Despite the dominance of suburban home building, large cities experienced rapid gains in new housing construction between 1991 and 1998. However, the gains in metropolitan-area home building are distributed unevenly. In some large cities, new home building is stagnating; while in others, it is booming. In half of the large cities, the share of metropolitan permits shrunk between 1986 and 1998, while it expanded in just over a quarter of the cities.

Size of the cities’ land area matters. In general, compact, densely developed cities are constructing fewer homes and have a relatively smaller share of regional housing permits than spacious cities that have substantial amounts of undeveloped land. Only two compact cities, Seattle and Orlando, issued more than 1,000 permits and had more than 10 percent of all permits issued in their metropolitan areas in 1998.

A comparison of the 39 large cities by their land size shows clearly which cities, by 1998, had “hot” and “cold” housing construction markets. The hot markets are: Seattle, Orlando, Boston, Miami, Columbus (OH), Portland (OR), Tampa, New York, San Francisco, San Antonio, Phoenix, Houston, Dallas. Cold markets are: Baltimore, Providence, St. Louis, Sacramento, Detroit, Philadelphia, New Orleans, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles.
I. Home Building in America: City Revival or Endless Sprawl?

The current unprecedented period of sustained economic growth in the United States has led to a surge in new home construction. A growing economy spurs job growth, which leads to population shifts, which in turn bring about a demand for additional housing. The demand for more homes in a given metropolitan area rises as people form new households, migrate from elsewhere, or seek new, usually more expensive, homes. Even as the national economy grows, however, some regions, and some places within regions, do better than others, and the amount of home construction is distributed unevenly among the cities and suburbs of our metropolitan regions.

The question of where in metropolitan areas new home construction occurs is of particular interest to policy makers and others. On the one hand, many government officials have been trying to trigger economic activity and population growth in America’s cities for decades. The National Association of Home Builders recently pledged to construct 100,000 homes a year in cities over the next decade. On the other hand, fears that uncontrolled suburban growth will degrade the environment and engulf the neighboring countryside have made “suburban sprawl” a national political issue. In 1998, citizens approved more than two hundred ballot initiatives to preserve green spaces and curb real estate development. In 1999, Vice President Al Gore announced a federal effort to control sprawl by encouraging construction within central cities. The states of Maryland and Georgia recently enacted measures aimed at containing urban growth.

To help measure the patterns of urban growth, the extent of the urban revival, and the intensity of suburban sprawl in the United States, the Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University has investigated patterns of home building in American cities at the national, regional, and metropolitan levels during the economic boom, bust, and revival of the last fifteen years.

This report analyzes data on building permits that have been issued for dwelling units in the 39 largest American urban regions at the peak of the last housing cycle in 1986, the trough in 1991, and the expansion years 1996 and 1998. (We have chosen two recent years for data points to determine whether the trend established in the early part of the current expansion has continued.) These data illuminate the extent and proportion of new housing construction in large cities and their surrounding metropolitan areas.

The data examines the trends in the 39 largest metropolitan areas and their large cities. The term “large city,” used by the Joint Center for Housing Studies in this and other research on urban centers, refers to the largest city and any others with a population of more than 200,000 within a metropolitan area. We prefer this term to the more commonly used “central city,” which the U. S. Bureau of the Census and Office of Management and Budget define as the largest city and, if they exist, any other cities of more than 250,000 people in each designated metropolitan area. In 1990, these 39 largest metropolitan areas each had a population of more than one million people and together were home to half of the population of the United States. The combined population of the large cities of these metropolitan areas comprised 15 percent of the total national population. (See Figure G later in paper for population figures.)

One should keep in mind that because of key differences between American suburbs and cities, far more home construction occurs in outlying areas than in core large cities. Suburban areas usually cover much greater land area and contain more sparsely settled and undeveloped land than do large cities. Large urban centers, on the other hand, frequently have less territory, more developed and densely settled land, and numerous buildings (including old warehouses and office buildings) that can be renovated or remodeled for residential purposes. Hence, in most circumstances, suburban home building—and therefore sprawl—will outpace residential development in urban centers.

