


PRICING LANDSCAPE QUALITY THE INFLUENCE OF LANDSCAPE VIEWS ON HOUSE VALUES

**Dr Andrew Lothian, Scenic Solutions
August 2010**

Real estate values provide an excellent surrogate for valuing landscape quality in monetary terms. Any value so derived reflects the laws of demand and supply prevailing at the particular location. In an area with an abundance of scenic beauty but a low population, the values may be low whereas the presence of a large population will increase demand and hence values. This was reflected in a study in New Zealand (Bourassa et al, 2005) which found an inverse relationship between the relative abundance of a water view and its effect on house values, the fewer the views, the higher the contribution (Christchurch), and the converse – the more abundant the views, the lower the contribution (Wellington) (Table 1, Figure 1).

Table 1 Relative abundance of view vs contribution to house value

	Wellington	Auckland	Christchurch
% of houses with water view	18.6%	11.4%	2.5%
Influence of water view to house prices	6.6%	9.7%	10.9%



Source: Bourassa et al, 2005

Figure 1 Inverse relationship between abundance of view and contribution to house value

With this proviso in mind, studies of the influence of landscape views on property values do provide useful insights.

The Appendix summarises 21 papers covering 37 studies between 1973 and 2009 that have quantified the influence of landscape views on house values. Most of the studies examined the influence of water views on house prices, using the sea or lakes as the landscape and assessed the presence or absence of a view. All but two studies used actual sales data in preference to valuation data. Most studies used hedonic price analysis, a form of regression analysis where the price (dependent variable) is a function of the house characteristics (independent variables) such as

number of bedrooms, floor area, air conditioning, etc to derive the contribution of each to the price. The presence or absence of a view is included in the model.

The mean increase to house values for all studies is 17.4% but with a large standard deviation of 20%. Thus a property worth, say \$200,000, will be worth \$234,800 if it has a good view. Multiply this by the hundreds, or in some areas, thousands of properties which enjoy the view, and its worth runs to millions of dollars. Based on an average house value of \$200,000, the value of the view for 1000 homes will be \$34.8 million.

The increase to house values ranges from 2.18% to 90% and is heavily skewed towards the lower percentage as shown in Table 1 and Figure 2 (median 8.9%, mode 8%). Of the 37 separate study locations, 22 increased house values by up to 10%.

Table 1 Frequency of % increase in house values

% Increase	Frequency
0 - 4.99	4
5 - 9.99	18
10 -19.99	6
20 - 29.99	2
30 - 39.99	3
40 - 49.99	0
50 - 74.99	3
75 - 100	1





Figure 2 Studies of influence of a landscape view on house values

The highest increase, 90%, was derived in a study of houses along Lake Erie where houses with a view of the lake averaged \$527,184 compared with \$285,518 for those without a view. After controlling for house characteristics (e.g. lot size, house size) the premium added to homes with a view was \$256,545. The authors wrote with academic understatement: “This is quite a large premium even given the spectacular view that Lake Erie offers.” (Bond, *et al*, 2002).

There appeared to be little or no relationship between the house value and the contribution of the view to the value. Figure 3 shows the results of a study of condominiums near Boston where the contribution ranged from 4% to nearly 12% across the range of house values.



Source: Plattner and Campbell, 1978

Figure 3 Influence of water view on price of condominiums, Massachusetts

A study in Switzerland examined the profit derived from two hotels in and near Zurich that offered views over the lake and Alps compared with views without these (Lange, E. and P.V. Schaeffer, 2001). It found for one hotel an annual difference of US\$0.45 m and for the other US\$1.74 m. In present value terms, these added \$4.3 m and \$16.3 m to their property value (interest rate 10%, time period 20 years).


A study of rental apartments in Chicago in the mid 1970s found that the amenities in the area – access to parks and lake, and lake view, comprised 26% of their rents, including 7% for the lake view (Pollard, 1982). The author concluded that the “presence of either a lake view or accessibility to the lake leads to a doubling of the predicted height of buildings. These results for Lake Michigan are indicative of the substantial impact of topographic amenities on the height of buildings, the supply of housing, and the structure of cities”.

The extent of a view varies widely from a full expansive view covering the entire landscape through partial views to no view. It also varies by distance from the landscape being viewed, generally the more distant the view the lesser its influence on house prices. A study at Bellingham, Washington, which classified the extent of an ocean view (superior, good, poor) and distance found the value of a view varied inversely with distance from the water (Benson *et al*, 2000) (Table 2, Figure 4).

The study showed that the significant contribution of the view to house values decreases quite quickly within the first mile but then declines less quickly, meaning that a landscape viewed from even a considerable distance will generally still contribute to property values, unless the view is very restricted.

