Index

ad valorem taxes 24–5, 303–10
developable land value tax 305–6
developable land value tax and area
tax 308–10
developable land value tax and
frontage tax 307–8
on pre-development land value 23
property tax 306–7
structures, tax on 304–5
Advisory Commission on
Intergovernmental Relations
210
age group communities 242–3
agricultural land 62, 63, 64–5, 72, 75
Aiken, J.D. 65
Alexander, G. 214
Almost Ideal Demand System 153
Amendment I 94
American Farmland Trust 148
Anas, A. 6–35, 128
Anderson, J.E. 40, 62–85
Anderson, N. 128–9, 139, 142
Anderson, S.P 29
area tax 300–303, 308–10
Arizona 94, 213, 224
Arnott, R.J. 8–9, 10, 11, 21
Asami, Y. 289
Assembly Bill 680 (2001) 117
asset bid-price equation 20
Atascadero 114
Atkinson, A.B. 83
Atkinson, G. 93
Automobile Association 155
Avery decision 221
Bailey, R.W. 280
Baldassare, M. 139
Barbour, E. 93, 104
Barlowe, R. 66
Bartik, T. 174, 176, 180
Barton, S. 213
Beattie, G. 66
‘bedroom suburbs’ 129
before-and-after appraisal approach 76
Bellingham 98
Berg, T. 244
Berle, A. 227
Berliant, M. 289
Bernstein, D.E. 278
‘big-box’ urban sprawl in United States
88–120, 130
implications 115–17
local revenue choices and retail
decentralization 98–110
regression findings 110–15
retail activity location in
metropolitan area 91–3
retail decentralization 93–8
urban retail sprawl 90–91
binary logit models 22
Bish, R.L. 283
Blackledge, J. 65
Blinder, A. 125, 137–8
Bogart, W.T. 122–44
Booher, D.E. 93
bordered Hessian condition 294
Bowman, J.H. 66
Box–Cox hedonic price functions 152
Bradford, D.F 125
Brandes, L. 280
Brasington, D.M. 284
Brazil 232
Bredin, J.B. 78
Briffault, R. 216, 219, 280
Brueckner, J.K. 8, 10, 125, 148, 288,
304–6
big-box urban sprawl 88, 93, 98, 102,
104, 111, 115, 117
preferential assessment 80, 81–2, 83
Buchanan, J. 227, 251–2
Buchanan v. Warley (1917) 278
Bunch, H.C. 66, 72
Burchell, R.W. 287
Burger, W. 215
Index

