurisdictions have the flexibility to use the funding for transportation projects that are consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Livable Communities program.²⁴

THE OFFICE OF COMMONWEALTH DEVELOPMENT

The Romney administration, seeking to make good on campaign promises to tackle sprawl, established the Office of Commonwealth Development to implement a smart growth agenda and oversee policy relating to housing, the environment, transportation, and energy. Douglas Foy, former president of the Conservation Law Foundation, heads the new office. Since the Legislature did not approve a cabinet-level position for him, the extent of his powers and the as-of-yet unfunded office is unclear. Initial tasks of the office have been to craft smart growth principles, study the cost-effectiveness and feasibility of the Greenbush rail line, and to investigate transit-oriented development potential for selected Orange Line and commuter rail stations with large available MBTA-owned parcels (Newburyport, Mishawum, Woodland, Wonderland, Assembly Square, Wellington, and Malden Center).

In 2002 the Massachusetts Legislature approved a housing bond bill that allocated \$10 million for Housing on Main Streets, including \$5 million specifically for transit-oriented development. However, the funding is currently unavailable and it is likely that early bond dollars will instead go to public housing improvements.²⁵ Other legislative proposals to increase funding for TOD include: a historic preservation tax credit bill modeled on the Rhode Island credit that encouraged renovation in downtown Providence,²⁶ the creation of Urban Center Housing (UCH) zones in active commercial districts with high daytime use but few multifamily housing units,²⁷ and modifications to the existing Economic Development Incentive Program (EDIP) to make the affordable residential components of larger projects eligible for city property tax breaks and state investment tax credits.²⁸

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) supports smart growth and has highlighted successful transit-oriented development policies in its annual national achievement awards. The EPA disseminates policy information, catalogues case study profiles, and maintains lists of major federal and private foundation funding sources for smart growth initiatives. However, hotly-contested transportation funding is the most significant federal contribution to transit-oriented development.

Greater flexibility in federal highway and transit funding programs was first authorized in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). Increased emphasis was placed on comprehensive planning for multimodal transportation networks and dedicated funding was set aside for non-highway enhancement projects. "New Starts" transportation funding has helped to establish new light rail lines and lay infrastructure for regional mass transit networks. Although the American Planning Association and a broad spectrum of environmental advocates seek additional TOD-friendly provisions, they face the harsh reality that "many federally funded highways and other transportation facilities are still designed and built in ways that are detrimental to smart growth and community livability."²⁹ In the current budget-constrained climate non-highway provisions are at risk of being slashed in the reauthorization of the transportation act.

THE CITY OF BOSTON AND THE BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Many existing policies and initiatives of the City of Boston support transit-oriented development. Mayor Thomas M. Menino's 2000-03 housing strategy noted the importance of promoting smart growth housing initiatives and TOD.³⁰ This initiative helped attract and permit over 7,700 new housing units. Another city program, Boston Main Streets, has become a national model for urban neighborhood commercial revitalization by channeling funding and technical assistance into 21 neighborhood districts, many of which are close to major transit nodes.

Because land use decisions and zoning regulations are made at the local level through the BRA, the City commands a strong position to guide and implement transit-oriented development. Boston is fortunate to have a robust mass transit network already in place. The downtown core is blanketed with subway stops and a significant portion of the rest of the city lies within a half-mile of transit stations. Much can be done to capitalize on the existing infrastructure by following a TOD strategy to redevelop station areas and nearby parcels. But decisions to initiate TOD planning around anticipated transit service must be carefully weighed. A 2001 BRA community planning exercise for Upham's Corner found that delays in transit service improvements badly discouraged residents and merchants engaged in the planning process. The city cannot reliably promise to deliver on one essential element of transit-oriented development: the transit.

