WORKING PAPER
RESPONSIBLE PROPERTY INVESTING CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
BENECKI CENTER FOR REAL ESTATE STUDIES, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE WALKABILITY PREMIUM IN COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE INVESTMENTS

GARY PIVO[1] *AND JEFFREY D. FISHER*[2]

February 2010

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of walkability on property values and investment returns. Walkability is the degree to which an area within walking distance of a property encourages walking for recreational or functional purposes. It is of particular concern to developers, investors and others interested in sustainable and responsible property investing because of its potential social and environmental benefits. We used data from the National Council of Real Estate Investment Fiduciaries (NCREIF) and Walk Score to examine the effects of walkability on the market value and annual investment returns of more than 4,200 office, apartment, retail and industrial properties over the past decade in the USA. We find that, all else being equal, the benefits of walkability are capitalized into office, retail and industrial property values with more walkable sites commanding higher property values. On a 100 point scale, a 10 point increase in walkability increases property values by 1 to 9 percent, depending on property type. We also find that walkability is associated with lower cap rates and higher incomes, suggesting that the higher values are caused by both higher incomes and expectations of less risk, greater income growth, or slower depreciation. Walkability had no significant effect on historical total investment returns. All walkable property types generated higher income and therefore have the potential to generate returns as good as or better than less walkable properties, as long as they are priced correctly. Developers should be willing to develop more walkable properties as long as any additional cost for more walkable locations and related development expenses do not exhaust the walkability premium.

[1] Professor of Urban Planning, University of Arizona, gpivo@u.arizona.edu, 520-349-8090
[2] Director, Benecki Center for Real Estate Studies and Charles H. and Barbara F. Dunn Professor of Real Estate, Indiana University

INTRODUCTION

The emerging field of Responsible Property Investing (RPI) is concerned with real estate investments that benefit both investors and the common good. It examines portfolio, asset and property management activities that go beyond compliance with minimum legal requirements to better manage the risks and opportunities associated with social and environmental issues. RPI encompasses all kinds of efforts to address ecological integrity, community development, and human fulfillment in the course of profitable real estate investing. It seeks to reduce risk and pursue opportunities while addressing challenging public issues facing present and future generations. Its goal is to address social and environmental problems related to the built environment through better understanding of financially prudent property investments that are consistent with principles of corporate social responsibility, smart growth, green building and sustainable urbanization.

In a recent effort to rank RPI criteria based on both financial materiality and the public interest, Pivo (2008a) found agreement among real estate, investment and academic experts that a high priority should be placed on the development of "higher density, mixed-use walkable places." However, in another study, real estate executives expressed the opinion that insufficient financial performance could be the biggest obstacle to RPI, even though 85% agreed they would increase their allocation to it if it met their risk/return criteria (Pivo 2008b). This study was designed to address this concern by examining the effects of walkability on the financial performance of real estate investments. In particular, we sought to determine whether walkable properties had market values, incomes, and investment returns that were equal to or better than less walkable forms of development.

This study is significant because it is the first to examine the effects of walkability per se on property income, values and returns on a national scale for office, retail, apartment and industrial properties. Walkability has become a prominent issue for real estate investors and developers as urban planners, governments, and public health leaders have increasingly embraced the goal of increasing pedestrian mobility. For example, according to a new global policy report by the World Cancer Research Fund/American Institute for Cancer Research (2009), in order to reduce preventable cancers linked to obesity and inactivity, governments should require increased walking facilities, developers should construct more projects that promote walking, and employers should occupy buildings that facilitate physical activity. This idea also was endorsed by former HHS Secretary Donna Shalala in her keynote address to the annual fall meeting of the Urban Land Institute in 2006 (Riggs 2006). Similar recommendations are emerging from global policy discussions on global warming (Ribeiro et al. 2007, Ewing and Rong 2008, Marshall 2008).

Our study is also significant because it is the first to examine Walk Score, a new measure of walkability and the first to be widely used in the marketplace. Every day, nearly 3 million walk scores are displayed online to people interested in knowing the walkability of a property. Walk Score is used on over 3,000 websites, has been featured in over 500 print publications and 50 TV and radio segments, named as one of the 7 ideas changing real estate by Inman News, and featured in discussions by the Wall Street Journal on the growing importance of walkability in the real estate market (Front Seat 2009).

Finally, this study links the subject of walkability back to the traditional literature on the determinants of property value and demonstrates how it builds on more than 40 years of related studies and reinforces our traditional framework for understanding such problems. It also makes contributions to small but significant lines of work on "local accessibility", which has been largely overlooked in the accessibility literature, and the economic consequences of land use mixing, something that was studied in the 1970s and 80s and has recently begun to reappear in the field of real estate and urban economics.

THE NATURE OF WALKABLE PLACES

Walkable places are streets and districts with physical attributes that encourage walking for functional and recreational purposes. They are found in various settings including new neo-traditional subdivisions, turn of the century streetcar suburbs (Southworth 1997), urban and suburban centers (Lang et al. 2008), greenbelt new towns (Ahrentzen 2008) and rural villages (Dalbey 2008).

Researchers have suggested that walkable places may produce a variety of environmental and social benefits. Environmental benefits may include less air pollution, auto use, and gasoline consumption (Frank et al. 2000, Ewing and Cervero 2001, Frank and Engelke 2005). Social benefits could include greater physical activity (Frank et al. 2006, Doyle et al. 2006, Kerr et al. 2006, Pikora et al. 2006, Forsythe et al. 2007, Frank et al. 2007) and increased social capital including more community cohesion, political participation, trust, and social activity (Leyden 2003, duToit et al. 2007). These benefits remain a topic of ongoing research, though evidence supporting them is emerging from well controlled studies (Handy 2005, Cao et al. 2006, Frank et al. 2007).

We define walkability as the degree to which an area within walking distance of a property encourages walking trips from the property to other destinations. It interacts with the property users' walking preferences and capabilities to produce the timing, quantity and distance of walking trips that occur. Several different physical and social attributes of the area around a property can affect walkability. As such, it is a multi-dimensional construct composed of different factors which together comprise a single theoretical concept. Contributing attributes include urban density, land use mixing, street connectivity (i.e. the directness of links and the density of connections), traffic volume, distance to destinations, sidewalk width and continuity, city block size, topographic slope, perceived safety, and aesthetics (Frank and Pivo 1994, Hoehner et al. 2005, Cao et al. 2006, Lee and Moudon 2006, Parks and Schofer 2006).

Of all these attributes, the presence of desired destinations within walking distance of a property may be most important. Hoehner et al. (2005) found it was the strongest correlate with home-based walking trips when compared to other social, transportation and aesthetic features. Lee and Moudon (2006) also found that distance to routine destinations, such as grocery stores, eating places and banks, is particularly useful for predicting pedestrian activity. This dimension of walkability is similar to what Handy (1992) calls "local accessibility" which is "primarily determined by nearby activity, most of which is oriented to convenience goods, such as supermarkets and drug stores, and located in small centers". As Li and Brown (1980) observed, access has traditionally been measured in relation to regional centers, but also important are access to the corner grocery, the neighborhood park, or local schools. The main difference, however, between local accessibility and walkability to desired destinations is that local accessibility presumably includes opportunities that are easily reached by all transport modes, including cars, while walkability depends on opportunities that are easily reached on foot. As such, walkability is concerned with the availability of destinations in a much smaller area around a given property than local accessibility (e.g., within ¼ to 1 square mile).

DEMAND FOR WALKABLE PLACES

Some researchers forecast growing demand for walkable places. Myers and Gearin (2001) point to a desire for walkable communities, especially among older consumers. They predict that as older consumers grow as a proportion of the total population, demand for walkability will grow as well. They also list other trends supporting this shift including growing traffic congestion, falling urban crime rates, more attractive ethnic enclaves and urban vitality produced by immigration, a growing café culture, and a growing record of fashionable and successful higher density housing. Bailey and Humphrey (2001) list additional drivers that could support the market for walkable urban places

including urban job growth, tight urban housing markets, preferences for urban amenities, and support for public policies and investments that favor revitalization, alternative transportation modes, historic preservation, and urban parks and open space. Shiller (2007) has recently suggested that concerns about pollution, the environment and energy conservation may stimulate a move toward walkable urban centers, though he is uncertain it will occur, and if it does, he thinks it could take many years. But others conclude that unmet demand already exists today. Levine and Inam (2004) found in a national survey that developers perceive considerable interest among consumers in alternatives to "conventional, low-density, automobile-oriented suburban development" including higher density, mixed use, pedestrian oriented places. They also found that developers think there is an inadequate supply, which they attribute to restrictive local government regulations. A survey of residents in Boston and Atlanta by Levine et al. (2002) supports the developers' impressions: there seems to be a mismatch between the desire for pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods and the choices available to consumers. A more recent study by Levine and Frank (2006) also found a correlation between the desire for walkability and the desire for neighborhood change, lending further credence to the view that there is an undersupply of walkable neighborhoods relative to demand. Generally then, there may be an unmet demand for walkability that is increasing with the passage of time.