California 66, 88, 93, 94, 103, 105
Assembly Bill 680 (2001) 117
court of appeals 242
Land Conservation Act (1965) 71
Study Group 72
Open Space Subvention Act (1971) 72
private neighborhood associations 218, 243, 275
Proposition 13 233
Supreme Court 210, 238
Capozza, D.R. 72
Carman, H.F. 66
Carter, H.O. 72
central business district 56, 57, 72, 156–7, 159, 164
Chapman, J.I. 37
Cheshire, P. 147–72, 292
Chicago 128, 174, 180–81, 197
tax increment financing and land use 37, 38, 41, 45, 46, 49, 51, 57–8
Chicoine, D.L. 66
Chico-Paradise 98
China 141
Choi, Y.J. 9, 18, 31
city, optimally compact see frontage
tax and optimally compact city
civil rights 280
Clark, W.A.V. 92
classified property tax systems 73–5
Cleveland 128, 129
closed-region containment 105
Clyde Hill 239
Coase, R. 195–6
Cobb–Douglas
consumer preferences 300, 308
model 184
preferences 312
utility 310–11
Colorado 80, 94, 105, 116
Columbia 213, 277
Colwell, P.F. 287–313
Commerce Clause 141
commercial districts 56, 57, 58
Community Associations Institute 209, 234, 245, 250, 251
comparable sales method 76
comparative static analysis 32–4
competitive market 195–6
concurrence regulations 77
condominiums 209, 211, 212, 232–3
Conklin, H.E. 66
conservation easements 75–7
constant elasticity of substitution 183, 187
constitutional regimes, alternative 223–4
constitutional revolution 224–7
construction density 11
consumers 13
demand for developable land 290–97
containment 105
see also sprawl containment
conventional tax 21–3
conversion density 11
conversion technologies 15
Cooke, J.P. 66
cooperatives 209, 211, 212
Copeland, B. 125
Coronado 94
cost–benefit analysis see land use
regulations and property tax:
cost–benefit analyses
county district sample (6) 49–57
county municipality samples:
six-county 38–45
102-county 45–9
courts oversight 236–8
Covenants, Conditions and
Restrictions 250
Crone, T. 193, 195
Cubberley, E.P. 280
Davis–Stirling Act 218
DC Ranch 224
dead weight loss 151
Deaton, A. 153
Delaney, C.J. 80
demand, hedonic analysis of 152–5
Denver 98
Department of Environment,
Transport and Regions 149
developable land
consumer demand for 290–91
cost function 297
supply of 291–2
value tax 305–6, 307–10
development impact fees 80–82
development rights, transfer/purchase of 77–9
development timing effect 70–71
developmental control, baseline level of 155–7
Dilger, R.J. 276
Dipasquale, D, 91, 279
discriminatory actions 241–2
dispersion parameter 12
Dorgan, Senator 64
Downs, A 89, 90, 124, 148
Dunford, R.W. 66
Dye, R.F. 37–60
dynamic market equilibrium 17–20
dynamic model of real estate markets 6–35, 139–41
comparative static analysis 32–4
conventional tax 21–3
fortran code 31
multinomial logit calculus 29–30
optimal taxation problem 24–8
structure of model 10–20
basic assumptions 10–13
consumers 13
dynamic market equilibrium 17–20
investors 14–17
vacant land tax 23–4
Eagle, S.J. 282
‘edge cities’ 129
Ellickson, R.C. 283
empirical evidence 71–3, 197
employment centers 128–30
Entreken, H.C. Jr 66, 77
environmentalism, neighborhood 235–6
Epstein, R. 244–5, 282
equalized assessed value 38–46, 49, 51–4, 55–6, 57–8
equilibrium with multiple locations 131–3
equity insurance market 141
Escondido 94
Europe 280
Ewing, R.H. 89, 90–91
executive branches 249–50
expansion path characterization 295–7
extensive margin 9
F statistic 111
factor taxes see zoning and factor taxes
Fair Housing Act (1988) 243–5, 278
Fairfax County 240
Fansler, D.A. 93, 98, 102, 111, 117
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation 233
Federal National Mortgage Association 233
federalism 279–80
Feldstein, M. 178
Felsenstein, D. 177
Fennell, L. 215
Ferguson, J.T. 66
FHA mortgage insurance 232
Fifth Amendment 282
finite demand elasticities model 199–206
first-order condition 81, 193–4, 195, 196
Fischel, W. 122, 123–4, 127, 140, 141, 273–84
Fishe, R. 178
floor–area ratio 122, 131, 134–7, 138, 141
Florida 66, 77, 80
private neighborhood associations 217, 232, 235–6
Supreme Court 237–8, 242–3
Foer, A. 213
Forest Ridge (Texas) 276
fortran code 31
French, S. 225
frontage tax and optimally compact city 287–313
ad valorem taxes 303–10
land tax effects 298–303
residential land market 289–98
Frug, J. 215
Fu, Y. 130, 139, 141
Fujita, M. 289
Gatzlaff, D. 140
general equilibrium model 84
generalized least squares random effects model 54
George, H. 6, 7, 65
Germany 232
Glaeser, E. 141, 279
Glazer, A. 125
Gloudemans, R.J. 66
Goldin, C. 280
Gordon, P. 88
Gordon, R. 177
graded tax systems 82–4
Gramercy Park (New York City) 231
Green Valley (Las Vegas) 236
Greene, W.H. 54
Greystoke (Salt Lake City) 232
Griffing, M.F. 66, 72
Gumbel 12, 29, 30
Gyourko, J. 80
Hamilton, B. 124, 127, 130, 174, 178, 228
Hanson, G. 125
Hardin, G. 217
Harvey, R.O. 92
Hausman test statistic 111
Heckscher–Ohlin model 130, 137
Helsley, R. 72, 125
Hendricks, D.A. 66
heterogeneity coefficient 12
Hicksian demands 306
Hidden Harbor Estate association 237–8
Homestead Act 258
‘homevoter hypothesis’ 122, 140–1
Hoover, H. 275
housing districts 56
housing production function 291, 307
Houston 274–5
Hyatt, W. 210, 223–4, 239
Idaho 94
Illinois 37, 38
Department of Commerce and Community Affairs 42
Department of Revenue 41–2
Indianapolis 128
industrial districts 56, 57, 58
infill development 139–40
Innes, J.E. 93
intensive margin 9, 10
interior solution 194
intrametropolitan specialization and trade 126–30, 133–9
inverse demand function 312
investors 14–17
isolated containment 105
Jacobian determinant 299, 312
Jacobs, J. 231
Jones, S. 178
Kamecke, U. 289
Kansas City 232, 276
Kasper, H. 178
Kennedy, A. 219
Kennedy, D. 220
Kiefer, N. 178
Kim, H.-A. 8, 93, 104, 115, 148, 288, 304–6
King County (Washington) 275
Kitsuse, A. 89, 90
Klacik, J.D. 37
Korngold, G. 237, 275–6
Kotin, A. 93, 103
Laffer Curve 191
Lagrange function 193
Lagrange multiplier 111
Lakeside Village Condominium Association 238
land consumption function 312
land tax effects 160–3, 298–303
area tax 300–303
frontage tax 299–300
land use regulations and property tax:
cost–benefit analyses 173–206, 282–4
cost–benefit analysis of land use intensity regulations 181–4
cost–benefit analysis of zoning at block level 192–7
cost–benefit and local land use allocation decisions 174–81
finite demand elasticities model 199–206
property taxation 185–7
property taxation, zoning and local tax base size 187–92
urban production model 184–5
land value
basic model 67–8
increase in 196–7
model with preferential assessment 68–9
Landmarks Preservation Commission 78–9
land-to-building-to-land conversion cycle 21
Laplace transformation 30
Las Vegas 98, 236
Latin America 232
legislative branches 249–50
Lesher, W.G. 66
Lewis, P. 93, 104
Li, F. 66
Lillydahl, J.H. 80
Lincoln 72
local consumption goods 126–7
local government see private neighborhood associations and local government
local revenue choices 98–110
local taxation 130–39
base size 187–92
equilibrium with multiple locations 131–3
zoning, taxes and intrametropolitan trade 133–9
localism, excessive and land use 282–4
Los Angeles 128
lot dimensions 293–5
lump sum tax 24