DEVELOPERS

A partnership between a municipality and transit agency succeeds only when it attracts private developers interested in building transit-oriented projects. The success of Copley Place and Tent City in the Back Bay, new downtown residential buildings, the fast-emerging developments on the South Boston Waterfront, and the persistence of developers seeking to move forward with the Columbus Center air-rights project, all attest to the attractiveness of Boston real estate. Eager developers recognize the potential profitability of TOD.

Yet even these model programs can complicate the development process and increase costs. Implementing transit-oriented development is especially difficult when it is only one of many competing public priorities. An affordable housing developer in California laments the tendency of cities to unintentionally undermine planning goals by over-complicating of the development process:

Each time you layer on another goal – whether it’s affordable housing, or some redevelopment objective, or paying a living wage, or transit-orientation – you come out with another set of variables. Meantime [developers are] moving on this inexorable time line while windows of opportunity are opening and shutting... Greenfield development, in contrast, must be incredibly easy – it’s private land, private money, and the developer builds whatever they want. You have to understand why it’s so attractive to developers.³¹

ADVOCACY ORGANIZATIONS

Despite the sagging economy and Massachusetts budget woes, environmentalists and housing advocates continue to exert pressure on the Romney administration. The Massachusetts Smart Growth Alliance has formed from six separate advocacy groups: the MAPC, the Citizens Housing and Planning Association, the Fair Housing Center of Greater Boston, the Boston Society of Architects, the Environmental League of Massachusetts, and the Conservation Law Foundation.³²

The Alliance is pressing for shared tax revenue across municipal boundaries, compact affordable housing development near transit, and overhaul of the Chapter 40B “anti-snob” zoning law. Educational outreach efforts by the Alliance will include events to build a constituency for smart growth and to encourage citizens to think at a regional scale.³³ The Greater Boston Action Committee, another new group organized by PolicyLink, is comprised of many of the same member organizations. The committee promotes affordable housing and better transit access for low-to-moderate wage earners.

Citizens interested in TOD in Boston have ample opportunity under Article 80 of the Boston Zoning Code to participate in the development review process and to suggest that developers make transit-friendly modifications to their projects. Furthermore, citizens and community development corporations can proactively pursue TOD projects of their own.

POLICY OPTIONS FOR THE BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Policy options for the Boston Redevelopment Authority to promote transit-oriented development can be arrayed along a spectrum ranging from “passive” interventions such as requesting transit-friendly modifications to developer-initiated projects, to the crafting of “active” regulations to support specific TOD goals. The BRA can engage in “proactive” efforts to frame neighborhood and citywide strategic plans according to TOD principles and can even act as a “master developer” issuing requests for proposals for specific city-led transit-oriented developments.

PASSIVE

Little development in Boston is allowed “as of right.” The Article 80 development review process for large and small projects, Planned Development Areas (PDAs), and Institutional Master Plans en-

sure that projects are reviewed by community members and BRA planners and designers.³⁴ During the review process developers often incorporate significant project modifications at the request of BRA staff and neighboring residents and property owners. Boston does not require any formal review of a proposed project's conformance with transit-oriented development principles. For example, in June 2003 the BRA Board of Directors authorized the Village at Cleary Square residential development without questioning the high parking ratio of nearly two spaces per residential unit, or requesting pedestrian provisions and linkages to the adjacent Hyde Park commuter rail station, a mere 20-minute train ride from South Station.

The BRA has not adopted any citywide TOD standards for new developments, so any modifications requested are at the discretion of the planners and designers reviewing the project. Such modifications are difficult to justify if they are not universally required. And TOD is but one of multiple priorities that play out in development review. Transit-oriented development criteria compete against policies insuring "no net loss" of industrial land, affordable housing, and the employment of Boston residents for construction. Each priority is also weighed against the mayor's promises and initiatives, the relative power of various city agencies, and the enduring need to grow the economy and provide more housing and jobs for Boston residents.

