

STRATEGIES, U.S. LOCATIONS PROMOTING VISITABILITY

Cities, counties and states are using a variety of strategies to promote visitability's incorporation into new home construction. The Center for Inclusive Design and Environmental Access (IDEA Center) at the Department of Architecture, State University of New York at Buffalo for many years has tracked where and how the approach is being implemented.

The Center's data were most recently profiled in the 2008 report, **Increasing Home Access: Designing for Visitability**, prepared by Jordana L. Maisel (IDEA Center), Eleanor Smith (Concrete Change) and Edward Steinfeld (IDEA Center) for the AARP Public Policy Institute, and are highlighted below.

Approach	Typical strategies	Locations using
Public education/ outreach; property designation	<p>Organizations or coalitions:</p> <p>Develop or disseminate materials about construction or remodeling features and practices; builders' clients in some cases must review checklists</p> <p>Develop/award certificates for homes constructed with benchmark features</p>	<p>Albuquerque, NM Howard County, MD Irvine, CA Montgomery County, MD Onodaga County, NY Prescott Valley, AZ Sacramento, CA San Mateo County, CA Syracuse, NY Visalia, CA New Mexico EasyLiving Home Certification Program (state/local coalitions forming)</p>
Incentives	Direct monetary payments, credits on property taxes, credits for building permit fees, etc.	<p>Consumer benefits: Escanaba, MI (rebate) Freehold Borough, NJ Pittsburgh, PA Southampton, NY Georgia (tax credits) Pennsylvania (tax credits) Virginia (tax credits)</p> <p>Builder benefits: Houston, TX</p>

Incentives, con't.		<p>Builder benefits, con't.</p> <p>Southampton, NY (reduced permit fee)</p> <p>Illinois (demonstration grant)</p> <p>Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency (research project)</p>
<p>Design standards incorporated into building codes, or design features authorized outside of building codes</p>	<p>Set of designated features are incorporated into new home construction - features included vary around the country</p>	<p>All unsubsidized and subsidized properties:</p> <p>Arvada, CO (15% of new homes)</p> <p>Bolingbrook, IL</p> <p>Lafayette, CO (25% new homes)</p> <p>Naperville, IL</p> <p>Pima County, AZ</p> <p>Florida</p> <p>Vermont</p> <p>Properties subsidized with public funds or particular agencies' funding:</p> <p>Atlanta, GA</p> <p>Auburn, NY</p> <p>Austin, TX</p> <p>Chicago, IL</p> <p>Davis, CA</p> <p>Dublin City, CA</p> <p>Iowa City, IA</p> <p>Fort Worth, TX</p> <p>Long Beach, CA</p> <p>Milwaukee, WI</p> <p>Pine Lake, GA</p> <p>Rockford, IL</p> <p>San Antonio, TX</p> <p>Scranton, PA</p> <p>St. Louis County, MO</p> <p>St. Petersburg, FL</p> <p>Toledo, OH</p> <p>Tuscon, AZ</p> <p>Urbana, IL</p> <p>Georgia</p> <p>Kansas</p> <p>Kentucky</p>

Design standards incorporated into building codes, or design features authorized outside of building codes, con't.		Properties subsidized with public funds or particular agencies' funding, con't.: Minnesota Michigan New Jersey Ohio Oregon Texas
--	--	--

(Updated 9/09)