McDonald, J. 123, 173–206, 274
McFadden, D. 29
McFarlane, A. 66, 71, 80
McGregor, P. 177
McKenzie, E. 213, 282
McMillen, D.P. 80, 123, 173, 193, 197
Man, J.Y. 38, 40
marginal cost function 297
market equilibrium 298
market-clearing condition 20, 22
Markovian stock adjustment equation 20
Marousek, D.C. 66
Marshallian demands 291
price terms 306
stability condition 299, 312
Maryland 277
Massachusetts ‘Anti-Snob Zoning’ law 277
Mauer, D. 175

Means, G. 227
Measure 5 94
Measure 47 94
Medford-Ashland 98
Mercia Heights (Clyde Hill) 239
Mercia Homeowners Association 239
Merrifield, J. 177
Merriman, D.F. 37–60
Metropolitan Statistical Area 94
Michigan 62, 66, 72
Mieszkowski, P. 92, 127
Mikesell, J.L. 66
Miller, D.J. 66
Mills, D.E. 77–8
Mills, E.S. 6, 8, 9, 88, 92
Mills–Muth infinitesimal lot size model 297
Misczynski, D.J. 92–3
Mishan, E.J. 176, 177
Mission Hills (Kansas City) 232
Mitchell, J.L. 278
Model Real Estate Cooperative Act 234
Montana 94
Morris, A.C. 65, 66, 72–3, 84
Mount Laurel decision 277, 278
Muellbauer, J. 153
multinomial logit calculus 29–30
municipalities as mediators 278–82
Muth, R. 190
Myers, D. 89, 90
Myles, G.D. 83

