

Senior Project

Department of Economics



“Economic Effect of Greenways in Summit County”

Stephen Hritsko

May, 2019

Abstract

Recently bicycle infrastructure has been a focus for cities within Summit county and Akron in particular. However, this is not a new phenomenon in the Summit County area. One of the major bicycle, recreation, and environment project was the creation and maintenance of a “green way” that is known as the “Ohio Erie Canal Way Towpath.” In this paper, I use a hedonic housing price model to estimate the effect that proximity to the Ohio Erie Canal Towpath has on willingness to pay for local households. Using Housing data from the Summit County Fiscal Office, I created an OLS regression of over 140,000 observations of house in Summit County sold within the years 1990 to 2019, and proximity data created through GIS. The regression used in this analysis takes into account housing characteristics, neighborhood quality, and proximity to the Towpath Amenity. The results of this analysis show that there is a positive and significant effect that proximity to the Towpath has on housing price.

Table of Contents:

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Introduction | p.4 |
| Literature Review | p.5 |
| Model | p.7 |
| Data and Methodology | p.8 |
| Results | p.12 |
| Conclusion | p.14 |

Introduction

One issue that many cities are facing in the United States is the stagnation of population growth. This issue can easily be seen by observing the cities in northeast Ohio. For example, the City of Akron has seen a population decrease of 0.6% from 2010 to 2017. Cleveland has seen an even greater population decrease of 2.6% within the same time (census.gov). Some of the population that left these cities moved into areas that are just outside of the city but within a distance that can still benefit from the Central business district of these cities. This growth of the suburban areas of Ohio is an example of sprawl.

The theory of urban location predicts that households will move to areas that offer the best amenities that match the household preferences (Straszheim, 1987). The households that have left the cities of Cleveland and Akron left to live in areas that they believe have greater benefit than original locations. Reasons why households might value an area more than another could include the quality of the school system, the quality of the environment of the area, and the overall quality of the neighborhood. If households hold an area in greater value because of one of its characteristics, then such characteristics would be considered an amenity. Areas with a greater amount of characteristics that would be considered amenities would be valued higher than an area that lacks such amenity. Because of the greater valuation, households would be willing to pay more to live in that area.

An infrastructure focus that many cities in the United States have taken up recently is the creation of bicycle and recreational areas. One example, in Summit County, that fits the focus of bicycle and recreation is the "Ohio Erie Canal Towpath." This Towpath is a network of

trails and waterways constructed and maintained since the 1980s in Ohio. Summit County specifically sees the Towpath infrastructure pass through the county and many of its major cities as well. Since its creation it has become a central part of the culture and recreational time of the area. What effect does proximity to the “Ohio Erie Canal Way Towpath” have on housing Price? Using a hedonic housing price model, the effect of proximity to the Towpath on household willingness to pay for that area can be estimated to observe whether the presence of the Towpath is considered to be an amenity to the area or a disamenity.

Literature Review

The method for measuring the way that households value certain amenities and disamenities is based on the hedonic price analysis (Lancaster, 1966; Rosen, 1974).

Using this methodology several papers have analyzed the effect of bike lanes and trails on local housing prices. There is no consensus in the economic literature on whether bike lanes are actually considered an amenity by local populations. For example, Krizek, 2006 performed a hedonic analysis of bike lanes and trails in the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul Minnesota. His analysis found that there is a negative effect of road side bike lanes on housing sales prices in proximity to the homes. There was an average effect of \$-2,271 and \$ -1,058 for houses, in cities and suburbs respectively, if the house was located within 400 meters from the bike lane. The only bile infrastructure with a positive effect on housing prices were non-roadside bike trails in cities. Houses located 400 meters closer would see a sales price increase of \$509.85. The effect was \$-240 in suburbs. This analysis concludes that different urban areas can value

goods differently, and that households may see the presence of bike lanes as a way to bring fears of crime in the local neighborhoods.

Other economic studies of bike lanes within metropolitan areas have found that the presence of bike infrastructure has a positive effect on housing sales prices. The areas analyzed in these studies include the state of Delaware (Racca Dhanju, 2006), San Antonio (Asabere Huffman, 2007), and Portland (Liu Shi, 2016). In the Delaware study, the presence of road side bike trails increased housing prices by an average of 8,886 dollars (Racca Dhanju 2006). The authors challenge the idea that bike lanes lead to an increase in crime. The San Antonio study found that the presence of bike trails lead to a 2 percent increase in housing prices. The Portland study found that housing prices would increase by 686 dollars every quarter mile closer a home is to Bicycle facilities. All of these studies conclude those bike infrastructures are amenities.

