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I. Introduction

In the last several years a new type of development called “micro-housing” has been spreading nationwide. Micro-housing has become the subject of several Web sites, blogs and even a new cable television series called “Tiny House Nation.”

Some cities are enthusiastic. In 2012, NYC’s Mayor Bloomberg held a micro-apartment design competition and put the City’s support behind the developer to make it happen. Seattle already boasts more than 10 micro-housing developments. Other cities, e.g. Berkeley and Boston, are more cautious.

As the name suggests, “micro-housing” refers to dwelling units that are below general standards in terms of space, usually in conflict with existing planning, zoning or building codes. While they average around 300 square feet, micro-housing comes in a variety of names and forms, including micro-apartments, micro-units, efficiency units, aPodments, tiny houses, micro-loft and “hostel-style” apartments. Micro-housing can be compared with numerous existing housing forms, including accessory dwelling units (aka secondary units), rooming or boarding houses, efficiency units or studio apartments, single room occupancy units (SROs), and mobile homes.

Proponents present micro-housing in several perspectives. It is a rational developer response to the demographic trend of smaller households, resolving a mismatch between existing housing supply and current demand. It is a solution to the affordability crisis. It offers a market-proven infill alternative to sprawl and a promising strategy to revitalize cities with attractive
workforce housing. And, it is a solution to our environmental crisis—a new truly efficient and sustainable form of residential living that will help us adapt to climate change, including by reducing carbon-emissions from vehicles.

But micro-housing is controversial. Some fear micro-housing is merely a profit-maximizing scheme by developers that will solve none of these problems, but rather strain infrastructure, discriminate against families, undermine urban quality of life, exploit new workers, and threaten longstanding habitability standards by promoting "overcrowding."

After providing background on micro-housing, this article will review the policy controversies it raises and then explore the regulatory and policy issues that jurisdictions considering micro-housing should contemplate.

II. A Brief Introduction to Micro-Housing

A. What is micro-housing?

Micro-housing is usually defined by smaller relative square footage per unit compared to historical standards. However, one source defines it based on an ecological purpose: "A small house that is energy efficient and designed strategically to maximize usable space while minimizing ecological footprint."

The dimensions of micro-homes and apartments vary from state-to-state. Generally micro-homes are comprised of less than 300 square feet, but they can range as large as 500 square feet and to as small as 84 square feet. As this housing form is still emerging, it is not clear where the range begins and ends.

B. What are the variety of types of micro-housing? Where are they being built?

Micro-housing comes in for-sale versions and rental versions. Single family owned detached dwellings—sometimes called "tiny houses"—are often custom-designed by buyers. Some are equipped for traveling, sometimes to avoid regulatory limits. Mobile versions blend into more traditional mobile homes, but they are typically not mass-produced. Micro-homes are often located in suburban spaces, sometimes in lots authorized by owners or even in the backyards of others. There are also communities of micro-homes that are located outside city limits or in vacant lots in suburban area.

The rental form of micro-housing ("micro-apartment") is prevalent in large cities with dense populations. Micro-apartments are rented like normal apartments, sometimes below market value and sometimes above.
They can also be developed as a condominium and then rented by the owner. They may be designed to be modular and prefabricated apartments, and pods (serving the homeless community).

Micro-apartments tend to be located to urban centers where there is a rise in the tech community. The leading innovators of micro-apartments in the United States are Seattle, San Francisco, New York City, and Boston. There is some skepticism about whether micro-apartments will work in smaller cities and suburban areas where rents are not growing as rapidly, there is no mass transit, or there is a lack of cultural facilities and amenities to lure people. However, some cities such as Cincinnati, OH; Providence, RI; and Worcester, MA have been experimenting with micro-apartments to develop their downtowns by increasing single-person households.