Nahrstedt, N. 238
Naperville 174
National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws 234
National Housing Act (1961) 232
Nebraska 66, 72
Nechyba, T.J. 84
neighborhood taxes 245–8
Nelson, A.C. 105
Nelson, R. 209–72, 273–4, 279, 282, 284
Netzer, D. 179, 186
Neumann, G. 178
Nevada 94, 105, 107, 236
New Deal 223
New Jersey Supreme Court 277
New Mexico 105, 116
New State Ice v. Liebmann (1932) 280
New York City 211, 231
Nichols, J.C. 232, 276
‘notch’ constraints 137–8, 141
Nunn, S. 37

Oakerson, R. 247–8
Oates, W. 139
Oelson, T. 93
Ohio 275–6
Olson, M. 227
Omaha 72
open space 62
open suburbs movement 277
open-region containment 105
optimal taxation problem 10, 24–8
optimality condition 295
Orange County 139
ordinary least squares regression 111
Oregon 94, 105, 234
Orfield, M. 284
Orr, G. 174
O’Sullivan, A. 91
Ott, S. 175

Papageorgiou, Y.Y. 289
Pareto efficiency 20, 26
partial factor tax 124
Paso Robles 114
Peiser, R. 93, 103, 139
Penn Central Transportation Co. v. City of New York 78–9
Pennsylvania 234, 240
Uniform Planned Community Act 251
Percentage Statewide Discretionary Municipal Revenue from Charges 103
Persky, J. 177
Philadelphia 276
Pierce, N.R. 88
Pigouvian subsidy 63
Pines, D. 289
Pipes, R. 257
Pitt, W. 235
Pittsburgh 139
planned unit development 231
Plantinga, A.J. 66
Polinsky, A.M. 288
Pollock, Sir F. 258
Popenoe, D. 214–15
Portland 128
Portney, P. 132
post-development residual site value 9
Poterba, J. 178
Power, F.B. 66
pre-development value of land 9
preferential assessment 62–85
alternatives 73–84
classified property tax systems 73–5
conservation easements 75–7
development impact fees 80–82
development rights, transfer/purchase of 77–9
graded tax systems 82–4
application, extent of 65
background 62
impacts 66–73
development timing effect 70–71
empirical evidence 71–3
land value basic model 67–8
land value model with preferential assessment 68–9
wealth effect 69–70
justification 63–5
literature 66
Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area 94
private neighborhood associations 273–84
growth of 276–8
localism, excessive and land use 282–4
and municipal zoning 274–6
municipalities as mediators 278–82
see also private neighborhood associations and local government
private neighborhood associations and local government 209–72
age group communities 242–3
body of law, evolving 238–40
collective ownership, reasons for 229–32
condominium ownership 232–3
constitution amendment 250–52
constitutional regimes, alternative 223–4
private neighborhood associations and local government (continued)
  constitutional revolution 224–7
court oversight 236–8
discriminatory actions 241–2
division in society 213–14
existing neighborhoods and associations 254–7
field of study, new 227–9
legislative and executive branches 249–50
neighborhood environment, protection of 216–18
neighborhood environmentalism 235–6
neighborhood taxes and services 245–8
private prerogatives 221–3
private suburbs 214–16
problems 233–5
‘public’ and ‘private’ ambiguities 218–21
termination 253–4
Property Owners Association’s Architectural & Land Zoning Committee 276
property tax 306–7
  see also land use regulations and property tax
Proposition 13 94, 233
Puerto Rico 232
pure land tax 153
Puritanism 235
Qadeer, M. 80
random effect method 110
Ransom, R. 66
Rast, J. 174, 180
regression
  analysis 89, 91
  findings 110–15
  model 104
religion 244
residential land market 289–98
  consumer demand for developable land 290–97
  market equilibrium 298
Reston (Virginia) 213, 277
retail activity location in metropolitan area 91–3
retail decentralization 93–110
Richardson, H.W. 88
Riss, C. 239
Riss, W. 239
Robinson, G. 241–2
Rosen, H. 29, 125, 137–8
Rosenberry, K. 226
Rosentraub, M.S. 40
Rubinfeld, D. 125, 288
Rusk, D. 284
Sacramento 98
St. Louis 128
Salem 98
Salt Lake City 232
San Diego 94
San Luis Obispo 114
Santa Fe 114
Sarbanes, M. 241
Scheu, T. 292
Schill, M.H. 277
Schneider, W. 215
Schwab, R. 139
Schwartz, S.I. 66
Scott, J.T. 66
Scottsdale 224
Seattle 275
second-order condition 195
Securities and Exchange Commission 218
selectivity bias 42
services 245–8
Shelley v. Kraemer (1948) 241, 278
Sheppard, S. 147–72, 292
Shleifer, A. 141
Sick, G.A. 72
Siegel, S. 209
Silverman, C. 213
Singell, L.D. 80
single tax 6
Skaburskis, A. 80
Skullney, K. 241
Slutsky
  equations 306
  symmetry 307
Small, K.A. 29
smart growth policies 148, 287
Smith, M. 80, 140
## Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sokolow, A.D.</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerville, C.T.</td>
<td>130, 139, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonstelie, J.</td>
<td>75, 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialization, intrametropolitan</td>
<td>126–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprawl containment policies and welfare impacts</td>
<td>147–72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and setting</td>
<td>151–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand, hedonic analysis of 152–5 developmental control, baseline level of 155–7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land taxation 160–63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport taxation 157–60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Hill Community Association</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sridhar, K.</td>