In the context of competing demands the BRA could foster greater transit-orientation in existing development proposals by assigning a dedicated staff member to review all incoming Project Notification Forms, focusing on the integration of TOD principles for projects within a half mile of existing and planned transit stations. At the very least the BRA could raise TOD awareness among the designers and planners already engaged in the development review process.

ACTIVE

Developers often resist additional regulations, but they prefer the clarity and certainty of TOD zoning regulations as opposed to vague "guidelines" governing development today.

Cities nationwide have developed a myriad of regulatory standards meant to encourage and implement transit-oriented development. Standards cover such details as: minimum floor-to-area ratio, maximum parking spaces per residential unit and per 1,000 square feet of commercial development, maximum surface parking lot size, maximum stand-alone retail size, minimum landscaping and open space percentages, and minimum densities at key intervals between one-eighth mile and one mile from the transit station. The most commonly-used interval of measurement for TOD standards is a quarter-mile radius from the transit station (a five-minute walk).³⁵

A complete audit and overhaul of the Boston Zoning Code for conformity with transit-oriented development principles would likely be politically unpopular and extremely time consuming. One alternative is to establish an "overlay district" with special development requirements for properties within a designated distance of particular transit stations. However, such regulations are often based on a relatively simplistic "transit village" prototype of medium-density residential development surrounding a small commercial core near the station. Boston's mature urban landscape presents more diverse TOD opportunities which require more varied zoning responses.

Citywide parking standards provide an easier way to support TOD. Transit-oriented development is most attractive in areas where there are transportation alternatives to private car ownership and incentives to decrease automobile dependence. Some TOD research has shown that transit-accessible housing can have 20 percent less parking per household than non-TOD housing.³⁶ Limit-

ing parking and instituting parking maximums instead parking minimums would save developers money on design and construction costs. Assuming the parking maximums would satisfy banks and other lenders, only very high-end developers would likely object to parking restrictions.

Case studies of six San Francisco neighborhoods show that reduced off-street parking requirements lowered condominium prices by more than 10 percent.³⁷ A San Francisco architect claims that eliminating parking requirements would lower the cost of new housing construction by \$20,000 to \$40,000 per unit. Because an off-street parking space has a market value of \$75,000, housing units without parking are more affordable to moderate-income buyers. Moreover, reduced parking requirements allow more units to be constructed because garages can fill up to one-quarter of the potential building volume.³⁸

Unbundling parking regulations from housing regulations could also encourage alternative travel. In Tokyo, for instance, proof of off-street parking is required to register an automobile.³⁹ Linking parking costs to car ownership rather than home ownership makes housing more affordable and alternative travel modes more attractive. In the long run, developers would be discouraged from oversupplying parking. More flexible markets for the independent supply of housing and parking would respond more quickly to changing lifestyles and demand.⁴⁰

PROACTIVE

A proactive TOD strategy would make neighborhood and city plans subject to transit-oriented principles. Integrating TOD into neighborhood and city planning would require extensive BRA research to identify specific TOD opportunities. A citywide TOD analysis was initiated with a private consultant in 1999 but never completed. Resuming efforts to quantifying development opportunities which are currently overlooked would generate the data necessary to justify more ambitious TOD policies. After modeling potential build-out scenarios and cataloging opportunities by TOD typology, the BRA could then prioritize TOD-promotion efforts.

Several stations on the Orange and Fairmont lines have great potential to attract a wider range of activities and to foster well-designed, well-oriented public spaces. A detailed opportunity analysis considering the station areas' physical attributes, land-use regulatory context, and community readiness would help to prioritize significant transit-oriented development opportunities and to engage the neighborhood in a TOD planning process. Taking a leadership role in facilitating TOD near specific stations, the BRA could issue requests for proposals for development on publicly-owned land, guide private developers, and strive to implement elements of the community vision for the area.

