

## Trends Encouraging Infill Development

The trends noted in the left-hand column below are from the Urban Land Institute, *Making Infill Projects Work* (1985), crediting an earlier source, Real Estate Research Corporation, *Urban Infill: its Potential as a Development Strategy* Chicago: RERC, 1981. Though the sources are more than 20 years old, these observations may still be valid. The middle column contains statements about Columbia. As you read the trends and notes, are the trends still valid factors encouraging infill development, both generally and here in Columbia? Considering all these trends, what are Columbia's prospects for a successful infill development program? Are there any "trends encouraging infill" that may have been overlooked?

Trends Encouraging Infill	Columbia's situation	Trend present in Columbia?
1. Traffic congestion and high energy costs reinforcing the advantages of close-in locations	Average commute time of 15 minutes is below national average	
2. Limited capability of local governments to expand infrastructure at the urban fringe	Columbia has relatively open borders for annexations and infrastructure extensions	
3. High costs of land preparation at the urban fringe	As best land is "cherry picked" for development costs of developing land with environmental constraints (rock excavation, stream crossings, steep slopes) increases	
4. Interest in public transit accessibility	Public transit advisory board formed. Approximately three-quarters of Columbia's population resides in transit service area	
5. Growing costs in money, time and "aggravation" of obtaining approvals for development on raw land	Actual approval time for large-scale developments is high: 6 months or more	
6. Rising local government need for tax base expansion	City is better off than many but sales tax and user fee revenues are declining	

<b>Trends Encouraging Infill</b>	<b>Columbia's situation</b>	<b>Trend present in Columbia?</b>
7. Strengthening service economy and growth in centrally located office employment	Manufacturing base is dispersed but key employers (education, government) are in central locations	
8. Fewer child-oriented households	Percentage of households with children is a minority (approximately 19%)	
9. Interest in accessibility to urban amenities and multiple uses	Community is strongly supportive of its downtown, culture, the arts, active and healthy living	
10. Expanding multi-use nodes in cities and suburbs	Some planned multi-use nodes (e.g., Discovery/Discovery Ridge/SE regional parks)	
11. Increased scrutiny of excess land in public ownership	There are approximately 6,000 acres of public-owned land in Columbia, or about 1/6 of the total	
12. Pressures to preserve environmentally sensitive or agricultural land	City has partnered with university to take inventory of natural resources; under regulatory pressure to protect surface water resources	
13. Need to maximize use of in-place public facilities	Central parking garages; recent major roadway improvements; rehabilitated central bus station; some areas with recent sewer investments; others in need of remedial sewer work	
14. Strengthening of older neighborhoods through preservation and rehabilitation efforts	Block grant programs active in approximately ¼ of city's area; two urban conservation overlay districts formed	
15. Capitalizing on development opportunities that do not require substantial public expenditure	Many developments occur in areas with concurrent or needed large public improvements (e.g., new developments on Rangeline/Rangeline Street project; residential subdivisions along Scott Boulevard)	