C. Who lives in micro-housing?

Micro-housing serves young singles, low-income people, seniors, and others. Micro-apartments are marketed to singles in their 20s and 30s who comprise the most likely renter population in general. Many micro-units serve young professionals, especially “techies.” The project in New York also targeted low-income people, allotting 40% of their units to people making 80%-115% of the Area median income. The elderly, adult children, and in-home caretakers are also possible residents of micro-units. In cities such as Austin, TX and Olympia, WA, micro-homes have been used to serve as stable homes and communities for formerly homeless people.

D. What are the building and design variations?

Some micro-housing utilizes traditional construction but much of it employs diverse building forms. Micro-homes come in a great variety of shapes and sizes, including tall, multilevel homes, shipping containers, modular and prefabricated apartments, and pods (serving the homeless community).

There are also wide variations in micro-housing interior design. What is included in the unit versus what is shared with others or separately purchased varies considerably. Standard features include a bed, a living area, a bathroom, and small storage space, but “pods” may consist merely of a sleeping space or possibly a sleeping space with a bathroom. Micro-units often take advantage of multipurpose features, e.g. a table becomes bed or bed folds over to create more living space. One distinguishing feature is whether each unit includes a kitchen, a kitchenette, or no kitchen. Some include only a small refrigerator and microwave (or hotplate) like a hotel suite. Other micro-apartments share a full kitchen and other common areas with other tenants. Another distinguishing feature is what amenities are included in the building that micro-unit dwellers can access. Some have extensive, even luxurious, amenities. Many include more common spaces to make up for the reduction in private space.

III. What Policy Issues Does Micro-Housing Raise?

A. Micro-housing supporters’ arguments

Developers see an emerging and growing market for micro-apartments particularly among young professionals, especially “techies” who have distinct lifestyles. Research points to a high demand for micro-housing based on the increased demand for studios and city-living. Many millennials are currently living at home as “boomerang” children, but many of them will be entering the market soon as renters. They are potential renters of micro-apartments because some will be starting at lower salaries. Despite
some uncertainty about financing, developers want municipalities to allow these units to be built and let consumers decide. Some even seek tax exemptions for micro-apartment development.

Most local governments that approve micro-housing do so for two sets of policy reasons. First, they believe micro-housing will serve unmet housing needs as well as emerging housing needs. Consistent with the demographic trend of smaller household size, single-person households continue to grow, especially in urban centers. Some governments in high cost areas fear that if they do not provide micro-housing, the influx of young professional renters will increase rents further. Some localities see micro-housing as an "urban necessity" similar to SROs and boarding houses. Some localities in high-cost housing areas support micro-apartments as a source of affordable housing, especially for low-wage workers. Some micro-units are being proposed or built by nonprofit developers specifically as legally-restricted affordable housing or are required to be affordable by the jurisdiction. Some versions of micro-housing serve as special needs housing, including for homeless people. Even without subsidy or legal restrictions, micro-housing can be "market-affordable" or "affordable-by-design" because reduced land costs (space per unit) can lead to lower overall project costs which can increase affordability. And construction costs per unit can be reduced by the use of prefabricated materials.

Second, many local governments envision micro-housing as part of a broader city planning strategy. For these, micro-housing promises city revitalization by attracting people, especially young professionals, to come live and stay downtown. They hope that micro-housing will also "attract larger employers concerned about residential opportunities for employees."

Other localities view micro-housing as promoting an environmentally friendly housing strategy. In general micro-apartments will make more efficient use of land because they are higher-density housing. And, smaller units are more likely to be energy-efficient than traditional dwellings because they will use less resources to heat or cool, and there will be fewer unused rooms that are unnecessarily heated or cooled. If they are built near public transit or in walkable neighborhoods, their occupants will be likely to produce less greenhouse gases by reduced auto use.

B. Micro-housing skeptics' arguments

Disputes and controversies about micro-housing generally fall into three categories: Will micro-housing be good for the city as a whole, good for tenants, and good for neighbors?

Some doubt that micro-housing will be quality development for the city. Some early micro-apartments in Seattle caused controversy because they were developed without design and environmental reviews while developers received tax breaks. Micro-apartments increase density, but without appropriate planning, they will burden (perhaps already overburdened) infrastructure. And depending upon the location of micro-units in relation to other land uses, some fear these units could create a new version of "ghetto" with concentrations of low-wage workers.