San Diego has followed a proactive TOD strategy since 1999. The strategy combines housing, commercial development, employment centers, schools and civic uses together in walkable activity centers connected by a high-quality transit system.⁴¹ Seeking pilot projects to "bridge the gap between the grand vision and reality," the city opened an application process to identify potential projects.⁴² Successful proposals will be eligible for a sweeping range of incentives: priority scheduling of infrastructure upgrades, development fee subsidies, a dedicated city project manager to resolve issues and prioritize staff efforts, urban village overlay zoning amendments, city loan guarantee fund, smart-growth revolving loan funds for mixed use projects, property tax rebates, and priority standing in resource allocation for affordable housing, Community Development Block Grants, capital improvement projects, and relocating utilities underground. The city hopes the initial pilot

villages will be developed and built within three to five years, demonstrating how best to “provide incentives and remove obstacles to village development.”

In another proactive approach to transit-oriented development, Oakland uses TOD as an economic development strategy. The city’s 1995 plan includes agendas to concentrate development downtown and in key areas, enhance the transportation network, reclaim the waterfront, and encourage sustainable economic development.⁴³ The city plan sets forth land use designations to encourage mixed-use development. Ground-floor retail and commercial uses are to be clustered around major intersections while higher density housing is targeted for the block segments between intersections. Oakland is updating its zoning code to reflect the priorities of the city’s plan. Extensive community outreach is planned for 2004; the city council is expected to adopt new zoning in 2005.⁴⁴

Marketing itself as similar in character to San Francisco, yet more affordable, Oakland has streamlined its development process and attracted over 60 major projects – an all-time high for investment in the city.⁴⁵ Transit-oriented villages are emerging around Oakland’s eight BART stations. In early 2003 the city’s redevelopment agency brokered a deal with a large REIT to add up to 400 residential units to City Center, helping to develop a 24-hour feel in the current office and retail hub.⁴⁶

INNOVATING TO FURTHER A LEGACY

Boston’s human scale and European-inspired layout and design are unique among urban areas in the United States. The legacy should be guarded by conscientious planning efforts to direct growth and ensure quality development. By formulating a citywide TOD strategy, Boston has the opportunity to build upon the successful transit-oriented legacy of earlier centuries of development. In promoting a range of transportation choices and TOD typologies, Boston will enrich its layered urban fabric, greatly enhancing the city’s livability and sustainability. By adapting innovative development models and policy approaches from around the nation, the BRA is well-positioned to reinforce the city’s past and to rediscover Boston’s leadership role as a national TOD trendsetter.

ENDNOTES

1. Alden Raine, “Waterfront TOD,” *Urban Land*, (May 2003), pp.79-83.
2. “The Boston Redevelopment Authority: A Brief Overview of Boston’s Planning, Economic, and Industrial Development Agency,” Boston Redevelopment Authority, May 1999, p. 1.
3. “About Smart Growth,” United States Environmental Protection Agency, http://www.epa.gov/piedpage/about_sg.htm.
4. Brett Hondrop, “Appendix B: History of Transit-Oriented Development,” *Envisioning Neighborhoods with TOD Potential*, Mineta Transportation Institute, San Jose State University, August 2000, http://transweb.sjsu.edu/publications/envisioning2/MTI2001_Etodp_website/.
5. Anthony Flint, “Frustrating Development: Romney Approach Being Rejected by Many Communities,” *The Boston Globe*, June 7, 2003.
6. Todd Litman, “Economic Development Impacts of Transportation Demand Management,” Victoria Transport Policy Institute, June 13, 2002, http://www.rtd-denver.com/Projects/TOD/Economic_Development_Impacts_of_Transit_Demand_Management.pdf, p. 7.
7. Litman.
8. Scott Bernstein, “The Benefits of Transit-oriented Development – Why Bother?,” Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2001, p. 1, http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/pdfs/Benefits_of_TOD.pdf.