Following along the economic literature that analyzes the economic benefit of bicycle infrastructure, the economic analysis of greenways observes the economic effect that the presence of this type of infrastructure has on willingness to pay for households. A “greenway” is considered to be infrastructure such as bike paths and recreational trails that have an environmental component. In the study of bike lanes in San Antonio, the analysis found that the presence of a green way increased housing price by 5% (Asabere Huffman, 2007). The addition of the environmental factor leads to a further increase in the housing price. Other studies have also evaluated the effect of greenways on housing price. In an analysis of greenways in Austin Texas, the presence of greenways had the effect of increasing housing

price by 3.90%, 3.97%, and 1.13% in three different regressions (Nicholls Crompton, 2005).

Another study of property values in Indianapolis finds that the presence of a greenway had the effect of increasing housing price by 4.16% (Lindsey 2004).

From this analysis of the literature, one can see a broad amount of findings that bicycle infrastructure and greenways have on housing price. The literature facilitates continued study in the area of bicycle lanes and green ways by allowing for studies for other areas. From the literature, each the different studies find that the presences of the amenity has a benefit that is different in each case. This allows for my analysis of the Ohio Erie Canal Way Towpath to be an addition to the economic observation in the study of economic effect of greenways.

Model

For this analysis, the economic model that I will create is an application of the hedonic pricing model. Through using this analysis, one is able to estimate the willingness to pay of the household. This analysis takes into account the characteristics of the good being purchased, in this case it is a household bought in a certain area, and measures the utility that the good brings to the household through a comparison is the price that is paid for the good. In my analysis of houses purchased in Summit County, the model that I will use is as follows.

Price=f(Housing Characteristics, Neighborhood Characteristics, Proximity to Amenity)

The housing characteristics refer to the variables that include the structure house. This includes the year built, bathrooms, bedroom, etc. The neighborhood characteristics refer to the

quality of the neighborhood or areas that the house is purchased. In this analysis, I will estimate this variable by creating a variable of the city area that the house is purchased. Finally the proximity to amenity refers to the proximity that the house is to an environmental good that is a certain distance from the home. In this analysis, I will be measuring the distance that a house is from the Towpath.

Data and Methodology

The data that I used in this analysis was provided through the Summit County Fiscal Office. From that data, there are over 170,000 household data observations that are provided for public use. In order to create a true analysis of proximity to the towpath, the data must be limited to the house sales that would be affected by proximity to the towpath. The Ohio- Erie Canal way towpath was an environmental project that began in the 1980s. The data in my analysis is limited to the 1990s to account for the completion of the Towpath construction. After the limitation of the data, the amount of household observations present in the regression is 141,547.

A basic OLS model is the method that is used to estimate the effect of the proximity to the towpath in this analysis. The econometric model is as followed, where i = individual sale of home:

$$\text{Logprice} = \beta_0 + \beta_{1i} \text{yearbuilt} + \beta_{2i} \text{stories} + \beta_{3i} \text{rooms} + \beta_{4i} \text{bedrooms} + \beta_{5i} \text{fullbath} + \beta_{6i} \text{halfbath} + \beta_{7i} \text{familyrooms} + \beta_{8i} \text{sqft} + \beta_{9i} \text{yearsold} - \beta_{10i} \text{proximity to the towpath} + \beta_{11i} \text{dummy variable for city} + \varepsilon_i$$