Table 2 Percentage increase to house values based on distance of view


Type of ocean view	0.1 miles	0.25 miles	0.5 miles	1 mile	1.5 miles	2 miles	3 miles
Full view	68.31	62.97	55.63	44.72	36.79	30.63	21.47
Superior partial view	56.21	50.09	41.78	29.59	20.86	14.16	4.35
Good partial view	37.03	35.05	32.28	28.01	24.8	22.23	18.29
Poor partial view	25.64	22.69	18.61	12.45	7.89	4.30	-1.12



Source: Benson *et al*, 2000

Figure 4 Percentage increase to house values based on distance of view


The contribution of a landscape view to house prices is not constant, but in accordance with the laws of supply and demand, may fluctuate over time. This is shown by the study of New Zealand cities (Bourassa *et al*, 2003) which traced house sales by date (Figure 5). While the contribution was relatively constant for Auckland and Wellington both of which have abundant sea views, it fell appreciably for Christchurch between 1986 and 1994 before making up for some of the decline by 1996. The decrease was probably due to new developments occurring nearer the coast and water features during the 1980s and early 1990s and supply being limited after 1994.



Source: Bourassa *et al*, 2005

Figure 5 Varying contribution of landscape view to house values over time (New Zealand)

The study referred to above at Bellingham, Washington also traced the contribution of an ocean view over a decade and produced more stable results than the New Zealand study (Figure 6). It also found an appreciable increase in the contribution of the view to house values. For example, the contribution of the full ocean view rose from 51% to 59% over the decade, while the superior view more than doubled midway through the decade and then fell back to about a two-thirds increase by the end of the decade. This probably reflects the continuing demand for a view resulting in an added supply of suitable housing sites which reduced prices.



Source: Benson *et al*, 2000

Figure 6 Varying contribution of landscape view to house values over time (Washington)

Although most of the studies were carried out in Western nations (US, NZ, Holland) with single storey family houses, five studies were of multi-storey apartment blocks in Hong Kong, Singapore and Guangzhou (China). The Singapore study (Shi Ming Yu *et al*, 2005) found a view of the sea increased apartment values by 15.4%. Two of the three Hong Kong studies found apartment values increased by 4.6% (Hui *et al*, 2007) and 9.3% (Tse, 2002). The third study found a broad sea view yielded an increase of 3.97% whereas confined sea views yielded 2.18%, not a large difference (Jim and Chen, 2009). However, this latter study also found that a broad mountain view lowered values by 6.7%, the reasons for which the authors speculated may be linked to the traditional Chinese view that regards water as fortune but mountains as wilderness. The Guangzhou study found that a view of green spaces near the apartments contributed 7.1% to their value.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The contribution of the view to house values ranged from 2% to 90% with a modal average of 8%. The amount reflects the laws of supply and demand; in locations with abundant views but little housing demand, the contribution may be slight but reverses where the demand increases with little supply. The contribution of a view did not correlate with the house value, the same contribution occurred for houses of low and high values. The value of a view varied inversely with distance from the view, declining quite rapidly over the first few kilometres before levelling out so that even distant views will provide some added value to house prices. The contribution of the view generally appreciated over time, presumably reflecting continuing

demand but contracting supply of suitable land. While most of the studies were in the West (US, New Zealand and Holland), five studies in the East (Singapore, Hong Kong and Guangzhou) found similar results, ranging from 2% to 15%.

While not a perfect surrogate of the value of landscape quality, these studies demonstrate that house prices can benefit very significantly from a view of an attractive landscape.

REFERENCES (in chronological order)

- Darling, A.H. 1973. Measuring benefits generated by urban water parks, *Urban Economics*. 49:1, 22 -34.
- Davies, G., 1974. An econometric analysis of residential amenity. *Urban Studies*, 11, 217 – 225.
- Morton, T.G. 1977. Factor analysis, multicollinearity, and regression appraisal models. *The Appraisal Jnl*, Oct, 578 – 588.
- Plattner, R.H. and T.J. Campbell, 1978. A study of the effect of water view on site value, *The Appraisal Jnl.*, Jan, 20 – 25.
- Gillard, Q., 1981. The effect of environmental amenities on house values: the example of a view lot. *Professional Geographer*, 33:2, 216 – 220.
- Pollard, R. 1982. View amenities, building heights, and housing supply, In Diamond, D, and Tolley, G. (Eds). *The Economics of Urban Amenities*. Academic Press, New York, pp 105 – 123.
- Rodriguez, M. and C. Sirmons, 1994. Quantifying the value of a view in single family housing markets, *The Appraisal Jnl*. Oct, 600 – 3.
- Wolverton, M.L., 1997. Empirical study of the relationship between residential lot price, size and view. *Journal of Property Valuation and Investment*.15:1, 48 – 57.
- Benson, E., J. Hanson, A. Schwartz and G. Smersh, 1997. The influence of 'World Class Water' views on residential property values. American Real Estate Meeting, Lake Tahoe, Calif. 1996.
- Benson, E., J. Hanson, A. Schwartz and G. Smersh, 1998. Pricing residential amenities: The value of a view. *Jnl Real Estate Finance and Economics*, 16:1, 55 -73. (Also: Benson, E., J. Hanson, A. Schwartz, 2000. Water views and residential property values, *The Appraisal Journal*, July, 260 – 271.)
- Benson, E., J. Hanson, A. Schwartz and G. Smersh, 1998. The influence of Canadian investment on U.S. residential property values. *Jnl Real Estate Research*. 13:3, 231 – 249.
- Lange, E. and P.V. Schaeffer, 2001. A comment on the market value of a room with a view. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 55, 113 – 120.
- Luttik, J., 2000. The value of trees, water and open space as reflected by house prices in the Netherlands, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 48, 161 - 167.
- Lange, E. and P.V. Schaeffer, 2001. A comment on the market value of a room with a view. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 55, 113 – 120.
- Seiler, M.J., M.T. Bond and V.L. Seiler. 2001. The impact of world class Great Lakes water views on residential property values, *The Appraisal Jnl*, 69:3, 287 – 95.
- Bond, M.T., V.L. Seiler and , M.J. Seiler, 2002. Residential real estate prices: a room with a view. *Jnl Real Estate Research*, 23:1/2, 129 -137.
- Tse, R.C., 2002. Estimating effects in house prices: towards a new hedonic model approach. *Urban Studies*, 39:7, 1165 – 1180.