THE RAPPAPORT REVIEW

9. Bernstein.
10. Bernstein, p. 2.
11. "Driven to Spend: the Impact of Sprawl on Household Transportation Expenses," Surface Transportation Policy Project, March 19, 2000, <http://www.transact.org/states/metro.asp?s=massachusetts>, accessed June 23, 2003.
12. "Take the 'T' Home Mortgage Program," MassHousing, http://www.masshousing.com/mif/mif_takethet.htm, accessed July 20, 2003.
13. "Transit Resource Guide," American Public Transportation Association, No.1 rev. February 2003, <http://www.apta.com/research/info/briefings/documents/brief1.pdf>, accessed June 2003.
14. "Transit Resource Guide."
15. "Guidelines for Transit-Supportive Development," Chicago Transit Authority, 1996, p. i.
16. "Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study," California Department of Transportation, September 2002, <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/tod.htm>, pp. 67-69.
17. "Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study, (Technical Appendix)," California Department of Transportation, September 2002, <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/tod.htm>, pp.38-40.
18. Anthony Flint, "MBTA Seeks to Build Housing Over Rail Line," *The Boston Globe*, June 27, 2003.
19. Flint.
20. Flint.
21. "That is the MPO?," Boston Metropolitan Planning Organization, <http://www.ctps.org/bostonmpo/mpo/what.htm>, accessed August 31, 2003.
22. "About MAPC," Boston Metropolitan Area Planning Council, http://www.mapc.org/about_mapc.html, accessed August 31, 2003.
23. "Build-Out Analysis," Boston Metropolitan Area Planning Council, http://www.mapc.org/projects_initiatives/build-out_analysis.html, accessed August 31, 2003.
24. Gloria Ohland, "Transit-Oriented Development in Four Cities," The Great American Station Foundation, August 2001, http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/pdfs/TOD_In_4_Cities.pdf, accessed June 2003, p. 17.
25. Geoff Lewis, "Transit Oriented Development Policies, Funding, and Legislation," Memo to BRA TOD Team, May 15, 2003.
26. Anthony Flint, "Tax Credit Eyed As Spur to Urban Redevelopment," *The Boston Globe*, June 30, 2003.
27. Flint, "Tax Credit."
28. Flint, "Tax Credit."
29. "TEA-21 Reauthorization Recommendations," American Planning Association, <http://www.planning.org/legislation/pdf/TEA3FinalReport.pdf>.
30. Preliminary Completion Report FY 2001-2003, "Leading the Way: Boston's Housing Strategy," June 2003.
31. Preliminary Completion Report, p. 15.
32. Anthony Flint, "Six Groups Join Forces for a War on Sprawl," *The Boston Globe*, June 11, 2003.
33. Flint, "Six Groups."
34. "A Citizen's Guide to Development Review under Article 80 of the Boston Zoning Code," Boston Redevelopment Authority, August 2001.
35. For a recommendation of 12 units/acre see California Department of Transportation, Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study, Appendix to Chapter 1, "Transit-Oriented Design Guidelines for Sacramento County," September 2002, <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/tod.htm>, p. 1; For a 15/unit recommendation see Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, "Transit-Oriented Development Zoning Overlay District Model Ordinance," 1999, <http://www.morpc.org/web/departments/transportation/transit/Modelordinance.pdf>; A 44-unit recommendation, Jeffrey Tumlin and Adam Millard-Ball, "How to Make Transit-Oriented Development Work," American Planning Association, May 2003; And a 25-30 unit recommendation for Denver can be found at Denver Regional Transit District, "RTD - Bringing Transit to Your Community, and Community to Your Transit," <http://www.rtd-denver.com/Projects/TOD/index.html>.
36. "Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study, Executive Summary," California Department of Trans-