Others are concerned that micro-housing will not actually serve affordable housing needs but merely serve developers' bottom line. They argue that micro-housing is not inherently more affordable and note that the prices of some micro-apartments cost more per foot than regular apartments. For example, one micro-unit project in San Francisco would rent for $6.91 to $6.82 per square foot, compared to $4.21 per square foot for the
average sized studio in the city. So, developers profit more on the lower development costs, while renters pay more money for less space. And high rents for small units could increase rents overall. Finally, in some cities micro-apartments are replacing what had been affordable housing (e.g. SROs) that affordable housing developers would like to rehabilitate and preserve.

The counter argument is that—all other things being equal—economic theory would predict that “if micro-units increase housing supply in a city they should reduce, or at the very least not increase, rents... In addition, micro-units may reduce the demand among singles for shared two-to-four bedroom housing units, which could render those units more affordable to families.” On this view, “[h]igher average rents for micro-units may simply reflect demand for new construction, particular locations within a city, or the attractiveness of the new housing options.” And, without the availability of micro-units, high demand for smaller (and more affordable) units fuels the creation of illegal units.

Of course, the important determinants are regional and local housing market conditions.

The other housing need concern is that typically micro-housing does not serve families. Markets, such as San Francisco, are in need of affordable family housing, which micro-apartments do not serve due to their size and their likely rise in cost as demand grows.

Some micro-housing skeptics express concerns for tenants. They argue that the small spaces that micro-apartments provide will undermine tenants’ quality of life. However, other studies report contrary findings and raise other questions. While residential occupancy standards and housing code standards for habitability provide some parameters, our housing law and policy has never resolved the issue of how much space people need to live a healthy life. And fundamental issues remain unresolved, e.g. are minimum healthy standards objective or subjective and culturally dependent? And who should decide: government, developers/the market, or housing dwellers?

While certain people may have no trouble acclimating to a limited space, some housing proponents see micro-apartment development as a slippery slope, and an unwinding of the zoning laws that sought to uphold a decent quality of life. If we reduce required minimum standards for housing for purely economic reasons, this could increase supply and, on certain additional assumptions, increase affordability, but it also sets up a precedent to push farther below the new floor in the future.

Housing advocates also raise equity issues: Do we have different housing standards for different classes of people, e.g. lower standards for (formerly) homeless people? To the degree micro-units are marketed to young professionals, this concern may be misplaced because with large disposable incomes, they can supplement their lifestyle outside of their home. However, when micro-apartments are intended for low-wage workers or homeless people, the concern is more salient, especially if these units have few amenities.

Would-be neighbors of micro-units, especially single family neighborhoods and neighboring business communities, have voiced traditional concerns about density and property values. If micro-apartments are sited in already dense districts, increased traffic and parking problems that will accompany an influx of new residents are likely to be a particularly strong concern, and even more intense if the locality reduces parking standards for micro-apartments located downtown. Owners of neighboring buildings may protest the height of infill micro-apartments that might block light. Some
homeowners and property owners claim that micro-units lower their property values.  

Other concerns of neighbors focus on the prospective tenants themselves. To the extent the units will be affordable housing, neighbors express the fears typical of all local opposition to affordable housing—they will attract "itinerant" and "sketchy people," homeless people, criminals, or those with drug problems.  

Because micro-housing is a relatively new form of housing, there is not yet much empirical evidence of its actual effects. Data on historical parallels (e.g. tenements in New York City) may only be suggestive because so many other factors are distinct. In his review of micro-housing, Professor Infranca recognizes some policy concerns but suggests "[a]pplying reasonable regulations to the development of micro-units...can provide a safe and affordable alternative that reduces demand for illegal units."  