THE EFFECTS OF WALKABILITY ON PROPERTY VALUES AND RETURNS

Developers and investors would be key players in the creation of more walkable cities, but the real estate economics of walkability is not well understood. Does it add or detract from property values? How does it affect investment risks and returns? If walkability improves profits and returns, we could expect the private sector to produce more walkable places, so long as land use controls permit it (Levine 2006). If, however, the financial effects are more neutral or negative, then producing more walkable places may require public subsidies, mandates or partnerships.

WALKABILITY AS A DETERMINANT OF URBAN LAND VALUES

Determinants of urban land values have been studied for over 100 years. Seminal works focused on the role of accessibility and transportation systems (Hurd 1903, Haig 1926, Alonso 1960), but scholars have long understood that other factors, such as site advantages, can also be consequential (Wendt 1957). Brigham (1965) was perhaps the first to offer a comprehensive set of determinants and to quantify their contribution using regression analysis. In his work on single-family home values, he identified four groups of explanatory factors: accessibility (e.g. distance to workplaces and other desired destinations), amenities (e.g., air quality), topography (e.g., slope, elevation and views) and historical factors (i.e. conditions extant when development occurs). Within 10 years, Stull (1975) was able to observe that "it has become customary to think of a single-family parcel as a bundle of characteristics" that can be classified into four "mutually exclusive and exhaustive" categories including accessibility (e.g., distance to desired destinations), physical site characteristics (e.g., building age), environmental features around the parcel (both social and bio-physical), and public sector factors (taxes and services).[3]

Walkability seems to fit rather well within this traditional theory of land value determinants with one exception; the factors that determine walkability bridge two of Stull's categories. The presence of

[3] Ball (1973) reviewed the work of these and other pioneers. Since then, the research has been extended to cover nonresidential properties and other determinants beyond Stull's four categories including buyer and renter characteristics, property management quality, lease provisions, regional economic drivers and macroeconomic conditions (Ogur 1973, Hoag 1980, Guntermann and Norbin 1987, Glascock et al. 1990, Sirmans and Benjamin 1991, Mills 1992, Ambrose 1990, Sirmans and Guidry 1993, Asabare and Huffman 1996, Kim and Nelson 1996, Benjamin et al. 1997, Buttimer et al. 1997, Sivitanides 1998, Frew and Judd 2003, and Rosiers et al. 2005.

desired destinations within walking distance falls within the "accessibility" category, while factors such as path connectivity, topography and safety would fit under "other environmental features around the parcel". Walkability includes characteristics that may not fit neatly into just one of the traditional "mutually exclusive" categories, but neither does it require going beyond the categories identified by Stull over 30 years ago.

Most of the work by Brigham, Stull and others focuses on single family property values. In this paper, however, we look at offices, apartments, retail and industrial properties. Is the prior work transferable? Following traditional reasoning about accessibility, one could argue that walkability can be expected to lower the cost of transportation to food, recreational, financial, and retail services which are desired by the tenants, workers, and customers who frequent these other types of buildings. And in a world of more single adult and two-worker households, where time budgets for daily tasks are severely constrained, as well as a world of growing traffic congestion and transportation costs, where the costs of mobility are rising, it may well be easier in more walkable places for apartment owners to attract and retain renters, for office, retail and industrial employers to attract and retain employees, and for retailers to attract customers. These benefits to tenants would then be capitalized into higher rents and lower turnover, which would increase property incomes and values.

It is possible that walkable places have other merits as well that are capitalized into property values. For example, they may be more widely recognized as distinctive "places" with greater prestige than other locations, which, as Gertrude Stein famously put it, "have no there there". Walkable places may also be valued for the interesting diversity, sense of community and vitality which they can offer the residents, workers, and customers who use them.

Thus, in theory, there are reasons to expect higher property values in more walkable places. Although we have no empirical papers so far directly confirming it, there are a number of related studies that would support the proposition that walkability increases property values.

Two teams of researchers have examined the value of "new urbanism" or "traditional neighborhood development", which emphasizes pedestrian-oriented design. Tu and Eppli (1999) studied Kentlands, a community in Gaithersburg, Maryland which they describe as "one of the best and most complete" new urbanist cases. Using data on single family home transactions and hedonic models, they found a 12 percent premium for Kentland properties. They later expanded their work to include cases from Sacramento and Chapel Hill and again found a 4 to 15 percent premium which could not be explained by housing characteristics other than the more pedestrian-friendly design (Tu and Eppli 2001). Similar work was completed by Song and Knaap (2003) on the Portland, Oregon region. They looked at separate measures of urban form that are associated with walkability, including the percent of homes within ¼ mile of commercial uses and bus stops, density, mixed use, circulation system design, and the availability of non-auto travel modes. They found buyers prefer pedestrian access to commercial uses and a 15.5 percent premium for houses in neighborhoods with new urbanist features.

Other researchers, studying the determinants of rent, have included variables in their analyses that pertain to walkability. Sivitanidou (1995) looked at the effect of "utility-bearing worker amenities" on office rents in over 1,400 properties in the Los Angeles area and found that the level of retail amenities in the surrounding area increased rents. This is consistent with Mills (1992) who found that the presence of a bank and restaurants in an office building increased office rents per square foot. Working on apartment buildings, Des Rosiers and Theriault (1996) found that the distance to primary schools and shopping centers were inversely related to rents. Except for Mills' work, its unknown whether the schools and shopping examined by these researchers were within walking distance of the properties, but their positive association with rent suggests that access to them is an amenity for office workers and apartment tenants that can increase rents and values.

Other work has focused on the effect of land use mixing on residential property values. This line of work grew from interest in the effectiveness of zoning; particularly whether separating land uses improves property values. These studies were not concerned with walkability *per se*, but land use mixing, which is analogous to proximity to desired destinations.

According to Matthews (2006) there are two views, grounded in urban economic theory, on how the presence of nonresidential uses in a residential area should affect home values. On the one hand, microeconomic theory predicts that value is related to transportation costs. So as the distance to destinations, like work or shopping or entertainment, declines with less separation between uses and increased mixing, residential values should increase. This has been called the proximity effect. It should be noted, however, that this increase in value should come about because it is less expensive to access opportunities by all modes of travel, not just by walking. So, even if land use mixing and greater proximity to desired destinations improves walkability, it is not just the greater ease of walking that would drive values higher, it is the lower cost of all forms of transportation that is being capitalized into property prices. This should be kept in mind later when considering the results of our study. Nonetheless, walkability can be associated with higher property values, even if those higher values are not the result of greater walkability alone.

The second view on how nonresidential uses should affect home values recognizes that there may be disamenity effects from land use mixing. Nonresidential uses can produce negative externalities, such as noise, traffic or litter, and that can reduce residential values.

Some prior empirical work found no evidence that land use mixing affects property values (Crecine et al. 1967, Rueter 1973). Other quantitative studies produced evidence that both proximity and disamenity effects are operating simultaneously. For example, Kain and Quigley (1970) found evidence of the disamenity effect when they showed that commercial and industrial uses in the immediate vicinity of housing lowered apartment rents and single-family home values. Stull (1975) also found that industrial, vacant and multifamily land uses negatively affected single family values as did commercial properties after it exceeded 5% of the land area. More recently, Mahan, Polasky and Adams (2000), found a negative relation between residential values and proximity to commercial and industrial zones. All of these studies demonstrate disamenity effects on residential uses from land use mixing. However, evidence of proximity effects on residential values, especially from commercial and recreational uses, has been published by Li and Brown (1980), Cao and Cory (1982), and Song and Knaap (2004).

Li and Brown (1980) and Colwell et al. (1985) have paid particular attention to the trade-off between the proximity and disamenity effects. They hypothesize that the net of the two effects on home values is negative where non-residential uses are close to homes and positive farther away.

After reviewing much of this literature, Matthews (2006) concludes that both positive and negative effects may decline with distance, and that the negative effects probably extinguish more quickly than the positive ones producing a net benefit reflected in higher values for residential uses located more than a minimum and less than a maximum distance from nonresidential uses. He goes on to combine this conclusion with data that suggest that the effect of proximity depends on street layout. For example, curvilinear and cul-de-sac streets can make it difficult to access retail services from homes even if they are close by as measured by straight-line distance. The net benefits are only possible when desirable destinations are both proximate and accessible (Matthews 2006, Matthews and Turnbull 2007). This important insight, that accessibility is a function of both proximity and connectivity, was also offered by Brigham (1965) four decades earlier.