II. Home Building in the Thirty-Nine Largest Metropolitan Areas

A. New Housing Construction Activity Is Increasing in Metropolitan Areas, Particularly in the Suburbs

According to permit data for new housing construction in the years 1986, 1991, 1996, and 1998, home construction in metropolitan areas in the United States is well on the road to recovering from the effects of the recession of the early 1990s and may soon rise to the lofty levels of the 1980s boom. Total housing permits in the 39 largest metropolitan areas grew by nearly 78 percent between 1991 and 1998, reaching approximately 793,000 total permits or 76 percent of the peak permit level of 1986. (See Figures A and B)

The data also confirms that sprawl is alive and well. The majority of new housing construction activity in the last 15 years has taken place in the suburbs and exurbs of central cities. In 1986, at the height of the last housing construction boom, suburbs captured 81 percent of new housing permits in the 39 metropolitan areas. By the 1991 recession, the number of suburban housing permits dropped by 67 percent but their share of metropolitan permits increased to 85 percent.
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As the economy recovered between 1991 and 1998, the number of new suburban homes built rose by 71 percent, making up approximately 82 percent of all homes built in metropolitan areas in 1998. Thus, the suburbs have captured the overwhelming share of new homes built in metropolitan areas in the last 15 years—between 80 and 85 percent. (See Figure C.) Furthermore, in each of the years examined here, the suburbs, small cities, and towns outside of these metropolitan areas—with the exception of those outside San Antonio—consistently attracted more new home building than their large cities.

B. Home Building in Large Cities Is Climbing Back but Still Lagging behind Suburban Construction

According to housing permit data, housing construction activity in large cities dropped off sharply after the building boom of the 1980s but has been soaring since the recession of the early 1990s. Between 1991 and 1998, the number of new homes built in the 39 large cities more than doubled, growing by 116 percent. This percentage increase in new housing construction activity outpaced that of the suburbs and metropolitan areas generally, which saw their housing permits grow 71 percent and 78 percent, respectively, during the same time period. The cities’ share of metropolitan housing permits also grew by 3.2 percentage points, from 14.6 percent in 1991 to 17.8 percent in 1998.

Cities are gaining momentum in residential construction even without the boom in multi-family buildings promoted by various tax incentives (such as accelerated depreciation tables and loose restrictions on declaring losses) that existed in the 1980s. The number of multi-family permits issued in both large cities and metropolitan...
areas has more than doubled since the market bust in the early 1990s. In 1986, large cities issued 132,500 permits, as developers and investors rushed to develop multi-family buildings before a new tax law went into effect and eliminated housing investment tax shelters. In 1998, large cities issued only 80,000 multi-family permits, but this figure reflects real demand more accurately than does the number from the year of the tax shelter rush.

The progress in large city home building should be considered cautiously, however. As mentioned earlier, suburban areas remain the dominant sites for new homes in metropolitan areas. While the 1998 city share of metropolitan housing permits has almost returned to the peak level of 1986, new city housing still represents less than one-fifth of all new homes built in these metropolitan areas. And since the sharp drop after the speculative building boom in 1986, housing construction in large cities has not recovered as quickly as it has in cities' outlying regions. Even though cities did gain 116 percent additional permits from 1991 to 1998, the large cities issued 29 percent fewer permits in 1998 than they did in 1986, lagging somewhat behind the suburban areas, which issued 23 percent fewer permits in 1998 than in 1986.