IV. Regulatory and Policy Issues to Consider  

Most localities have the legal authority to zone and plan for residential uses that meet their communities' housing needs. However, many existing zoning ordinances and planning codes do not anticipate micro-housing. Therefore, usually localities need to revise their planning codes and zoning ordinances to allow micro-units or to bring them under review where they would otherwise escape review under current definitions and standards. In some cases, approving micro-housing may require revising state law, particularly a state's building code, or getting waivers or exceptions to it.  

In some cases micro-units have been developed under special circumstances. After conducting a design competition for micro-

housing, New York City waived certain requirements because the development would be constructed on city-owned property. San Francisco amended their zoning laws to create a pilot program to allow a limited number of micro-apartments to be built.  

If a locality wants to enable a substantial number of micro-units to be built, it will need to review and revise its planning code and zoning ordinance carefully, both to ensure that these developments will serve its planning and development goals and to anticipate potential lawsuits by developers, property owners, neighbors and other interested groups.  

Following are the primary regulatory and policy issues to consider:  

- Define micro-units and articulate the purposes for including them.  

Like all development, in most communities planning for housing is both a regional and a local issue. The inclusion of micro-units should be considered in conjunction with a more comprehensive analysis of housing needs and policies, including their possible effects on other housing types such as accessory dwelling units and SROs. In cities subject to mandatory general plans with housing elements, the inclusion of micro-units may help the locality meet the state requirements.  

Depending upon its use and design, micro-housing can be defined separately or in relation to an existing housing type, e.g. efficiency units, rooming house, or accessory dwelling units. If ownership micro-units can be developed in a group on a single parcel, they can be regulated as an RV park or cohousing.  

- Set zoning ordinances and planning policies accordingly.  

If micro-units are included in order to meet
particular housing needs, zoning and planning must be designed to ensure that such development is feasible and that the intended housing needs are actually met. Similarly, if micro-units are intended to promote other planning policies, e.g. downtown revitalization, appropriate planning and zoning policies must be adopted as well as fiscal policies that enable their development. If affordability is a goal and the locality has an inclusionary zoning ordinance in place, it could define micro-unit developments to be subject to the inclusionary ordinance. Because housing developments typically last for many decades, localities should consider incorporating flexibility into their planning and zoning policies for this new type of housing “to allow for reconfiguration of units that would accommodate changing household sizes and enable residents to remain in a neighborhood.”

If micro-housing will be a new type of land use in the jurisdiction, the locality will need to make the following determinations:

- Decide in what zones they will be allowed (including possibly limiting them to high-amenity neighborhoods) and whether as of right or only with a special use permit;

- Decide allowable density and the need to up-zone density in zones where they will be allowed;

- Define planning standards because micro-unit design is critical, and like all development, the devils (and angels) are often in the details of design:
  - Minimum square footage per living unit (keeping any state requirements in view);
  - Height standards, bulk standards, setback requirements;
  - Lot coverage (if applicable);
  - Size of common areas;
  - Required amenities: e.g. kitchen, kitchenette or no kitchen? Combinations between minimum unit size and common spaces may allow smaller units while controlling density;
  - Parking: Many cities that have encouraged micro-apartment development have either reduced or eliminated parking requirements. The increasing availability of cars and other vehicles for occasional use by Zipcar and other car-sharing companies as well as via companies like Uber that are common in cities may be a factor to consider;
  - Landscaping and other exterior requirements; and
  - Permissible kinds of construction, e.g. traditional only or also allow prefabricated and modular construction.

The locality will also want to consider the following:

- Ensure consistency with residential habitability standards;

- Ensure consistency with relevant state and/or local residential occupancy standards or revise accordingly;

- Revise design review procedures and standards accordingly;

- Consider whether to subject micro-housing to exactions to support additional infrastructure; and

- Whether to apply affordability requirements.
V. Conclusion

The potential scope and effects of micro-housing are unknown, but they appear promising. Localities would do well to consider their value to their communities while attending to the policy controversies. And, if they choose to proceed, carefully revise their planning code and zoning ordinances to ensure that the promises will be realized and the potential perils avoided.
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