There are two additional conclusions suggested by the literature. One is that once the mix of nonresidential uses exceeds a certain level in an area, the disamenities effects may begin to dominate. The other is that some non-residential uses, such as retail, parks, and offices, tend to have a more

favorable impact on single family values compared to apartments and industrial uses. It seems logical to expect that both the precise amount and the specific mix of uses in an area can affect property values. Moreover, each type of property may differ in how it responds to different amounts and types of other uses. For example, shops and parks and restaurants may benefit residents in homes and apartments and workers in non-residential properties, while industrial uses may always do best when located away from homes and shopping. A search for such "optimum blends" has not been conducted by researchers so far, but it is logical to expect specific uses to benefit most from proximity to a specific amount and mix of other uses.

Market Values and Investment Returns

All of these prior studies suggest that walkability could well produce higher property values. If demand for walkable places is growing and currently exceeds supply, if homes in new neighborhoods designed to promote walking sell at a premium, if access to schools, banks and shopping increase office and apartment rents, and if land use mixing increases property values, then it seems reasonable to hypothesize that walkability improves incomes and values. But properties which produce more income at any given point in time will not automatically generate higher investment returns if the higher income was already expected when the property was acquired and purchased at a price that reflects that expectation. Assuming the same risk, for actual (*ex post*) returns to be higher for walkable properties, income would have to be higher than was expected when the property was acquired or appraised. This is because property values are generally a function of expected earnings, given a certain level of risk. If income for walkable properties was higher than expected, they would have generated higher *income returns*. And if walkable properties appreciated more than was expected, due to faster than expected income growth or a decline in perceived relative risk, they would have generated higher *appreciation returns*.

Prior studies have shown that certain macroeconomic conditions affect property returns including GDP, inflation, vacancy rates, and employment growth (Sivitanides 1998, de Wit and Van Kijk 2003). But unanticipated effects in these conditions would likely have the same effect on both more and less walkable properties. Unanticipated effects on incomes or values that might selectively affect more walkable properties could include changes in the cost of vehicular transportation and congestion, a cultural shift in favor of health and exercise, or more favorable attitudes toward street life and urbanism. The demand studies, discussed above, point to recent trends which may not have been anticipated by investors and could have uniquely affected more walkable properties. If, as some argue, demographic changes and other factors are causing an unanticipated shift in demand toward more walkable properties, then unexpected growth in earnings and values could well have caused more walkable properties to outperform as investments.

So, the effects of walkability on property values and incomes on the one hand and investment returns on the other must be considered as two separate questions. Values will be higher if there are benefits from walkability that are capitalized into property prices. Returns will be higher if incomes or appreciation are larger than were expected when walkable properties were appraised or acquired.

Based on this review, we concluded that walkability may well be producing benefits that are reflected in higher market values and incomes. We also suspected that a shift may be occurring in the marketplace in favor of more walkable places which has not been fully anticipated by investors or appraisers. Therefore, we hypothesized that walkable properties have been valued as much or more and produced investment returns as good as or better than other more auto-oriented real estate.

METHODS

To test our hypotheses we combined real estate performance information from the National Council of Real Estate Investment Fiduciaries (NCREIF) with walkability data from Front Seat. NCREIF is a non-partisan source of real estate performance information based on property-level data submitted by its data contributing members, which include tax-exempt institutional investors and investment managers. Front Seat is a civic software company that developed Walk Score, an online tool that provides walkability ratings for any address in the USA.

NCREIF has information on the financial performance, physical features and location of office, hotel, apartment, retail, industrial and other properties. Properties owned by contributing members are included in the pool, and added or removed as the members acquire or sell holdings. The financial data for each property are quarterly observations for those quarters when it was held by a contributing member. Most properties do not have quarterly financial information from 1977, when the dataset was established, until the present because they were not held for the entire period.

For our work, we selected all stabilized office, apartment, retail and industrial properties that were in the NCREIF pool for at least one quarter from 2001-2008 and had complete addresses. Addresses were needed so we could obtain geocodes, which were needed to obtain information from other data sources (discussed further below). That came to a total of 4,237 properties with a market value of over $211 billion. We obtained Walk Score ratings from Front Seat for each of these locations.

Because the dataset increases in the quarter a new property is acquired (or a new member joins NCREIF and starts contributing) and data is no longer available in quarters after a member sells a property to a non-member, our dataset varied for any given quarter. Altogether, we had 44,169 observations with Walk Score ratings.

In order to understand how well our final dataset represented all US commercial properties, we compared the final sample to data from the US Energy Information Administration (EIA) Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS), which estimates the number of commercial buildings in the nation by region and type. Excluding apartments, which were also in our dataset, the distribution of our sample by region and by property type fell within the 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates for the entire US commercial building stock generated by the EIA from CBECS. Nonetheless, when we compared our sample of commercial buildings to the CBECS population estimates, our sample was over-weighted toward industrial properties, over-weighted toward western properties, and under weighted toward all other types and regions. To address any bias this may have introduced in our results, we conducted separate analyses by property type. We also tested the robustness of our results by running separate analyses by region, property value, and regional walkability. One bias we could not check the sample for was financial performance. If NCREIF members drop low performing properties from their portfolios, then our sample would be biased toward higher performing properties. And if the effects of walkability covary with property performance, this could limit the ability to generalize our findings to properties that do not perform to institutional standards. This could put some limitation on the external validity of our study but it would not affect its internal validity since it would not change any relationships we observed between walkability and our dependent variables.

We used ordinary least squares regression analysis to test our hypotheses. Because the sample had characteristics of an incomplete panel, we also used the random effects panel regression model, which is discussed further under Robustness Checks. Table 2 gives definitions and summary statistics for the variables used in the study.

Table 2: Variable definitions and summary statistics

Variable	*Definition*	*Obs.*	*Mean*	*Std. Dev.*	*Min.*	*Max.*
WALK SCORE	Walkability index based on distance to desired destinations.	47,263	60.17	22.90	0	100
VALUE	Value of the property at the end of the quarter.	47,262	43,500,000	77,500,000	209,850	1,730,000,000
NOI	Net operating income per square foot	45,946	2.48	2.27	0.00	48.33
INCRET_QTR	Mean income return (cap rate) for the current and prior three quarters.	47,263	0.017	0.012	-0.341	1.656
APPRET_QTR	Mean capital return for the current and prior three quarters.	47,263	0.011	0.186	-10.751	27.819
TRET_QTR	Mean total return for the current and prior three quarters.	47,263	0.028	0.187	-10.843	27.912
REG_EMP	9 quarter moving average employment growth rate in the CBSA, expressed annually.	49,987	1.68	2.23	-8.73	25.64
SUPPLY	9 quarter moving average office building growth rate in the CBSA, expressed annually.	59,898	1.94	2.14	0	29.02
OCC_CBSA	Average occupancy rate for the property type in the CBSA for the quarter.	47,263	0.91	0.58	0.02	1.00
RET_CBSA	The average quarterly total return in the CBSA for all property types in the current and prior three quarters.	47,263	0.027	0.052	-0.972	0.923
NPITOTRET	Quarterly return for all properties in the NCREIF Property Index.	47,263	0.024	0.029	-0.083	0.055
AGE	Age of the property (years).	43,219	18.60	15.21	0	124
SQFT	Size of the property (square feet).	47,263	277,288	329,086	5,858	2,260,000
FLOORS	Number of stories.	47,263	3.3	6.6	0	76.0
FLOORS2	Number of stories squared.	47,263	54.6	253.1	0	5,776
PROPCRIME	Property crimes in city per 100,000 persons.	38,487	4,589.6	5,187.1	353.9	150,000
PROPTAX	4 quarter moving average property tax per $ of property value (in dollars).	46,704	0.014	0.005	0.000	0.066
BGPOPDEN	Census block group population density in persons per square mile in 2007.	47,263	5,405.3	14.464.9	0	226,900
TRANSITHALF	A dummy variable where 1 = within ½ mile of a fixed rail transit station.	47,263	0.14	0.34	0	1
TRAVHOMEWORK	Mean travel time (minutes) from home to work in the census tract for all workers and all 11 categories of means of transportation to work.	46,875	25.17	5.68	0	71
MSADEN	Persons per square mile of land area in the city or census designated place.	50,633	939.74	1,065.32	6.81	6,683.03

WALK SCORE

The walkability measure used in the study was Walk Score. It rates the walkability of an address by determining the distance to educational (schools), retail (groceries, books, clothes, hardware, drugs, music), food (coffee shops, restaurants, bars), recreational (parks, libraries, fitness centers), and entertainment (movie theaters) destinations. The algorithm awards points based on distance to the nearest destination of each type using Google Maps. If the closest establishment of a certain type is within one-quarter mile, Walk Score assigns the maximum number of points for that type. The number of points assigned declines as the distance approaches 1 mile and no points are awarded for destinations further than 1 mile. Each type of destination is weighted equally and the points assigned to each category are summed and normalized to yield a score from 0–100.

