

# Estimating the Political Feedback Loop of Local Housing Politics

Daniel Posthumus

May 27, 2025

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Literature Review</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Institutional Background</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Empirical Methods</b>	<b>1</b>
4.1	Existing Data on Housing Regulations . . . . .	1
4.2	Creation of Planning Commission Dataset . . . . .	2

## 1 Introduction

## 2 Literature Review

## 3 Institutional Background

## 4 Empirical Methods

### 4.1 Existing Data on Housing Regulations

This project requires leveraging both existing data and the creation of a new dataset. First, a granular time-series of the regulatory stringency of housing policy on the community level doesn't exist. Any researcher seeking to use housing policy stringency as a model input must choose between the survey-based Wharton Land Use Regulatory Index and Bartik, Milo, and Gupta (2024)'s LLLM-created dataset (hereafter referred to as the 'LLM Index'). The Wharton Index has observations from two time periods: 2005 and 2018, whereas the LLM Index only has one period of observation – 2024. Also unfortunately, the two don't match in where they place communities in the distribution of regulatory stringency. And because their time periods don't match perfectly, it is

impossible to **definitively rule out** that some localities significantly changed their place in the distribution of housing policy stringency between 2018 and 2024.

This means estimating a model of feedback by using these indices is not possible; we need a time-series related to housing regulation on a more granular level to match high-frequency political changes. Ideally, we also want a panel dataset, composed of interconnected housing markets. To illustrate why this is necessary is straightforward. Imagine individual  $i$  prefers a low density community. They live in San Francisco, denoted as  $SF$ . They vote for a NIMBY candidate in period  $t$ . Then, their candidate loses and the planning commission uses its authority to approve a spate of new projects in  $i$ 's neighborhood. Individual  $i$  then moves to Daly City, in San Mateo County. Intuitively, individual  $i$  hasn't changed housing markets; there is a clear and direct relationship between Daly City real estate and San Francisco real estate. If individual  $i$  would have moved to Stockton, California, however, we could effectively argue for strong geographical segmentation between the San Francisco and Stockton housing markets.

## 4.2 Creation of Planning Commission Dataset