| Variable | N | Mean | Std Dev | Minimum | Maximum |
|---------------|--------|----------|----------|------------|-----------|
| MACENORTH | 141547 | 0.000572 | 0.023915 | 0 | 1 |
| SAGANORTH | 141547 | 0.001088 | 0.032967 | 0 | 1 |
| Twinsburg | 141547 | 0.000191 | 0.01381 | 0 | 1 |
| NORTONBAR | 141547 | 0.177764 | 0.382316 | 0 | 1 |
| BATH | 141547 | 0.00385 | 0.061932 | 0 | 1 |
| Clinton | 141547 | 0.051425 | 0.220863 | 0 | 1 |
| green | 141547 | 0.000897 | 0.02994 | 0 | 1 |
| HUDSON | 141547 | 0.012279 | 0.110127 | 0 | 1 |
| LAKEMORE | 141547 | 0.000396 | 0.019887 | 0 | 1 |
| MFALLS | 141547 | 0.00178 | 0.042157 | 0 | 1 |
| PENINSULA | 141547 | 0.010943 | 0.104037 | 0 | 1 |
| TALLMADGE | 141547 | 0.003568 | 0.059624 | 0 | 1 |
| RICHFEILD | 141547 | 0.00231 | 0.048009 | 0 | 1 |
| Akron | 141547 | 0.112634 | 0.316146 | 0 | 1 |
| year built | 141547 | 1959.97 | 28.27239 | 1900 | 2018 |
| rooms | 141435 | 6.570707 | 1.669662 | 2 | 66 |
| bedrooms | 141547 | 3.116124 | 0.79023 | 2 | 43 |
| full bath | 141547 | 1.56151 | 0.709771 | 1 | 21 |
| half bath | 141547 | 0.465563 | 0.559937 | 0 | 11 |
| family rooms | 141547 | 0.304175 | 0.466555 | 0 | 7 |
| story height | 141547 | 1.445894 | 0.481475 | 1 | 3 |
| SQFT | 141547 | 1001.29 | 419.9526 | 120 | 9460 |
| HOUSING PRICE | 141547 | 152922.2 | 56260.9 | 52500 | 1345630 |
| log price | 141547 | 11.88277 | 0.32018 | 10.8685684 | 14.112373 |
| YEAR SOLD | 141547 | 2007.31 | 6.36116 | 1996 | 2019 |

Towpath takes through Summit County. The grey areas are parcels of land that are considered residential property.

Results

| Variable | Parameter Estimate | t Value | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---------|--|
| Intercept | 10.0124*** | 84.04 | |
| year_built | 0.00042781*** | 24.64 | |
| rooms | 0.02193*** | 62.41 | |
| bedrooms | 0.02263*** | 34.8 | |
| fullbath | 0.12441*** | 165.9 | |
| halfbath | 0.09697*** | 122.86 | |
| familyrooms | 0.066*** | 70.93 | |
| story_height | 0.22864*** | 205.52 | |
| Sqft | 0.00032875*** | 260.53 | |
| year sold | -0.00004234 | -0.74 | |
| Proximity to the towpath | -0.00426*** | -20.83 | |
| MACENORTH | -0.00447 | -0.29 | |
| SAGANORTH | 0.01349 | 1.22 | |
| Twinsburg | 0.04871 | 1.86 | |
| NORTONBAR | -0.00873*** | -7.85 | |
| BATH | 0.00000127 | 0 | |
| Clinton | -0.02404*** | -14.27 | |
| Green | -0.02629** | -2.17 | |

| | | | |
|--------------|------------|---------------|--|
| HUDSON | -0.0197*** | -5.94 | |
| LAKEMORE | -0.02077 | -1.14 | |
| MFALLS | 0.01293 | 1.5 | |
| PENINSULA | 0.00754 | 2.13 | |
| TALLMADGE | 0.01434*** | 2.36 | |
| RICHFEILD | 0.00375 | 0.5 | |
| Akron | 0.00047928 | 0.4 | |
| | | | |
| R-Square | 0.8185 | | |
| Significance | *, **, *** | 90%, 95%, 99% | |

From the table of results of the OLS hedonic regression, the observation that is seen for the estimated coefficient for the proximity to the towpath comes to -0.00426***. This coefficient is interpreted, that every mile that the house is located one mile away from the Towpath housing price decreases by 0.426%. This also means that every mile that a house is located closer to the Towpath housing price increases by 0.426%. In dollar amounts, the effect of locating one mile closer to the Towpath increases the housing price by \$626. The dollar amount is calculated through multiplying the coefficient value and the average sales value of houses within Summit County. This result follows the economic literature that proximity to a greenway has a positive effect on housing price. The magnitude of the effect is less than that found in the economic literature. One reason for this may be due to the amount of investment put into to the green way. This hedonic regression does not take into account the development of the green way and the amount of other amenities that are present within or are close to the green way.

The Housing variables follow closely to the signs predicted in the econometric model. All of the variables are positive and have a t value that is well within the level for significance at 99%. The only

value that is not significant is the value for year sold. This means that from the OLS estimation the amount time after the Towpath was completed does not have an observable effect on the willingness to pay for the household. When it comes to the location dummy variables, the results are mixed. Only some of the Dummy variables have a value that is statistically significant. These variables include the Norton and Barberton, Clinton, Green, Hudson and Tallmadge variables. Out of these, only the area of Tallmadge had a positive effect on housing prices. The rest of the areas with significant values had a negative effect on housing prices. One limitation of this method of location is the size of the area for the variable. By using the zip code for the location, the regression does not take into account the smaller neighborhood and school district areas. Further analysis in the effect of the Towpath should use variables that take into account a more local cluster of houses.