Some of the destinations analyzed in Walk Score are most likely to be accessed from homes or hotels (e.g., movie theaters and schools) but most could be desired destinations from both residences and workplaces. Consequently, it is reasonable to expect Walk Score to have an economic effect on both residential and nonresidential properties. Positive effects would likely be greatest for buildings whose value is most sensitive to the locational advantages, amenities and services that walkability provides its occupants. So we thought that walkability might be most beneficial for apartment and offices. For industrial properties, we thought there could be a negative effect because of the desire to avoid conflicting land uses and pedestrian activity. For retail properties, we the outcome seemed less clear. Higher Walk Score could mean more competition but it could also mean more foot traffic and agglomeration economies.

A few limitations of Walk Score should be noted. First, it weights all destinations equally. Lee and Moudon (2006), however, found that out of the 24 destinations they studied, only groceries, schools, banks, restaurants and bars were significantly associated with home-based walking. Walk Score does not count banks. It is also possible for a property to have a relatively high Walk Score without being close to what Lee and Moudon found were the most significant destinations. A second limitation is that it does not account for other factors that have been empirically or theoretically linked to walkability. The most notable is connectivity. As noted above, walkability is a function of both proximity and connectivity. Walk Score measures proximity but it does not consider topography, physical barriers, connectivity and street patterns, which can affect accessibility (as measured by travel time, effort, or distance) to proximate destinations (as measured by straight line distance). Other correlates of walking not measured by Walk Score include block size, sidewalk length and width, population density and security (Hoehner et al. 2005, Lee and Moudon, 2006).

Despite these limitations, Walk Score offers two important advantages. First, it measures proximity to desired destinations, which prior research has found is the best predictor of walking. Second, it covers all properties nationwide, allowing it to be used for a national study in combination with the NCREIF dataset. Both Moudon and Lee (2003) and Parks and Schofar (2006) discuss other more comprehensive indices of walkability, but so far no one approach has become the standard and no other measure of walkability is available nationally other than Walk Score.

Other caveats should also be mentioned to prevent misinterpretations of the results. First, Walk Score is not a traditional measure of land use mixing which is usually measured by taking into account the total amount and intensity of other land uses in a given area. Walk Score only measures whether there is at least a single case of various establishments nearby. It does not recognize the size or intensity of those uses, it does not count the percentage of a given area devoted to various uses, and it does not measure uses other than the 14 that it tracks. The reader should therefore be careful when comparing the findings from this study to other work dealing with land use mixing. While Walk Score does capture a particular type of land use mixing, it is a unique measure of that phenomenon (Hess et al. 2001, Krizek 2003). Second, Walk Score captures accessibility to desired locations within walking distance

from a given origin. But, as we previously noted, any economic value associated with greater walkability probably reflects the value of greater accessibility by other travel modes as well. As we previously warned, the reader should be careful not to assume that any walkability premium is only due to the added value placed by consumers on the ability to walk. In all likelihood it also reflects the value placed on the ability to easily drive or bicycle to nearby destinations. Nonetheless, the fact that walkability may produce accessibility benefits for non-walkers does not diminish the validity of any findings that walkable urban form is associated with higher property values. It only means that it brings with it an indivisible package of benefits that accrue to other forms of transportation as well. Third, for retail properties, walkscore does not differentiate between enclosed malls, shopping centers and freestanding retail outlets. A retail property in a mall could have the same Walk Score as a freestanding retail property, depending on its proximity to other services. And fourth, Walk Score does not differentiate between whether an address is a residence, workplace, retail outlet or other use. High walkability from a residence implies the potential for a relatively car-free lifestyle while high walkability from an office building or retail outlet does not because it may still require pedestrians to travel to the location from their home, and that could require other travel modes. Walk Score does not account for the distance to housing and as such is dissimilar from concepts such as jobs-housing balance, retail-housing balance or urbanism which imply a mix of housing, jobs, shopping and other daily needs all located in close proximity to one another.

Figure 1 gives two examples of the Walk Score method using maps of two neighborhoods in Jacksonville, Florida. On each map there is a star showing the location of a property being scored and icons indicating the locations of destinations surrounding the property. Tables are also presenting listing distances to the nearest destinations of each kind. The map for the San Marco neighborhood also illustrates one of the limitations of the method. There is an east-west freeway that may block access from the property being scored to services north of the freeway. The Walk Score protocol does not account for such barriers which, if impenetrable, should lower walkability. To help the reader interpret our findings presented later in the paper, we will compare our results in terms of properties with walk scores of 80 and 20. Figure 1 will help the reader understand the difference between these scores.

FINANCIAL VARIABLES

Data for whole buildings were provided by NCREIF on net operating income, market value and quarterly investment returns. Actual accounting data were available for net operating income. Appraised values were available for the properties that had not sold and transaction prices for properties that had sold -- the same appraisals and transaction prices used to calculate the quarterly NCREIF Property Index. Many studies have shown that appraised values tend to lag transaction prices by a quarter or two in appraisal-based indices. One reason for this is the nature of the appraisal process which relies on historical data such as comparable sales. Another reason is that not all properties are actually revalued every quarter. Some may only be revalued two or three times a year. However, virtually all of the properties are revalued at least once a year. Since the purpose of this study was to examine cross-sectional differences in property values as a result of different RPI characteristics, a delay of a quarter or two in updating the appraised value of a particular property did not significantly impact the relative cross-sectional differences in properties. Said differently, since properties with and without a particular RPI characteristic have the same appraisal lag, the cross-sectional comparisons are on an apples-to-apples basis.

The log of the end of quarter market value was used in the market value regressions. Return variables were based on the average compound return over the current and prior 3 quarters. The log of 1 + return was used in the return regressions because the values could be negative. Three components of return were analyzed: Income Return which measures that portion of total return attributable to each property's net operating income, Capital Return which measures the change in market value from one period to the next and Total Return which is computed by adding the Income Return and the Capital Return. Appendix A provides a more detailed description of the return variables.



Figure 1: A comparison of two neighborhoods in Jacksonville, Florida with low and high walk scores.

It should be noted that bias associated with appraisal smoothing at the individual property level is different from that at the index level. There are "unsmoothing techniques" that can be applied at the index level to account for the fact that not all properties are revalued every quarter. But this is not appropriate for individual properties. The problem caused by individual properties not being revalued every quarter is that in those quarters the property is not revalued, there will be no change in value and the return is biased toward zero. Furthermore, when there is a revaluation, the return will reflect all the change in value since the last appraisal. Virtually all properties in the index are revalued at least once a year. Thus, we use a four quarter moving average of returns as our dependent variable. This allows us to better capture the trend in returns than using single quarter returns. Each quarter will reflect how values have changed on average over the past four quarters rather than having some quarters with no change in value and others with a too high (or too negative) change in value that reflects more than one quarter. Because quarterly returns will tend to be correlated over time, we used a panel regression with clustering at both the property and year level as a robustness test to be sure the independent variables of interest were still significant and we found they were.

CONTROL VARIABLES

Prior studies on urban land values and investment returns have identified a variety of correlates. In order to isolate the effects of walkability, we introduced controls for many of them. To identify necessary controls we reviewed 35 published papers that model rent, value or returns for various property types. We cite many of them under Walkability as a Determinant of Urban Land Values. There is a good deal of variation in the controls used in the literature, but most fall into five dimensions: accessibility, physical characteristics of the building, neighborhood features, taxation and services, and

overall market conditions. More rarely, owner, renter, lease, and property management characteristics are included. For this study, we used one or more controls from each of the five common dimensions.

The NCREIF market index was used to control for overall market conditions. As noted, appraisal smoothing was not an issue because the index and the returns for individual properties were both appraisal based (Fisher and Geltner 2000). Regional employment growth was used as a measure of local demand. Growth of the regional building stock (for each property type) was used as a measure of local supply. Regional occupancy rates were used to control for the balance between supply and demand. We also used a regionally disaggregated NCREIF market index as a substitute for regional occupancy rates but they produced similar results (see Robustness Checks). Dummy variables were used to control for regional location. We tried both CBSA and State dummy variables and found that state controls produced better though similar results. Any factor not otherwise controlled and which varied systematically by state was controlled by the state dummies. This includes climate and demographics, which could affect the degree to which walkability is valued by building users. Building size, stories and age data from NCREIF were used to control for individual property characteristics. Property crime rates at the city-level published by the U.S. Department of Justice for 2006 were used to control for security conditions. Effective tax rate paid by each property was computed from NCREIF tax expenditure and property value data and was used to control for the cost of local government services.

We also controlled for regional accessibility from each property's location. Locations may be more walkable because of the higher local accessibility that comes from the higher density normally associated with increased regional accessibility. It was therefore important to control for regional accessibility. We did this by using three proxies for regional accessibility: a dummy for whether or not the property was within ½ mile of a fixed rail transit station, the mean travel time to work by all modes of travel from homes in the census tract of each study property, and the 2007 population density in the block group where each study property was located. Transit station locations were obtained from the US Bureau of Transportation Statistics and Google Earth, journey to work times were obtained from the 2000 US Census Transportation Planning Package, and density was obtained from the US Census. We would have used traditional gravity-based and distance to CBD measures but it was infeasible to obtain them for our large number of study properties (Song 1996, Geurs and Wee 2004). Nevertheless, Levinson (1998) has demonstrated that journey to work time is a good proxy for gravity-based accessibility measures and according to Heikkila and Peiser (1992), accessibility depends on urban density. We also controlled for regional congestion and mobility levels by using CBSA density, which we found to be a good proxy for more specific congestion measures which are not available for all the regions studied.