Bourassa, S.C, M. Hoesli and J. Sun, 2005, "The price of aesthetic externalities." *Journal of Real Estate Literature*, vol. 13: 2, 167-187.

Bourassa, S.C, M. Hoesli and J. Sun, 2004. What's in a view? *Environment and Planning A*, 36:8, 1427 – 1450.

Shi-Ming Yu, Sun-Sheng Han and Chee-Hian Chai, 2005. Modeling the value of view in real estate valuation: a 3-D GIS approach. Dept Real Estate, National University of Singapore.

Hui, E.C.M., C.K. Chau, L. Pun, M.Y. Law, 2007. Measuring the neighboring and environmental effects on residential property value: using spatial weighting matrix. *Building and Environment*, 42, 2333 – 2343.

APPENDIX

STUDIES OF THE INFLUENCE OF LANDSCAPE VIEWS ON HOUSE VALUES

Reference	Location	Data date	Sales	Val'n	Number	\$ added/ \$ house value	% added
Darling, 1973	California Lake Murray Santee Lakes		sales			+\$2362 +\$2756	
Davies 1974	Nottingham	1968	Sales		114	-	
Morton 1977	Sth California	<1975	Sales		400	\$19,748	
Plattner & Campbell 1978	Near Boston Knollsbrook Village Farrar Pond	1972 – 76	Sales		325	+\$2.2k/\$41.7k	5.6%
						+\$3.7k/\$45.4k	8.9%
						+\$2.3k/\$33.8k	7.3%
						+\$1.9k/\$36.8k	5.4%
						+\$4.3k/\$40.8k	11.7%
						+\$7k/\$70k	11.1%
						+\$6k/\$79.5k	8.2%
						+\$5.2k/\$67.7k	8.3%
						+\$3.8k/\$78k	5.1%
						+\$5.4k/\$69.9k	8.5%
+\$3.4k/\$85.9k	4.1%						
Gillard, 1981	Los Angeles	1970	Sales		392	+\$3.9k/ \$42K	9%
Pollard, 1982	Chicago	1975	Rents		232	+\$216/\$3090 annual rent	7% on apartment rents
Rodriguez & Sirmons, 1994	Virginia	1985 – 91		Val'n	194	+\$22.5k/ \$281k	8%
Wolverton, 1997	Tucson, Arizona	1989 – 91	Sales		56	+\$60,000/\$173,000 (incl. lots with view)	34.9%
Benson et al 1997	Washington		Sales		397		Ocean view 32% Partial view 10%
Benson et al 1998, and Benson et al, 2000	Bellingham Washington	1993	Sales		5095	+\$51.9k/\$200k +\$58.8k/\$200k +\$61.6k/\$200k +\$117.6/\$200k +\$36.2/\$200k	View +25.9% Good partial ocean view 29.4% Superior partial ocean view 30.8% Unobstructed ocean view 58.8% Lake view 18.1%

Pricing landscape quality – the influence of landscape views on house values

Luttik 2000	Netherlands Emmen Apeldoorn Leiden	1989 – 1992	Sales		282 102 336		Water view +10% Park view +8% Water view +8%
Reference	Location	Data date	Sales	Val'n	Number	\$ added/ \$ house value	% added
Seiler et al, 2001	Lake Erie	1998		Val'n	1172	+\$115k/\$292.5k	Water view +56%
Bond et al 2002	Lake Erie	<2000	Sales		190	+\$257k/\$285.5k	Water view +90%
Tse, 2002	Hong Kong	1994	Sales		1000	+\$23.3k/\$250.9k +\$40.8k/\$439.1k	9.3%
Bourassa et al 2004	Auckland NZ		Sales		5,000		Water view + 59% to waterfront property
Bourassa et al 2005	Auckland, NZ Wellington Christchurch	1986 - 1996	Sales		128,982 28,357 73,851	Inverse rel. with % water view	Water view +9.7% Water view + 6.6% Water view + 10.9% Annual values avail.
Shi-Ming Yu et al 2005	Singapore		Price		841	+\$233k	Water view + 15.4%
Hui et al, 2007	Hong Kong	2000 - 01	Sales		3000	US\$8,208/\$178,438 - \$14,358/\$312,131	Sea view 4.6%