Narberth’s smart growth report card

- Mix of housing
- Walkable
- Compact
- Transit oriented
- High social capital.
MARKET FAVORS WALKABLE PLACES
New “Narberths” are illegal
Narberth has...

- too much density
- too many apartments
- mixed uses
- too little open spaces
- too much impervious
- too little parking
Narberth – my former hometown

Narberth, PA

Does not conform with old zoning.
What would Narberth look like if it were built out to the standards of its old zoning ordinance?
Source: Montgomery County Planning Commission.
Source: Montgomery County Planning Commission.
No.
“No” to density
“No” to bike lanes
“No” to apartments
“No” to mixed use
“No” to alleys
“No” to school kids
“No” to affordable housing
No.

Where has all our naysaying gotten us?
Affordability is under threat.

Notes: Median incomes are estimated at the core-based statistical area (CBSA) level. Recently sold homes are defined as homes with owners that moved within the 12 months prior to the survey date. Monthly payments assume a 3.5% downpayment and property taxes of 1.15%, property insurance of 0.35%, and mortgage insurance of 0.85%. Affordable payments are defined as requiring less than 31% of monthly household income. Only CBSAs with at least 30 home sales in the past year are shown.

Source: Joint Center of Housing Studies of Harvard University. JCHS tabulations of US Census Bureau, 2017 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, and Freddie Mac, PMMS.
We know fewer neighbors.
Income segregation has grown.

Fewer kids walk to school.
Commutes have grown.

Average commute times (minutes)

Open space has been lost.
Carbon emissions have grown.

Source: The New York Times
Reflexive opposition to growth

NEGATIVES
Traffic - congestion, long commutes, undermine transit.
Costs – higher infrastructure costs,
Environmental - higher impervious surfaces.
Social – we destroy social capital.

Decentralization

Auto-dependency

No.
We say YES.

6 Actions to Support Sustainable Regional Development and a Greater Philadelphia
DVSGA: a broad regional coalition.
YES to density where it belongs.

YES to open space preservation.

YES to walking, cycling, and transit.

YES to cutting the red tape.

YES to removing parking minimums.

YES to infrastructure reinvestment.
YES to density where it belongs.

Compact development in established centers leverages existing infrastructure, provides housing choices, and reduces development pressure on open space.
We build at very low densities.

Figure 1: Density by Region. Source: Demographia, 2019
Density belongs in existing centers.
Density belongs in existing centers.
Density belongs in existing centers.
Density belongs in existing centers.

Case study: Village at Valley Forge
YES to open space preservation.

Protected natural and agricultural lands preserve wildlife, promote recreation, and constrain sprawl.
Where density doesn’t belong.

DVRPC: By 2045, conserve 400,000 more acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Ac</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Ac</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected Ac</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ac</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open space is good business.

- Home price appreciation
- Stormwater benefits
- Health benefits
- Fiscal benefits

Source: Chester County, Return on Environment, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR EVERY $1 IN TAXES RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return on Environment
The Economic Value of Protected Open Space in Chester County, Pennsylvania
May, 2019

Delaware Valley Smart Growth Alliance
YES to walking, cycling, and transit.

Practical transportation options strengthen local economies, improve public health, and reduce congestion.
Consumers pay for walkability.
- Walkable to transit: Septa regional rail & trolley
- Next door to brew pub and walkable to 30 restaurants
- Adjacent to Delco park
- Prices high $500s–low $600s
- Walkscore 76

- Not walkable.
- Conventional front-loaded subdivision
- Prices in $400s
- Walkscore 4
Active transportation supports property values.

- Radnor Township – trail raised property values by $70,000
- “Fifty-two percent would like to live in a place where they do not need to use a car very often; this includes 63 percent of Millennials and 64 percent of renters.” ULI, America in 2015.
YES to cutting the red tape.

Complex approval processes increase costs and discourage small-scale entrepreneurs, creative design, and affordable housing.
PHL is among the most regulated

Hurting the little guy.

Photo credit: Mark Stehle
YES to removing parking minimums.

Minimum parking requirements inhibit redevelopment, increase costs, and promote traffic.
½ of HH in many boroughs own 1 or fewer cars

Households with 1 or fewer vehicles available

US Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-year Estimates, 2016
Parking minimums add costs.

- Developers already have an incentive to provide parking – their customers.
- Should the law demand excess parking?
- $5,000 to $65,000 per space.

Diagram:

- High Parking Requirements → Parking Supply Exceeds Demand
- No Market Prices for Parking
- Commuters Park Free
- More Auto Commuting
- Perception That Generous Parking Supply Is Required
- Low Density, Auto-Oriented Urban Form
- Traffic Congestion, Air Pollution, and Energy Consumption Consequences
- Social Equity Consequences
- Lower Site Density
- Lower Land Value
- Automobile-Oriented Site Design
YES to infrastructure reinvestment.

Infrastructure that supports existing centers has more fiscal and environmental benefits than building new, and should be prioritized.
Letting our house fall apart.
Should we spend $835MM on this?
YES to density where it belongs.
Compact development in established centers leverages existing infrastructure, provides housing choices, and reduces development pressure on open space.

YES to open space preservation.
Protected natural and agricultural lands preserve wildlife, promote recreation, and constrain sprawl.

YES to walking, cycling, and transit.
Practical transportation options strengthen local economies, improve public health, and reduce congestion.

YES to cutting the red tape.
Complex approval processes increase costs and discourage small-scale entrepreneurs, creative design, and affordable housing.

YES to removing parking minimums.
Minimum parking requirements inhibit redevelopment, increase costs, and promote traffic.

YES to infrastructure reinvestment.
Infrastructure that supports existing centers has more fiscal and environmental benefits than building new, and should be prioritized.
Join us as we say YES to a Greater Philadelphia.
Thank you!

www.delawarevalleysmartgrowth.org