REGRESSION MODELS

OLS regression models were used to test our hypotheses. We used log transformed dependent variables to reduce skewness and facilitate interpretability of the coefficients.

All models were of the following form:

> Financial performance = f (walkability, regional supply, regional demand, regional property market conditions, national property market performance, individual building characteristics, local security conditions, property tax rates, density, transit access, journey to work time, regional congestion, state location)

Data were cross-sectional and time-series. The number of observations in any particular regression depended on the specific variables used because of missing variables (null values) for some data points for some properties. Since our focus was on the relationship between walkability and economic outcomes, we were primarily concerned with the coefficient and significance for Walk Score and

control variables that could be affecting its relationship with the dependent variable. The R-squares were of secondary importance as the models were not developed for predictive purposes.

Table 3 gives the correlations among the regressors. None were strongly correlated indicating a lack of multicollinearity problems.

Variable	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*	*15*
1. Walk Score	1														
2. REG_EMP	-0.11	1													
3. SUPPLY	0.04	0.09	1												
4. OCC_CBSA	-0.04	0.25	-0.15	1											
5. npitotret	0	0.02	-0.44	0.11	1										
6. age	0.25	0.09	-0.17	-0.01	0.08	1									
7. sqft	0.07	-0.01	-0.02	0	-0.03	0.08	1								
8. Floors	0.46	-0.1	0.07	-0.14	-0.03	0.1	0.24	1							
9. floors2	0.32	-0.08	0.04	-0.08	-0.01	0.06	0.27	0.89	1						
10. propcrime	-0.04	0.09	0.09	-0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.04	-0.02	0.01	1					
11. proptax	-0.03	-0.14	0.19	-0.13	-0.17	-0.06	0.02	0.08	0.04	0.09	1				
12. BGPOPDEN	0.35	-0.09	0.03	0.07	0	0.14	0.04	0.36	0.25	-0.14	-0.01	1			
13. transithalf	0.51	-0.15	-0.02	-0.04	0.02	0.24	0.11	0.46	0.31	-0.05	0.04	0.39	1		
14. travhomework	-0.19	0.01	-0.07	0.14	0.01	-0.05	-0.01	-0.13	-0.08	-0.21	-0.15	0.04	-0.1	1	
15. MSADEN	0.33	0.19	-0.16	0.11	0.02	0.25	0.05	0.25	0.17	-0.39	-0.12	0.51	0.3	0.18	1

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

MARKET VALUE

Table 4 presents our results for market value. In every model but industrial, the coefficient for Walk Score was positive and significant. A 1 unit increase in Walk Score produced a 0.9, 0.9 and 0.1 percent value premium for office, retail and apartment properties, respectively. All else being equal, an office property with a Walk Score of 80 was worth 54 percent more per square foot than an office with a 20 Walk Score. For retail and apartment properties, 80 Walk Score properties were worth 54 percent and 6 percent more, respectively.

We were unsurprised to not find a walkability premium for industrial properties. Most of the industrial properties in the dataset were warehouses and the non-industrial uses and pedestrians associated with walkability probably conflict with the trucks, trains, and noises typical of warehouse districts.

It was also interesting to find that walkability had a relatively small positive effect on apartment properties. As noted above, prior research has found both positive proximity and negative disamenity effects on residential property values from nearby non-residential uses, with the disamenity effects increasing as non-residential uses get closer to homes. Our findings suggest that these mixed effects could well have been present in our dataset, especially since the Walk Score protocol assigns the highest score to apartments with the most types of non-residential uses within ¼ mile. In these circumstances there could be insufficient distance between the apartments and nonresidential uses to fully extinguish negative externalities. We suspect the reason we did not see this effect in the other uses was that the noise, traffic, security and other disamenities from nonresidential uses may have more disutility for apartment dwellers than for the users of the other property types. It appears however, that any disamenity effects did not fully offset the positive proximity effects from walkability on apartments. On net, walkability was associated with higher apartment values.

Table 4: Regression results for log of market value

	All Types	*Office*	*Retail*	*Apartments*	*Industrial*
WALK SCORE	0.011***	0.009***	0.009***	0.001**	0.001
REG_EMP	0.050***	0.018***	0.056***	0.062***	0.035***
SUPPLY	0.052***	-0.038**	-0.118	0.028**	0.036*
OCC_CBSA	1.301***	1.684***	2.799***	-0.497*	-0.412*
NPITOTRET	9.060***	8.909***	10.021***	10.709***	3.347***
AGE	-0.011***	-0.011***	-0.001	-0.017***	-0.011***
SQFT	1.37e-06***	6.83e-07***	2.06e-06***	1.56e-06***	1.77e-06***
FLOORS	0.063***	0.043***	-0.060*	0.032***	0.188***
FLOOR2	-0.001***	-0.000***	0.023***	-0.000***	-0.129***
PROPCRIME	-0.000***	-8.25e-07	4.67e-06	-0.000***	-0.000***
PROPTAX	-30.562***	-58.452***	-0.102***	-22.492***	5.829
BGPOPDEN	-4.11e-07	5.33e-07	5.52e-06	1.18e-06*	3.46e-06
TRANSITHALF	0.182***	0.176***	0.292***	0.086***	0.276***
TRAVHOMEWORK	-0.006***	-0.002	0.002	-0.011***	-0.014***
MSADEN	0.041***	0.178***	0.010	0.201***	0.099***
STATE	Not shown	not shown	not shown	not shown	not shown
Number of obs	20638	6343	2174	4637	7484
R-squared	0.58	0.57	0.73	0.63	0.65
Prob > F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

* = sig. at .05 level, ** = sig. at .01 level, *** = sig. at .001 level

Nearly all controls had the expected signs and most were significant. FLOORS was significantly negative in the retail model, but there may well be economic disadvantages to shopping centers with more than 2 or 3 stories due to functionality and convenience issues (Brown 1999).

NET OPERATING INCOME

Table 5 presents our results for net operating income (NOI). Since property values are normally a function of the income they produce, we expected higher market values to be associated with higher incomes and that is what we found. For each 1 unit increase in Walk Score, we found that NOI was 0.7 percent higher for office, 0.7 percent higher for retail, and 0.1 percent higher for apartments. There was no difference for industrial, consistent with our findings for market value.

Comparing properties with 80 and 20 walk scores, NOI per foot would be 42 percent higher for office and retail and no different for apartments. For each of these types, the higher incomes were insufficient to fully explain the higher values. However, as we will see in the next section, an additional portion of higher market values can be explained by lower cap rates, which increase value independent of NOI.

Table 5: Regression results for log of net operating income

	All Types	*Office*	*Retail*	*Apartments*	*Industrial*
WALK SCORE	0.010***	0.007***	0.007***	1.67e-06	0.001
REG_EMP	0.029***	-0.007	0.034***	0.057***	-0.003
SUPPLY	0.072***	-0.008	0.027	0.022*	0.129***
OCC_CBSA	1.468***	2.403***	5.094***	0.317	-0.059
NPITOTRET	0.248	-0.822	1.961	2.690***	-3.660***
AGE	-0.011***	-0.012***	-0.003***	-0.018***	-0.013***
SQFT	1.34e-06***	6.52-07***	2.14e-06***	1.56e-06***	1.75e-06***
FLOORS	0.059***	0.040***	-0.031	0.025***	0.189***
FLOORS2	-0.001***	-0.000***	0.015***	-0.003**	-0.120***
PROPCRIME	-0.000***	0.000**	4.48e-06	-0.000***	-0.000***
PROPTAX	-24.657***	-42.094***	-4.458	-17.972**	3.018
BGPOPDEN	-1.65e-06**	2.05e-06	3.99e-06	1.47e-06**	6.10e-06
TRANSITHALF	0.138***	0.155***	0.357***	0.030	0.189***
TRAVHOMEWORK	-0.005***	0.004	-0.006	-0.015***	-0.012***
MSADEN	0.039**	0.115***	0.026	0.177***	0.134***
STATE	Not shown	Not shown	Not shown	Not shown	Not shown
Number of obs	20048	6112	2140	4588	7208
R-squared	0.47	0.41	0.64	0.52	0.53
Prob > F	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000

RETURN ON INVESTMENT

Table 6 gives the results for appreciation, income and total returns for all properties types combined. The models had low r-squares, but as stated above this was not a concern since the models were not developed to make predictions, but rather to examine the relationships between Walk Score and the dependent variables.