C. Home Construction Patterns Vary Widely in Different Cities

There are diverse trends—that define the home building experience of the 39 metropolitan areas and large cities in this study. Between 1986 and 1998, half of the large cities in the 39 largest metropolitan areas lost permit share in their metropolitan area to suburbs and small cities, while only about a quarter gained a greater share of permits.
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### Figure F: Permits and Large City Share for 39 Largest Metropolitan Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Large City</th>
<th>Outside Large City</th>
<th>City Share of Metro (%)</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Large City</th>
<th>Outside Large City</th>
<th>City Share of Metro (%)</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Large City</th>
<th>Outside Large City</th>
<th>City Share of Metro (%)</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Large City</th>
<th>Outside Large City</th>
<th>City Share of Metro (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257,757</td>
<td>16,952</td>
<td>240,805</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>129,091</td>
<td>8,992</td>
<td>120,099</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>160,781</td>
<td>7,143</td>
<td>153,638</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>194,233</td>
<td>11,222</td>
<td>183,011</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>14,412</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>10,273</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>129,091</td>
<td>8,992</td>
<td>120,099</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>160,781</td>
<td>7,143</td>
<td>153,638</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>194,233</td>
<td>11,222</td>
<td>183,011</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>208,680</td>
<td>64,751</td>
<td>143,929</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>3,896</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>39,078</td>
<td>11,930</td>
<td>27,148</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>12,716</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>8,792</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27,148</td>
<td>9,282</td>
<td>17,866</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>37,324</td>
<td>11,930</td>
<td>25,394</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>194,233</td>
<td>11,222</td>
<td>183,011</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>194,233</td>
<td>11,222</td>
<td>183,011</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>26,065</td>
<td>16,295</td>
<td>9,770</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>12,716</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>8,792</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27,148</td>
<td>9,282</td>
<td>17,866</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>37,324</td>
<td>11,930</td>
<td>25,394</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix/Mesa</td>
<td>12,716</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>8,792</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>27,148</td>
<td>9,282</td>
<td>17,866</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>37,324</td>
<td>11,930</td>
<td>25,394</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver/Aurora</td>
<td>12,716</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>8,792</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>27,148</td>
<td>9,282</td>
<td>17,866</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>37,324</td>
<td>11,930</td>
<td>25,394</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** 1998 data are preliminary. Large cities include the named central city and all cities with populations over 200,000 in 1990. Data are summed from place-level data to match 1983 metropolitan area definitions, except New England where metro area definitions are those in effect for the year of data collection. The Boston metropolitan area includes only the Boston, Lawrence, Lowell, Manchester, and Nashua PM SAs. Data from Charlotte are drawn from Mecklenburg County; permit data for Charlotte were not available. (State and area of M ecklenburg County is 527 sq. mi., land area of Charlotte is 174.3 sq. mi.) San Francisco includes San Jose and Oakland. New York includes Newark and Jersey City. Los Angeles includes Long Beach, Anaheim, Santa Ana, and Riverside. Dallas includes Ft. Worth and Arlington.

**Source:** U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Construction Reports, Series C-40.
To be precise, in 1998, 19 cities’ share was smaller than it was in 1986; 11 cities gained share, and nine held about the same share (or changed less than one percent). (See Figures D, E, and F.)

The amount of new home construction in large cities varied, even as it waxed and waned according to the national economy. As the housing industry put the brakes on building in 1991, only six of the 39 large cities issued more permits than they had in the flush year of 1986—they are Buffalo, Cincinnati, Baltimore, Portland (OR), Detroit, and Houston. The permit numbers in the other 33 cities dropped precipitously. As the economic recovery took hold, however, the figures for new home construction climbed for nearly all cities. Between 1991 and 1996, 28 cities—or over two-thirds of the total—increased the number of residential construction permits; 27 cities issued more permits in 1998 than in 1996. And, in 19 cities, the number of housing permits rose between 1991 and 1996 and again in 1998.

Within the twelve-year period from 1986 to 1998, the large cities’ share of housing construction in their metropolitan areas also varied widely. Between the boom of 1986 and the crash of 1991, 23 cities lost their share of their metropolitan area’s permits, while ten cities gained a greater share, which suggests that economic downturns affect urban markets more than they do suburban markets. Between the recession year of 1991 and the recovery year of 1996, 17 cities gained a greater share of their total metropolitan area’s permits, eight stayed the same (less than one percent change) and 14 lost their share of permits. As the economic recovery persisted between 1996 and 1998, the share of the metropolitan
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area’s permitting rose in 20 cities, stayed about the same in 11, and fell in eight.

Eleven cities increased their share of metropolitan area permits from 1991 to 1996 and either increased or maintained that share in 1998. Only two cities, Cincinnati and Sacramento, lost their share of metropolitan permits both from 1991 to 1996 and from 1996 to 1998.

D. Land Area Makes a Difference
What can explain this variation in the numbers and share of residential permits? Not regional differences. No clear trends emerge in cities’ number of housing permits and share of the metropolitan permits when sorted by the four major regions of the country.

On the other hand, knowing the size of cities helps make sense of the diverse patterns of home construction. Sorting the cities by their land area distinguishes between giant cities, such as Phoenix and Dallas, which contain significant areas of undeveloped land, and small, intensely developed metropolises such as Hartford and Miami. Furthermore, it produces a clear pattern of residential development. (See Figure G for specific land areas.)