THE RAPPAPORT REVIEW

- portation, September 2002, <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/tod.htm>, p. 10.
37. "Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study, Executive Summary."
 38. David Baker, "Why it's a Good Idea to Unbundle New Urban Housing and Parking," May 1, 2002, http://www.dbarchitect.com/www-writing/parking_and_housing.pdf.
 39. "Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study, Special Report: Parking and TOD: Challenges and Opportunities," California Department of Transportation, September 2002, <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/tod.htm>, p. 14.
 40. "Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study," p. 15.
 41. "General Plan: City of Villages Vision, Values, and Strategy," City of San Diego, <http://www.sannet.gov/cityofvillages/vision/strategy.shtml>.
 42. "General Plan Strategic Framework Element: City of Villages Pilot Village Program and Application," City of San Diego, December 2002, <http://www.sannet.gov/cityofvillages/pdf/pvpapp.pdf>.
 43. "Zoning Update: Building Sustainable Mixed-use Developments along Transit Corridors," *Oakland Now*, 2 (Spring 2003) City of Oakland Community and Economic Development Agency, <http://www.business2oakland.com/main/documents/OaklandNOW.Spring03.pdf>, p. 1.
 44. "Zoning Update."
 45. "Zoning Update," p. 57.
 46. "Oakland Leads Nation in Transit-Oriented Development," *Oakland Now*, Vol. 2, No.1, Spring 2003, City of Oakland Community and Economic Development Agency, <http://www.business2oakland.com/main/documents/OaklandNOW.Spring03.pdf>, pp. 1, 3, 6.
 47. Table sources: American Public Transport Association, Transit Resource Guide, 1 (Feb. 2003); Parsons Brinckerhoff, "The Effect of Rail Transit on Property Values: A Summary of Studies," draft. Feb. 27, 2001, TOC project 21439S, task 7, <http://www.rtd-denver.com/TOD>; Federal Transit Administration, "Commercial Property Benefits of Transit," June 12, 2002, <http://www.rtd-denver.com/TOD>; California Department of Transportation, Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study, Sept. 2002.

Effects of Transit on Real Estate Values⁴⁷

Location	Rail System	Property	Finding
Boston metro	MBTA com-	Residential	Single-family residential property values 6.7% higher in communities
Boston metro	MBTA com-	Residential	Median single-family home prices nearly doubled in 19 communities
New York	MTA rapid rail	Residential	Average home prices decline \$2,300 for every 100-ft increment of dis-
Philadelphia	SEPTA rapid	Residential	Single-family homes with access to rail stations have 7.5-8.0% premium
Washington	Metro rapid rail	Residential	Apartment rents decrease by 2.4-2.6% for each 1/10 mi increase in dis-
Washington	Metro rapid rail	Commercial	Commercial properties increase \$2.30/sq ft for every 1000 ft reduction in
Charlotte, NC	CATS LRT	1998-2002	Land values along South End LRT corridor doubled, and in some cases
Atlanta	MARTA rapid	Commercial	Price per sq meter increases \$75 for each meter increase in proximity to
Dallas	DART LRT	Res. & Com.	Median values of residential properties near stations increased 12.6%
Portland, OR	MAX LRT	Residential	Average home prices decrease by \$32.20 for each meter beyond 100 me-
Sacramento	LRT	Residential	Citywide analysis of access based on ground distance to station found no
San Francisco	BART rapid rail	Residential	Average home prices decline \$1,578 for every 100-ft increment of dis-
SF Bay Area	BART rapid rail	Res. & Com.	Single-family home prices decrease \$3,200-3,700 for each mile distant
Santa Clara	VTA LRT	2001	Land values within walking distance of an LRT station are 23% above the
Santa Clara	CalTrain com-	Commercial	Commercial business district properties within 1/4 mi of commuter rail
Santa Clara	VTA LRT	Commercial	Office space within 1/4 mi of a station average a \$4.87/sq ft premium
Los Angeles	Metro Rail rapid	Commercial	Commercial space within 1/2 mi of rail corridor sells for an average \$31/
San Diego	LRT Trolley	Residential	Residential sales prices increase \$272 for every 100-meter increment of
San Diego	Coaster comuter	Res. & Com.	10-46% premiums for residential properties near stations; 72-91% premi-