A one point increase in Walk Score increased the appreciation rate by 2 basis points and reduced income returns by 0.7 basis points. Income return is analogous to the cap rate, so in effect investors were willing to accept a .007 percent lower cap rate and pay .007 percent more per dollar of income for each unit of increase in Walk Score. For an 80 versus 20 Walk Score property this converts into 1.2 percent faster appreciation per quarter and a 0.42 percent lower cap rate.

Total return is the sum of appreciation and income returns. According to the third model, for every 1 unit increase in Walk Score, total returns increased by 1.3 basis points, which as it should be, is equal to the sum of the Walk Score coefficients in the appreciation and income return models. However, the Walk Score coefficient in the total return model was insignificant suggesting that higher appreciation and lower income returns offset one another, resulting in a statistically neutral effect on total returns.

We used the same controls in the return models as we did in the market value and NOI models. We only expected the regional and national economic variables (REG_EMP, SUPPLY, NPITOTRET, OCC_CBSA) to be significant, but we included all the controls to demonstrate that the Walk Score coefficients were not erroneously inflated from an under-specified model. As expected, the economic controls were significant and had the expected signs. Most other controls did have signs that were plausible and were significant in many instances. The most significant effects among these were from property tax rates which increased cap rates and lowered appreciation and total returns.

Table 6: Regression results for return measures for All Types

	Appreciation	*Income*	*Total*
WALK SCORE	0.00020**	-0.000067***	0.00013
REG_EMP	0.01221***	-0.00151***	0.01051***
SUPPLY	-0.01575***	0.00181***	-0.01359***
NPITOTRET	2.46899***	-0.42886***	2.00151***
OCC_CBSA	0.31385***	-.00133	0.30779***
AGE	-0.00025**	6.13-06	-0.00024**
SQFT	5.81e-09*	5.25e-10	6.24e-09*
FLOORS	0.00014	-0.00005	0.00011
FLOORS2	9.59e-07	-3.98e-07	2.11e-07
PROPCRIME	-5.12e-07	3.50e-07*	-1.86e-07
PROPTAX	-4.44518***	0.86066***	-3.58919***
BGPOPDEN	1.46e-07	-5.66e-08**	8.36e-08
TRANSITHALF	0.01094**	-0.00402***	0.00666
TRAVHOMEWORK	-.000424*	0.00010	-0.00053*
MSADEN	0.00141	-0.00036	0.00111
STATE	not shown	not shown	not shown
Number of obs	14603	14605	14603
R-squared	0.16	0.08	0.13
Prob > F	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

* = sig. at .05 level, ** = sig. at .01 level, *** = sig. at .001 level

Similar models were produced separately for each type of property. Table 7 gives the Walk Score coefficients from these models. For appreciation and income returns, the results for separate property types were not as clear-cut as in the All Types models. Walkability did not significantly affect appreciation returns, except in Offices where the effect was positive. Apparently, some of the higher value associated with walkable offices was first capitalized during the study period. For retail and apartments, on the other hand, the walkability premium must have been priced into the market prior to the study period. Walkability significantly lowered income returns for retail and apartments but not for offices and industrial. The results for total returns by property were most consistent with the All Types model and indicated that walkability did not significantly change total returns. Overall, these results indicate that walkability neither diluted nor inflated total returns over the past decade.

Table 7: Walk Score Effects on Returns by Property Type

	Office	*Retail*	*Apartments*	*Industrial*
Appreciation	0.00032*	0.00007	-0.00005	0.00008
Income	-0.00005	-0.00012**	-0.00009***	-0.00002
Total	0.00027	-0.00018	-0.00014	0.00006

* = sig. at .05 level, ** = sig. at .01 level, *** = sig. at .001 level

The lower income returns and cap rates help explain the higher market values that cannot be fully explained by higher NOI. Recall, for example, that retail properties had 0.9 percent higher market values and 0.7 percent higher NOI for each additional unit of Walk Score. Holding risk constant, a higher NOI should produce an equivalent effect in percentage terms on market value. However in this case, there was an additional value increment over and above what can be explained by higher NOI and that additional increment can be explained by lower cap rates. In fact, the combination of an NOI that is 0.7 percent higher than the mean for our dataset and a cap rate that is 0.012 percent lower than the

mean in the dataset increases the value of a hypothetical property by 0.9 percent, which is precisely the value premium that we found. So it appears that the higher retail value associated with higher Walk Score values can best be explained by a combination of the higher NOI and the lower cap rates that were observed in the data. The same is true for Apartments. Apartment NOI was not increased by walkability but market value was. Again, the difference can be explained by the lower cap rates we found using the Apartment income returns model. The Walk Score coefficient in the Office income returns model was insignificant. However, if it were correct, it would be large enough to explain half the walkable office market value premium that could not be explained by higher NOI. So, generally, the data appear to support the proposition that the walkability premium is driven by a combination of higher NOI and lower cap rates.

ROBUSTNESS CHECKS

We tested the robustness of our results by producing models for various subsets of our data.

First, we separated the data by the four NCREIF regions and produced models that included all property types using the same regressors as in our original models. The Walk Score coefficients for the market value and NOI models were significant for all regions and nearly identical to the coefficients for our original All Types models given in Tables 4 and 5. We also found no significant effect from walkability on total returns for the East, West and South, which is what we found when all regions were examined together. However, total returns were significantly higher for more walkable properties in the Midwest due to significantly higher appreciation returns. In the Midwest, a one point increase in Walk Score increased appreciation by 0.5 basis points, which converts to 0.3 percent faster appreciation per quarter for an 80 versus 20 Walk Score. So in general, the effect of walkability on Value, NOI and total returns were similar for all regions except for the Midwest where its effect on total returns was significantly positive. Walkability had positive effects in every region.

We also separated each type of property into those above and below the median value for their type and combined all the properties into two groups, one with above median valued properties and one with the below median valued properties. Each group contained the same share of each type as in our original All Types models. We then produced models for value, NOI and returns, again using our original regressors, to see if walkability had different effects on more or less valuable properties. In all the regressions Walk Score had significant coefficients with the same signs as in our original models but with larger absolute value in the more valuable properties. For example, the coefficients for value and NOI were 0.008 and 0.007 in the higher value properties model but only 0.002 and 0.001 in the lower value one. The effects on appreciation and total returns were very similar in each case, but the effect on income returns/cap rates was larger for higher valued properties (-0.00006 v. -0.00005). This test could indicate that walkability is a superior good, but nonetheless it remained significant when tested separately on higher and lower valued properties.

Finally, we created separate All Types models for the most and least walkable cities, as determined by Front Seat using the walk scores for all properties in each city. The most walkable cities were New York, Boston, San Francisco, Washington DC, Chicago and Philadelphia. The least were Jacksonville, Nashville, Charlotte, Indianapolis, Oklahoma City, Memphis, Fort Worth, Kansas City, San Antonio, El Paso, Austin and Phoenix. The Walk Score value coefficients were significantly positive in both models, though larger in the Least Walkable model than in the Most Walkable model (0.010 v. 0.009). The same was true for NOI (0.010 vs. 0.008). Perhaps there is an additional premium for walkability in the less walkable regions. For investment returns, walkability had no significant effect on total return in both groups, as we found for all cities taken together (Table 6). The result for income returns (cap rate) was notable. In our original model we found a significantly negative coefficient (lower cap rate) for Walk Score. We found a similar result in the most walkable cities, but no significant effect in the least walkable ones. It appeared that the walkability premium in the most walkable cities was attributable

to a combination of higher NOI and a lower cap rate, while in the least walkable cities the walkability premium could be fully explained by a higher NOI and investors seemed unwilling to accept a different cap rate for more walkable properties. Overall, our findings held up and were very similar in the most and least walkable places.

Because the data had characteristics of an unbalanced panel, we also tested our hypotheses using the random effects panel regression model. It controls for omitted variables that differ between cases but are constant over time and for omitted variables that may be fixed between cases but vary over time. As shown in Table 8, the Walk Score coefficients in all the panel models were very similar to those found with the general multiple regression models, though slightly smaller in most cases. For income and appreciation returns, the coefficients were smaller but in the same direction.

Table 8: Walk Score Effects on Returns by Property Type

	Panel Regression	*OLS Regression*
Market Value	0.008***	0.011***
NOI	0.010***	0.010***
Appreciation	0.00011	0.00020**
Income	-0.00002	-0.00007***
Total	0.00006	0.00013

* = sig. at .05 level, ** = sig. at .01 level, *** = sig. at .001 level

One final concern we had was to be sure that the results were not artifacts of any differences in real estate trends that might have existed across regions. For example, we wanted to be sure that the return results were not driven by having the more walkable cities appreciate slower or faster than the less walkable cities. We could accomplish this by using a metropolitan scale NCREIF return index in the models. However, since national trends in occupancy rates and the NCREIF index have been historically correlated, we thought that CBSA_OCC would control for year to year differences in returns at the metropolitan level as well. However, to be sure, we replaced CBSA_OCC with the NCREIF return index disaggregated to the metro scale in our All Types models. The change had virtually no effect on the value, NOI and return models, except the Walk Score coefficient was slightly lower in the income return model (-.00007 vs. -.00005), which only served to strengthen our initial findings.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We hypothesized that walkable properties had incomes and values that were as much or more and produced investment returns as good as or better than less walkable investments. We tested our hypotheses using 10 years of data for over 10,000 properties of various types from throughout the US. Table 9 summarizes our results and our hypotheses were mostly confirmed.