Sorting the list of cities into two size categories—those with land area greater than and less than 150 square miles—reveals that spacious cities have a strikingly larger share of housing construction than that of compact cities. During the recent economic booms and busts, all 17 cities with large land areas of more than 150 square miles (including and larger than Tampa/St. Petersburg) regularly exceeded 10 percent of their share of total metropolitan permits. The exceptions were Chicago and New Orleans, which had their share of metropolitan permits dip below 10 percent at least twice during the years examined. In contrast, only four of the 22 cities with small land areas of less than 150 square miles (ranging from tiny Hartford’s 17 square miles to Cleveland/Akron’s 140 square miles) issued more than 10 percent of their metropolitan areas’ housing permits in any year.

Breaking the list into four size categories makes the pattern even clearer. Cities whose area covers less than 100 square miles—that is, cities with a large proportion of developed land—issued far fewer permits and held a much smaller share of metropolitan-area home building than the giant cities. For the entire period between 1986 and 1998, the ratio of number of permits issued in these cities to permits in their metropolitan areas lagged far behind that of the largest cities. In 1998, 15 cities of less than 100 square miles commanded an average of 6 percent of the permits in their total metropolitan areas—three times their share of the metropolitan land area but less than a quarter of the shares of permits received by the largest cities. (See Figure F.)

At the other end of the spectrum, extremely large cities, those with more than 200 square miles of territory, all had over 10 percent of their metropolitan area permits, and the ratio of permits to square miles was higher in the extremely large cities than in cities of under 200 square miles. Of course, the far-flung boundaries of these cities contain large tracts of suburban and undeveloped land.

Within the land area categories, some cities are doing very well and others very poorly. To highlight their progress—or lack of it—cities of similar sizes have been assigned to hot and cold zones, depending upon their number of permits, ratio of permits to city land size (permitting density), and share of the metropolitan region’s total permits. (See Figures H and I.)

1. Cities less than 100 Square Miles
In the Hot Zone: Seattle, Orlando, Boston, Miami
Of cities less than 100 square miles in size, only two, Seattle and Orlando, issued significant numbers of permits and garnered over 10 percent of their metropolitan areas’ housing permits in 1998.

Seattle, one of the hottest home building areas in the country, issued 4064 permits, by far the most permits in its size category and more than those issued in 14 larger cities. Seattle’s average number of permits per square mile (permitting density) for the years 1986, 1991, 1996, and 1998 was 48, the highest of all 39 cities examined in this study. Although Seattle occupies only 1.4 percent of the territory in its metropolitan area—only four other cities had a lower percentage of metropolitan land—Seattle garnered 15 percent of 1998 metropolitan area housing permits, a figure exceeded
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only by cities with far greater territory. Orlando, Florida, packed into 67 square miles, is almost as hot an area of housing construction as Seattle. In 1998, Orlando had the second highest permits per square mile (41) of the 39 cities and followed Seattle in the number (2,748) and share of total metropolitan area permits (12.3) in the under 100 square mile category.

Among the smallest cities—under 50 square miles—Miami and Boston are the leaders in housing construction. Both have been increasing their number of permits recently, and may soon exceed 1,000 units a year. (Despite its high percentage of metropolitan area permits, Buffalo has issued a relatively small number of permits.) With a comparatively small land area of 36 square miles, Miami's 1998 permitting density was a torrid 27. In Boston, an old built-up eastern city, the ratio of permits to area was a remarkable 16.

In the Cold Zone: Baltimore, Providence, St. Louis, Sacramento Despite Baltimore's urban renaissance projects such as the Harborside festival marketplace and Camden Yards baseball complex, home building there has come to a virtual standstill. A city of 81 square miles—3 percent of its metropolitan area—Baltimore only managed to produce 64 permitted units in 1998, or 0.8 permits per square mile. Its 1998 share of metropolitan area housing permits was a measly 0.6 percent, down from 1 percent in 1996. Perhaps a revival in housing construction will come soon to Baltimore. Nearby Washington, D.C. was unable to produce a single permit in 1996, but two years later the nation's capital issued permits for 429 units, a ratio of 7 permits per square mile.

Providence, Rhode Island, a revival city, is not attracting new housing construction either. It only issued 39 permits last year, less than half the
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number of two years earlier, which gave it a permitting density of 2.1. In the M idwest, the city of St. Louis has lost population to its suburbs for the last 70 years, despite almost continuous urban renewal and development programs. Judging from the drop in the number of permits (from 395 to 162), share of metropolitan area permits (from 3.2 to 1.4), and ratio of permits to area (from 6.4 to 2.6) between 1996 and 1998, the Gateway City's slump is persistent.