<td>177, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard State Zoning Enabling Act</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static models 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary state condition 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson, S.</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterk, S.</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiglitz, J.E.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story property 232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strange, W.</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures, tax on 304–5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubblefield, A.</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitum v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, A.M.</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun City</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarlock, D.</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavernier, E.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax increment financing and land use 37–60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-county district sample 49–57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-county municipality samples 38–45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-county municipality sample 45–9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, S.</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Raa, T.</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas 274–5, 276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, W.R.</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiebout, C.</td>
<td>92, 124, 126–7, 130, 142, 174, 178, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobit problem 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town and Country Planning System</td>
<td>148, 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade 126–30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragedy of the commons 217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport taxation 157–60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullock, G.</td>
<td>227, 251–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnbull, G.K.</td>
<td>287–313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two boundary solutions 194, 195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-rate property tax 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Common Interest Ownership Act 234–5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Condominium Act 234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Planned Community Act 234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom 147, 148, 149, 164, 258, 259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 151–2, 157, 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census of Agriculture 110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census City and County Databook 110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census of Governments 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress 225, 232, 243, 249, 251, 258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution amendment 250–52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private neighborhood associations 221, 223, 225, 240–41, 244, 249, 251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce 275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development's State of the Cities Data System 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential assessment 62, 64, 65, 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprawl containment policies 148, 149, 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court 215, 219, 221–2, 223, 226–7, 245, 278, 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California 210, 238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida 237–8, 242–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey 277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax increment financing and land use 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See also ‘big-box’ urban sprawl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Containment Policy 104–5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
urban growth boundaries 148, 149–50
urban production model 184–5
urban retail sprawl 90–91
urbanist movement 287
Utah 94
utility function 291

vacant land tax 23–4
Virginia 213, 234, 240, 277

Wald test 41, 42, 45
Washington 116, 239, 275
Wassmer, R.W. 40, 88–120
Watts, J. 230
wealth effect 69–70
Weiss, M. 230, 275
Weitzman, M. 140
welfare impacts see sprawl containment policies and welfare impacts
Wetlaufer, G. 219
Wheaton, W. 91, 189
White, H. 110
White Egret neighborhood association 242–3
Wicksellian conclusion 71
Williamson Act see California Land Conservation Act (1965)
Wilson, G. 139

Wilson, J.D. 125, 137, 142
Winokur, J. 233
Wisconsin 62
Woodlands (Houston) 274
Worley, W.S. 276
Wunderlich, G. 65, 66
Wyoming 94

Yinger, J. 80

zero profit condition 20
Zodorow, G. 127
zoning 173, 187–92, 214–16, 217
at block level 192–7
intensive 137
municipal 274–6
private neighborhood associations 230–31, 232, 253, 257–9, 277, 279, 281–3
racial 277–8
see also zoning and factor taxes
zoning and factor taxes 122–44
connections 123–6
dynamic model 139–41
intrametropolitan specialization and trade 126–30
local taxation and zoning model 130–39