Walkability was associated with higher value for office, retail and industrial properties. These types of properties with a Walk Score of 80 were worth anywhere from 6 to 54 percent more than properties with a 20 Walk Score, depending on property type. Consistent with their higher values, we found higher net operating incomes for these types of properties as well.

Walkability did not have a statistically significant effect on total returns. We did see, however lower cap rates for more walkable retail and apartment properties. Apparently, investors were willing to pay more for each dollar of income produced by more walkable retail and apartment properties either because they viewed them as safer investments or because they anticipated superior income growth or slower depreciation.

Table 9: Summary of Results for 80 vs. 20 Walk Scores

Property Type	*Market Value*	*NOI*	*Appreciation per quarter*	*Income Return per quarter*	*Total Return per quarter*
Office	+54%***	+42%***	1.92%*	--	--
Retail	+54%***	+42%***	--	-0.72%**	--
Apartments	+6%**	--	--	-0.54%***	--
Industrial	--	--	--	--	--

* = sig. at .05 level, ** = sig. at .01 level, *** = sig. at .001 level, -- = insignificant effect

Finally, we should note what our findings do not include. First, the value figures do not include a public cost-benefit analysis of walkability which would address externalities to public health, air quality, traffic safety, and energy conservation. Our results do not address the advisability of promoting walkability as a matter of public policy. Second, our figures do not determine the relative profitability of more or less walkable property developments. We could not examine whether it costs more to develop walkable places and whether any such costs might exhaust the value premiums that were found. However, given the magnitude of the value premiums, it seems plausible that developers could profitably develop walkable properties. But any conclusions on this point must await the development of better information on the cost of developing in more walkable locations.

Investors, developers, policy makers and other stakeholders interested in RPI view walkability as an important goal for cities and property portfolios. However, as noted in our introduction, executives have expressed some concern that insufficient financial performance could be an obstacle to making what may otherwise be more sustainable and responsible property investments. We find no evidence, however, to support their concern. Rather, it appears that over the past decade walkable properties have performed on par with other property investments and could be superior investments for developers who can manage to capture some or all of the walkability premium that appears to exist in the US property market.

REFERENCES

Ahrentzen, S. (2008), "Sustaining active-living communities over the decades: lessons from a 1930s greenbelt town," *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 33 (3), pp. 429-453.

Alonso, W. (1960), "A theory of the urban land market," Papers and Proceedings of the Regional Science Association, Vol. 6, pp. 1489-157.

Asabere, P.K. and Huffman F.E. (1996), "Thoroughfares and apartment values," The Journal of Real Estate Research 12 (1), pp. 9-16.

Bailey, J. and Humphrey, E. (2001), "Comment on Dowell Myers and Elizabeth Gearin's 'Current Preferences and Future Demand for Denser Residential Environments," Housing Policy Debate 12 (4), pp. 665-674.

Ball, M.J. (1973), "Recent empirical work on the determinants of relative house prices," Urban Studies 10, pp. 213-233.

Benjamin, J.D., Sirmans, G.S. and Zietz, E.N. (1997), "Security measures and the apartment market," Journal of Real Estate Research 14 (3), pp. 347-358.

Brigham, E.F. (1965), "The Determinants of Residential Land Values," Land Economics 41(4), pp. 325-344.

Brown, MG (1999), “Design and value: spatial form and the economic failure of a mall,” Journal of Real Estate Research 17(1/2), pp. 189-225.

Buttimer, R.L., Rutherford, R.C. and Witten R. (1997), “Industrial warehouse rent determinants in the Dallas/Fort Worth area,” The Journal of Real Estate Research 13 (1), pp. 47-55.

Cao, T.V. and Cory, D. (1982), “Mixed land uses, land-use externalities, and residential property values: a reevaluation.” The Annals of Regional Science 16 (1), pp. 1-24.

Cao, X., Handy, S.L. and Mokhtarian, P.L. (2006), “The influences of the built environment and residential self-selection on pedestrian behavior: evidence from Austin, TX,” Transportation 33, pp. 1-20.

Colwell, P.F., Gujral, S.S. and Coley, C., (1985), The impact of a shopping center on the value of surrounding properties,” Real Estate Issues, Spring/Summer, 1985.

Crecine, J.P., Davis, O.A. and Jackson, J.E. (1967), “Urban property markets: some empirical results and their implications for municipal zoning,” Journal of Law and Economics 10, pp. 79-99.

Dalbey, M. (2008), “Implementing smart growth strategies in rural America: development patterns that support public health goals,” Journal of Public Health Management and Practice 14 (3), pp. 238-243.

De Wit, I. and Van Dijk, R. (2003), “The global determinants of direct office real estate returns,” Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics 26 (1), pp. 27-45.

Doyle, S., Kelly-Schwartz, A., Schlossberg, M. and Stockard, J. (2006), “Active community environments and health: the relationship of walkable and safe communities to health,” Journal of the American Planning Association, 72 (1): 19-31.

du Toit, L. Cerin, E., Leslie, E., and Owen, N. (2007), “Does walking in the neighbourhood enhance local socialbility?” Urban Studies 44 (9), pp. 1677-1695.

Ewing, R. and Rong F. (2008), “The Impact of Urban Form on US Residential Energy Use,” Housing Policy Debate 19(1): 1-30.

Forsythe, A., Oakes, M., Schmitz, K.H. and Hearst, M. (2007), “Does residential density increase walking and other physical activity?” Urban Studies 44 (4), pp. 679-697.

Frank, L. and Pivo, G., 1994. The Impacts of Mixed Use and Density on the Utilization of Three Modes of Travel: The Single Occupant Vehicle, Transit, and Walking. Transportation Research Record No. 1466: Issues in Land Use and Transportation Planning, Models, and Applications. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1994, pp. 44-52.

Frank, L.D. and Engelke P. (2005), “Multiple impacts of the built environment on public health: walkable places and the exposure to air pollution,” International Regional Science Review 28 (2), pp. 193-216.

Frank, L.D., Saelens, B.E., Powell, K.E. and Chapman, J.E. (2007), “Stepping toward causation: do built environments or neighborhood and travel preferences explain physical activity, driving, and obesity?” Social Science and Medicine, doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.05.053.

Frank, L.D., Sallis, J.F., Conway, T.L., Chapman, J.E., Saelens, B.E. and Bachman W. (2006), “Many pathways from land use to health: associations between neighborhood walkability and active transportation, body mass index and air quality,” Journal of the American Planning Association 72 (1) pp. 75-87.

Frank, L.D., Stone, B. and Bachman, W. (2000), “Linking land use with household vehicle emissions ain the central Puget sound: methodological famework and findings,” Transportation Research Part D 5, pp. 173-196.

Frew J. and Jud, G.D. (2003), “Estimating the value of apartment buildings,” Journal of Real Estate Research 25 (2), pp. 77-86.

Front Seat (2009), personal communication.

Glascock, J.L., Jahanian, S. and Sirmans, C.F. (1990), "An analysis of office market rents: some empirical evidence," AREUEA Journal 18 (1), pp. 105-119.

Guntermann, K.L. and Norrbin, S. (1987), "Explaining the variability of apartment rents," AREUEA Journal 15 (4), pp. 321-340.

Haig, R.M. (1926), "Toward an Understanding of the Metropolis," The Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 179-208.

Hall, J.G. (1994), "The intangible business component of commercial real estate investments", Real Estate Issues, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 13-22.

Handy, S., Cao, X. and Mokhtarian, P. (2005), "Correlation or causality between the built environment and travel behavior? Evidence from Northern California," Transportation Research Part D 10, pp. 427-444.

Hoag, J.W. (1980), Toward indices of real estate value and return, The Journal of Finance 35 (2), pp. 569-580.

Hoehner, C.M., Ramirez, L.K.B., Elliott, M.B., Handy, S.L., and Brownson, R.C. (2005), "Perceived and objective environmental measures and physical activity among urban adults," American Journal of Preventative Medicine 28 (2S2), pp. 105-116.

Hurd, R. (*1903*), Principles of City Land Values, New York, Record & Guide.

Kain, J.F. and Quigley, J.M. (1970), "Measuring the value of housing quality," Journal of the American Statistical Association 65 (330), pp. 532-548.

Kerr, J., Rosenberg, D., Sallis, J.F., Saelens, B.E., Frank, L.D. and Conway, T.L. (2006), "Active commuting to school: associations with environment and parental concerns," Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise 38(4):787-94.