But even a western city can be in the cold zone. Sacramento, California's 96-square mile capital city, has seen the number of permits fall and its share of metropolitan permits shrink in 1991, 1996, and 1998.

2. Cities of 100-200 Square miles
In the Hot Zone: Columbus, Portland, Tampa
In cities with territory of more than 100 but less than 200 square miles, Columbus had the greatest number and share of permits. After a dip in construction in 1991, Columbus issued more than 4,000 permits and captured over a third of its metropolitan area permits in each of the years 1996 and 1998.

Portland, Oregon, where metropolitan growth controls have been implemented to concentrate urban development close to the city, stands out on the housing permit list. Portland was one of only three of the 39 largest metropolitan areas whose central cities increased their share of residential building permits issued in their total metropolitan area in 1986, 1991, 1996, and 1998. The other two cities—Buffalo and Houston—are not comparable to Portland. Buffalo derived its recent gains from a drop in the number of suburban permits rather than a rise in the city's. Houston occupies 540 square miles, the third largest land area of the great cities, takes up 7.5 percent of its metropolitan territory, and contains large amounts of suburban and undeveloped lands.

Portland is a good-sized but not enormous city—at 125 square miles, it is the twenty-second largest in area of the large cities studied. Yet it gained a progressively larger share of metropolitan permits in 1991, 1996, and 1998 despite robust growth in the number of permits in its suburban territory. Portland did far better in numbers and share of permits than did other cities of its approximate size—Atlanta, Philadelphia, Salt Lake City, and Minneapolis. Portland's 26 permits per square mile ranked the seventh highest of the 39 cities.

In the Cold Zone: Detroit, Philadelphia, New Orleans
The intermediate-size group of cities also included those who fared poorly in new housing construction. In 1998, Detroit had a measly 1.5 percent share of total metropolitan housing construction, even though it holds a 2.7 percent share of the land. Philadelphia suffers from the same chilly construction climate affecting Baltimore and Washington, D.C. In 1996, the City of Brotherly Love mustered a small number and share of permits, which then declined in 1998. In that year, Philadelphia's ratio of permits to land area was a weak 3.4.

Even in Sunbelt cities, housing construction can stagnate. Although New Orleans regularly holds a relatively significant share of the permits issued within its metropolitan area, in 1998 its numbers plummeted, from 991 in 1996 to 335—a number almost as low as in the downturn year of 1991. Its 335 permits produced a 1.9 permitting density that was lower than all the other cities, save Baltimore.

3. Cities of 200-500 Square Miles
In the Hot Zone: New York, San Francisco, San Antonio
In general, the housing permit data for the giant cities of more than 200 square miles in territory reveals little about the issue of development in the urban core versus the suburban periphery. Such enormous expanses usually include all types of land and land uses, so it is difficult to differentiate between the activity in the city and its metropolitan area.

The exception to the rule is New York City. It stands in contrast to its mid-Atlantic neighbors (Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington) and, for that matter, every other city in the country. Despite the most densely settled population in the country, New York has ranked in the top six cities in number of permits in 1986, 1991, 1996, and 1998. Its 9,000 permits in 1996 and more than 11,000 permits in 1998 comprised over a quarter of the total for its metropolitan area. And although the city of New York (which here includes Newark and Jersey City) covers a territory of 348 square miles, we know that most of the housing development took place in densely packed urban areas. With more than 3,300 permits in 1996 and more than 3,800 permits in 1998, the borough of Manhattan led not only all the boroughs and smaller cities in the city of New York but also two-thirds of the other 39 large cities.

Although much of their residential construction may be in suburban types of environments, San Francisco and San Antonio are significant hot spots. Builders in San Francisco (which here includes Oakland and San Jose) received over 7,400 permits in 1998, one quarter of the permits in its metropolitan area, or 27 permits per square mile. San Antonio is also building significant numbers of new homes.
In 1998, it issued more than 6,600 permits, a whopping 73 percent of its metropolitan region’s permits. The city’s 333 square miles occupies 13 percent of the total metropolitan land area.

In the Cold Zone: Chicago, Kansas City
In the tepid zone, to be accurate. Both Chicago and Kansas City are increasing production of housing but at a slow rate. Chicago had the lowest share of metropolitan permits in its size class in each of the years studied, although its share and number of permitted units have been rising since 1991.