Conclusion

From my analysis of the effect of the Ohio Erie Canal Way Towpath, I find that the effect of proximity to the Towpath has a positive effect on housing prices. The hedonic regression that I perform within this paper finds that every mile a house is located closer to the towpath, willingness to pay increases by 0.426% or \$626. The result follows the economic literature in that the effect of green ways has a positive effect on the sales price for housing.

A policy suggestion that would follow from this research would be to continue to invest in the Towpath infrastructure to increase the benefit that households find in this amenity. One form of investment that would bring more value to the Towpath would be the introduction of service oriented business that operates along or in close proximity to the Towpath. These businesses would be able to provide the individuals that utilize the towpath services that would

make each use of the towpath more valuable. Another suggestion would be to expand the towpath to more areas. This would increase the value of houses because more households would be in closer proximity to the towpath.

References

- Asabere, Paul, and Forrest Huffman. "The Relative Impacts of Trails and Greenbelts on Home Price." *Journal of Real Estate Finance & Economics*, vol. 38, no. 4, May 2009, pp. 408–419. EBSCOhost, doi:10.1007/s11146-007-9089-8.
- Krizek, K. J. (2006). Two approaches to valuing some of bicycle facilities' presumed benefits. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 72(3), 309–320
- .Racca , D. P., & Dhanju , A. (n.d.). Property value/desirability effects of bike paths adjacent to residential areas. (2006). Delaware Center for Transportation, Retrieved from
- Rosen, S. (1974). Hedonic prices and implicit markets: product differentiation in pure competition. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 82, 34-5
- Lancaster, Kelvin J. "A New Approach to Consumer Theory." *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 74, no. 2, 1966, pp. 132–157. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/1828835.
- Liu, Jenny h, and Wei Shi. IMPACT OF BIKE FACILITIES ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY PRICES . Portland State University, trec.pdx.edu/sites/default/files/Liu TRB - IMPACT OF BIKE FACILITIES ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY PRICES_revise_v2.pdf.
- Straszhem, Mahlon. *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics*. 1987.
- Nicholls, Sarah, and John L. Crompton. "The Impact of Greenways on Property Values: Evidence from Austin, Texas." *Journal of Leisure Research*, vol. 37, no. 3, 2005, pp. 321–341., doi:10.1080/00222216.2005.11950056.
- Lindsey, Greg, et al. "Property Values, Recreation Values, and Urban Greenways." *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 2004, pp. 69–90.

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/akroncityohio/PST045217>

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/clevelandcityohio>

Appendix 1

Table of Variables

| Variable | Description | Source |
|------------|--|-----------------------------|
| MACENORTH | Dummy variable for Macedonia and Northfield zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| SAGANORTH | Dummy variable for Sagamore Hills and Northfield | Summit County Fiscal office |
| TWINSBURG | Dummy Variable for Twinsburg zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| NORTONBAR | Dummy Variable for Norton Barberton Zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| BATH | Dummy Variable for Bath zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| CLINTON | Dummy Variable for Clinton zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| GREEN | Dummy Variable for Green zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| HUDSON | Dummy Variable for Hudson zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| LAKEMORE | Dummy Variable for Lakemore zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| MFALLS | Dummy Variable for Munroe Falls zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| PENINSULA | Dummy Variable for Peninsula zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| TALLMADGE | Dummy Variable for Tallmadge zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| RICHFIELD | Dummy Variable for Richfield zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| AKRON | Dummy Variable for Akron zip code | Summit County Fiscal office |
| YEAR BUILT | Variable for year the house was built | Summit County Fiscal office |
| ROOMS | Variable for number of rooms | Summit County Fiscal office |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| BEDROOMS | Variable for Number of bedrooms | Summit County Fiscal office |
| FULL BATH | Variable for number of fullbathrooms | Summit County Fiscal office |
| HALF BATH | Variable for number of half bathrooms | Summit County Fiscal office |
| FAMILY ROOMS | Variable for number of family rooms | Summit County Fiscal office |
| STORY HEIGHT | Variable for number of stories | Summit County Fiscal office |
| SQFT | Variable for base sqft | Summit County Fiscal office |
| HOUSING PRICE | The housing sales price | Summit County Fiscal office |
| LOG PRICE | The log of the housing sales price | Summit County Fiscal office |
| YEAR SOLD | The year that the house was sold | Summit County Fiscal office |
| Proximity to the Towpath | Distance from the house to the towpath in miles | ARCGIS created with data from the summit county fiscal office. |