Kim, K.S. and Nelson W.A. (1996), "Assessing the rental value of residential properties: an abductive learning networks approach," Journal of Real Estate Research 12 (1), pp 63-77.

Lang, R.E., Nelson, A.C. and Sohmer, R.R. (2008), "Boomburb downtowns: the next generation of urban

Lee, C and Moudon, A.V. (2006), "The 3Ds + R: Quantifying land use and urban form correlates of walking," Transportation Research Part D 11, pp. 204-215.

Levine, J. (2006), Zoned Out: regulation, markets, and choices in metropolitan land use. Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.

Levine, J. and Frank, L.D. (2006), "Transportation and land-use preferences and residents' neighborhood choices: the sufficiency of compact development in the Atlanta region," Transportation 34, pp. 255-274.

Levine, J. and Inam A. (2004), "The market for transportation-land use integration: do developers want smarter growth than regulations allow?" Transportation 31, pp. 409-427.

Levine, J., Inam, A., Werbel, R., and Torng, G-W. (2002), "Land use and transportation alternatives: constraint or expansion of household choice?", MTI Report 01-19, Mineta Transportation Institute, College of Business, San Jose State University, San Jose, California.

Leyden, K.M. (2003), "Social capital and the built environment: the importance of walkable neighborhoods," American Journal of Public Health 93 (9), pp. 1546-1551.

Li, M.M. and Brown, H.J. (1980), "Micro-neighborhood externalities and hedonic housing prices," Land Economics 56 (2), pp. 125-141.

Marshall, J.D. (2008), "Energy-Efficient Urban Form," Environmental Science and Technology 42(9), 3133-3137.

Matthews, J.W. (2006), "The effect of proximity to commercial uses on residential prices," Ph.D. Dissertation, Georgia State University and Georgia Institute of Technology.

Matthews, J.W. and Turnbull G.K. (2007), "Neighborhood street layout and property value: the interaction of accessibility and land use mix," Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics 35, pp. 111-141.

Mills, E.S. (1992), "Office rent determinants in the Chicago area," Journal of the American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association 20 (1), pp. 273-287.

Myers, D. and Gearin, E. (2001), "Current preferences and future demand for denser residential environments", Housing Policy Debate, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 633-59.

Parks, J.R. and Schofer, J.L. (2006), "Characterizing neighbhorhood pedestrian environments with secondary data," Transportation Research Part D 11, pp. 25—263.

Pikora, T.J., Files-Corti, B., Knuiman, M.W., Bull, F.C., Jamrozik, K. and Donovan R.J. (2006), "Neighborhood environmental factors correlated with walking near home: using SPACES," Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise 38(4), pp. 708-714.

Pivo, G. (2008a), "Responsible property investment criteria developed using the Delphi Method," Building Research and Information 36 (1), pp. 20-36.

Pivo, G. (2008b), "Exploring responsible property investing: a survey of American executives," Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management 15(4), pp. 235-248.

Ribeiro, S.K., Kobayashi, S., Beuthe, M., Gasca, J., Greene, D., Lee, D.S., Muromachi, Y., Newton, P.J., Plotkin, S., Sperling, D. Wit, R., and Zhou, P.J. (2007) "Transport and its infrastructure," in Climate Change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [B. Metz, O.R. Davidson, P.R. Bosch, R. Dave, L.A. Meyer (eds)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

Riggs, T. (2006), "Urban Planning, Obesity and Healthcare," The Gound Floor: Heard at the Urban Land Institute, http://thegroundfloor.typepad.com/the_ground_floor/2006/10/urban_planning_.html.

Rosiers, F.D., Theriault, M. and Menetrier L. (2005), "Spatial versus non-spatial determinants of shopping center rents: modeling location and neighborhood-related factors," The Journal of Real Estate Research 27 (3), pp. 293-319.

Rueter, F.H. (1973), "Externalities in urban property markets: an empirical test of the zoning ordinance of Pittsburgh," Journal of Law and Economics 16 (2), pp. 313-349.

Shiller, R.J. (2007), "Understanding recent trends in house prices and home ownership," Paper presented at "Housing, Housing Finance, and Monetary Policy," sponsored by the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, on August 31-September 1, 2007.

Sirmans, G.S. and Benjamin J.D. (1991), "Determinants of market rent," The Journal of Real Estate Research 6 (3), pp. 357-379.

Sirmans, G.S. and Guidry, K.A. (1993), The determinants of shopping center rents," The Journal of Real Estate Research 8 (1), pp. 107-115.

Sivitanides, P.S. (1998), "Predicting office returns: 1997-2001," Real Estate Finance 15 (1), pp. 33-42.

Song, Y. and Knapp, G. (2003), "New urbanism and housing values: a disaggregate assessment," Journal of Urban Economics 54(2), pp. 218-238.

Song, Y. and Knapp, G. (2004), "Measuring the effects of mixed land uses on housing values," Regional Science and Urban Economics 34, pp. 663-680.

Southworth, M (1997), “Walkable suburbs: an evaluation of neotraditional communities at the urban edge,” Journal of the American Planning Association 63 (1), pp. 28-44.

Stull, W.J. (1975), “Community environment, zoning, and the market value of single-family homes,” Journal of Law and Economics 18 (2), pp.535-557.

Tu, C.C. and Eppli, M.J. (2001), “An Empirical Examination of Traditional Neighborhood Development”, Real Estate Economics 29 (3), pp. 485-501.

Wendt, P.F. (1957), “A theory of urban land values,” Land Economics 33 (3), pp. 228-240.

World Cancer Research Fund/American Institute for Cancer Research (2009). Policy and Action for Cancer Prevention. Food, Nutrition, and Physical Activity: a Global Perspective Washington DC: AICR.

APPENDIX A

The following description of the NACREIF properties and measures comes from material published by NCREIF on its website. More details are available at www.ncreif.org.

The qualifications for inclusion in the NACREIF dataset are:

- Operating properties only
- Property types - apartments, hotels, industrial properties, office buildings, and retail only
- Can be wholly owned or in a joint venture structure.
- Investment returns are reported on a non-leveraged basis. While there are properties in the NPI that have leverage, returns are reported to NCREIF as if there is no leverage
- Must be owned/controlled by a qualified tax-exempt institutional investor or its designated agent
- Existing properties only (no development projects)

An Operating Property is defined as follows:

a) For a newly developed property, operating is defined as reaching 60% occupancy or having been available for occupancy for a year from its certificate of occupancy (CO).
b) If a property has been recently purchased with a "redevelopment" strategy, and the property is undergoing substantial expansion or re-tenanting, rehabilitation or remodeling, the property is defined as operating when occupancy reaches 60%.
c) All existing properties (not recently developed or undergoing redevelopment as covered in a) or b) above) that are purchased regardless of current occupancy are defined as operating properties.

Two sets of data are collected. The first represents property specific descriptor information submitted when a property enters the database for the first time. The second dataset is collected quarterly and includes the components of return needed to calculate quarterly rates of return and index values. NCREIF collects considerably more data than what is required to calculate the NACREIF Property Index (NPI). Additional data are used in NPI data validation tests, to calculate additional statistical measures of performance, to develop operating benchmarks and for use in real estate research. Data are submitted in accordance with NCREIF's data submission manual, NCREIF Property Indexes Data

Collection and Reporting Procedures. The data NCREIF collects originates from the accounting and property management systems of Data Contributors.

NCREIF requires that properties included in the NPI be valued at least quarterly, either internally or externally, using standard commercial real estate appraisal methodology. Each property must be independently appraised a minimum of once every three years. Because the NPI is a measure of private market real estate performance, the capital value component of return is predominately the product of property appraisals. As such, the NPI is often referred to as an "appraisal based index."

The NPI quarterly, annual and annualized total returns consist of three components of return - income, capital and total.

The *Income Return* measures that portion of total return attributable to each NPI property's net operating income, or NOI. Net operating income (NOI) is gross rental income plus any other income less operating expenses - utilities, maintenance, taxes, property management, insurance, etc. The income return is computed by dividing NOI by the average daily investment for each quarter. The formula takes into consideration any capital improvements and/or any partial sales that occurred during the quarter.

$$\frac{\text{NOI}}{\text{Beginning Market Value} + 1/2\ \text{Capital Improvements} - 1/2\ \text{Partial Sales} - 1/3\ \text{NOI}}$$

The *Capital Return* measures the change in market value from one period to the next. A property's value can go up (appreciation) or it can decline (depreciation) depending on market forces. The formula takes into consideration any capital improvements and/or any partial sales that occurred during the quarter. When a property enters the Index, the capital return is not impacted until the second quarter of inclusion.

$$\frac{(\text{Ending Market Value} - \text{Beginning Market Value}) + \text{Partial Sales} - \text{Capital Improvements}}{\text{Beginning Market Value} + 1/2\ \text{Capital Improvements} - 1/2\ \text{Partial Sales} - 1/3\ \text{NOI}}$$

Total Return is computed by adding the Income Return and the Capital Value Return.