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*Abstract*—This paper explores the application of nearest-neighbor regression to land value prediction within the city of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. Assessed value, parcel location, parcel size, and parcel vacancy data was collected from the City of Edmonton Open Data Portal. 1454 vacant parcel examples were suitable for model fitting. A Euclidean distance-weighted nearest-neighbor regression model was evaluated using five-fold cross-validation on a selection of model scoring metrics.

The model showed mixed performance on the selected scoring metrics, with poor performance on explanatory power metrics like R-squared and Explained Variance, but reasonable performance on Mean Absolute Percentage Error, suggesting that the presence of outliers may be impairing the model.
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# Background and Motivation

Evidence and economic theory suggest that a Land Value Tax (LVTs) is an efficient, fair, and effective tool for governments to raise revenue, manage the cost of real estate, incentivize development, maximize land use, and ensure that the economic value generated by civic activity flows to public -- and not private -- interests. In jurisdictions where property taxes are levied on the combined value of land and improvements, tax assessments are generally made only for the combined value of land and improvements, and not for land and improvements separately; any shift towards LVTs would require these jurisdictions to develop assessment methodologies for both the land and improvement components of real property.

Because land values are highly location and geography specific, global regression techniques – such as generalized linear models – are ill suited to modelling them. Locally sensitive methods like nearest-neighbors or neural networks are better candidates. Both neural networks and nearest-neighbor predictors can model arbitrarily local functions, but each acquires this capability through very different approaches.

Neural networks can approximate arbitrary spatial functions in a single hidden-layer perceptron simply by increasing the number of nodes in the hidden layer to equal the number of points on the map that require a precise estimate; higher-order, “neighborhood” type effects can be modelled with additional hidden layers. The trade-off is that training such models requires a large number of examples, training time, and compute resources. They can, however, predict relatively quickly.

Nearest-neighbor approaches, on the other hand, are non-parametric, can perform predictions with minimal data, and require very little “training” time and compute resources. As the size of the training set increases, however, prediction time also increases.

# Methods

## Context

The City of Edmonton assesses taxes on the combined value of land and improvements. It also publishes data on:

* The assessed value of every parcel of land in the City of Edmonton
* A set of parcels of land in the City of Edmonton that happen to be vacant parcels

The intersection of these data sets comprise a set of the land values of a selection of parcels within the City of Edmonton. If the distribution of vacant parcels provides sufficient coverage over the city, assessed property values are accurate, and vacant parcels are accurately identified, then this data can be used as a training set for local regression algorithms that estimate the land value of every parcel of land in the city.

## Data

The data for this project was sourced from the City of Edmonton’s Open Data Portal. The specific data sets used were:

1. Property Assessment Data (Current Calendar Year)
2. Property Information Data (Current Calendar Year)
3. Vacant Land Inventory

The Property Assessment Data was leveraged for its geographic coordinate and assessed value attributes; the Property Information Data was leveraged for its lot size attribute; the Vacant Land Inventory data was leveraged for its lot size and vacant indicator attributes.

The Vacant Land Inventory data was originally generated in 2014, and last updated in 2015, while the Assessment and Information Data sets were current as of April 2021. This means that the vacancy status attribute was seven years out of date at the time of this analysis and likely included some inaccuracies as a result.

## Preparation

These data sets were downloaded, joined, coalesced, and filtered to include only vacant parcels that could be mapped to the following features and target:

* Features:
  + Latitude – the latitude of the centroid of the parcel
  + Longitude – the longitude of the centroid of the parcel
* Target
  + Unit price – the assessed price per square metre of the parcel

Only 1,454 parcels out of 822,494 City of Edmonton assessed properties met these requirements; this reduction was mostly due to the small size of the Vacant Land Inventory.

## Model Specification

Scikit-learn’s radius-based nearest-neighbor regression model was used to model the function from features to targets. It was trained with the following parameters:

* Euclidean distance based on the degrees of latitude and longitude separation between parcels of land.
* An infinite neighborhood radius -- all examples are used when making predictions
* Inverse-distance example weighting for prediction

# Results

The model was tested with five-fold cross-validation and scored on 13 metrics for each cross-validation fold.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cross-Validation Fold** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Fit Time** | 0.003 | 0.003 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| **Score Time** | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| **Explained Variance** | -0.25 | 0.001 | -0.87 | 0.02 | 0.11 |
| **Max Error** | 8668 | 356599 | 14436 | 110327 | 36154 |
| **Mean Absolute Error** | 1067 | 1824 | 859 | 1256 | 719 |
| **Mean Squared Error** | 1.66e6 | 4.38e8 | 1.80e6 | 4.90e7 | 9.57e6 |
| **Root Mean Squared Error** | 1287 | 20917 | 1341 | 7000 | 3093 |
| **Mean Squared Log Error** | 3.38 | 2.88 | 2.69 | 1.39 | 0.65 |
| **Median Absolute Error** | 977 | 548 | 784 | 498 | 16 |
| **R-squared** | -1.44 | 0 | -1.32 | 0.01 | 0.08 |
| **Mean Poisson Deviance** | 1206 | 12234 | 990 | 4306 | 1953 |

The results were mixed. On one hand, metrics that estimate the proportion of change in the target variable explained by the model -- such as R-squared and Explained Variance -- have relatively low scores, maxing out at 0.08 and 0.11, respectively, indicating that the model predicts a relatively small proportion of change in the target. On the other hand, the model performs reasonably well on the Mean Absolute Percentage Error, with a worst-case score of 20, indicating that for most test-train splits and parcels, the estimated prediction is off by less than 20%.

# Discussion

These results suggest that this method has promise, but that outliers may be impairing the performance of the model.

Given that it appears that outliers may be impairing the performance of this model, automated outlier exclusion or a manual audit of the assessed values of vacant lots may help remedy this impairment.

Standard geographic coordinates (latitude and longitude) were used as features, and standard euclidean distance was used to compute the distance between examples. This algorithm does not accurately calculate distances between geographic points. Utilizing the haversine formula -- which accurately calculates distances between geographic points -- could potentially improve the accuracy of this model.

Factors other than local geography may have a significant influence on land values. For example, land use zoning influences what a given parcel of land may be used for, which may influence its market value. Models that incorporate zoning and other information may improve land value assessment predictions.

Other data sources may also be useful in the development of land value models. The Multiple Listing Service maintains sale and listing data for real estate, and the Alberta Land Titles Registry maintains transaction history and sale price data for real estate. Models that incorporate this data could improve upon the ideas explored in this study.

This study uses point-in-time data sets, but tax assessment data in particular is available on an annual basis. This time series data may be useful for improving the accuracy of the model.
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