Kansas City has also been struggling to get back to the number (4,273) and metropolitan share of permits (23.3) it had in 1986, and its ratio of permits to land area was 8.5 in 1998, a low number for its category of city size.

4. Cities more than 500 Square Miles
In the Hot Zone: Phoenix, Houston, Dallas
The vast cities with more than 500 square miles of territory are almost regions in themselves: they are able to produce urban sprawl within their own city limits.

Phoenix/Mesa leads this group in share of the metropolitan region’s total permits (37 percent) and permitting density (32) and all 39 large cities in number of permits, with more than 16,700 in 1998. Houston follows close behind with a 35 percent share of metropolitan area permits, a permitting density of 30, and just under 16,300 permits issued.

Another behemoth, Dallas (including Fort Worth and Arlington), issued about 15,400 permits in 1998, giving it a 29 percent of the metropolitan share and a respectable ratio of permits to land area of 22.

In the Cold Zone: Los Angeles
Los Angeles, it is worth noting, is apparently still absorbing the massive numbers of units produced during the real estate boom of the 1980s—there were an astounding 38,419 permits issued in 1986! Multi-family investors were busy here: 34,765 units were in multi-family permits that year. In the late 1990s, the number of permits has dropped to 4,350—a low number among the huge cities—and about 10 percent of the metropolitan share. The ratio of permits to square miles in the City of Angels was an extremely modest 6.5.

III. Conclusion
The data concerning home building permits in metropolitan areas reveals an urban revival in the late 1990s that is close to the achievements of the 1980s’ boom. The recent surge in home building, however, is spread unevenly among different cities. Some urban centers, especially the geographically larger cities, are capturing most of the new construction. Other cities are still languishing. Meanwhile, permit data for both metropolitan areas and counties demonstrate that the pattern of sprawling suburban development persists.

From a policy perspective, the data indicates that the National Association of Homebuilders’ goal of constructing 100,000 new homes in cities annually is an ambitious one. To meet their goal, the homebuilders will have to focus most of their efforts on the cities where there is a vigorous demand for new housing. Most of this new home building in large cities will have to take place in the undeveloped, suburban-looking tracts in spacious metropolises such as Phoenix or Dallas. Among smaller cities, the urban core of hot real estate market cities such as Boston and Seattle will absorb new residential construction long before similar locales in other cities. For the present, it will be difficult to sell significant numbers of new homes in such sluggish markets as Baltimore or Detroit.

The question that remains for policy makers is how to generate new home construction—or how to encourage the forces that generate new home construction—in areas where there is little demand. The problem is twofold. First, in economically vital metropolitan regions—such as in Los Angeles and St. Louis—policy makers must devise ways to channel job and population growth to central urban areas. Second, in cities whose regions are economically stagnant, the cities will have to act as an economic catalyst.

In order to limit suburban sprawl, it seems likely that government officials will have to impose measures that limit development on the periphery of metropolitan areas and encourage more intense development in the inner cities and those parts of the suburban ring that are already developed. To revitalize economically depressed cities, officials will have to make dramatic improvements in infrastructure and services, such as schools, and find ways to increase the number of jobs accessible to residents of the urban cores.
Endnotes

1 The permits analyzed here are permits for new construction, as opposed to rehabilitation. Permits for rebuilding a substantial portion of a building, however, were counted among the permits for new construction and similarly reflect demand for new housing. Some cities may have had only limited new construction but still had significant levels of repair and remodeling.

2 The term “metropolitan area” in this study refers to the standard geographic classifications of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Metropolitan area refers to the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) where the OMB has defined one and the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) where it has not. The definitions are those in effect as of 1983, except for New England categories which uses the boundaries in effect for the year of data collection. The Boston metropolitan area includes only the following parts of the Boston CMSA: Boston Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PM SA), Lawrence PM SA, Lowell PM SA, Manchester, New Hampshire, PM SA, and Nashua, New Hampshire, PM SA.

3 As Michael Carliner points out in his recent essay, “Home Building in Central Cities,” the central city definition is full of anomalies. It includes 208 places with less than 50,000 people and fifteen with less than 20,000 as central cities and excludes thirty-seven cities with a population of more than 100,000. See Housing Economics (Feb. 1999), 8-17.

4 The permit figures are not available for Charlotte. The figures listed under Charlotte are based on available data for Mecklenburg County. Thus, although listed here in the largest city size category, these figures reflect housing development in the county not the city.
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