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Executive Summary

Throughout its recent history, and especially in the 21st century, Arlington County has struggled with providing housing affordable to residents during the rapid urbanization of the last 100 years. During this period, a series of events and policy changes at the state, local, and national level, in addition to rising construction and land costs have resulted in an environment of single-family homes that are financially out of reach for the average resident. The County’s median housing value is $669,400 compared to the national average of $204,900. Over 70 percent of residential developable land in the County is zoned for these expensive single-family homes by-right (they can be built without special permits or permission), and these homes are typically “the most expensive ownership typology (type) and the form that generally accommodates the least density” (most expensive for the least number of people). Federal and state laws barred minorities from joining white communities during their founding. For example, a statute in the Virginia Constitution of 1902 allowed localities to define “segregation districts,” which were defined borders between communities of color and white neighborhoods. These policies, along with neighborhood-level segregation through restrictive covenants, led to patterns of racial segregation which are still evident today. An explanation of how Arlington’s residential development evolved through local, state, and federal policy changes, federal funding, transportation planning, and wholesale community redevelopment is provided in this report.

Key Findings

- Late 19th century Arlington consisted of agricultural land with developing single-family subdivisions mostly home to white residents, with African Americans living in segregated clusters through the County.
- Development rapidly accelerated in the early 20th century until World War II. During this period, Arlington introduced its first zoning ordinance in 1930 which essentially codified the County’s existing land use and created policies which heavily favored the construction of uniform, single-family housing throughout the County. These policies included discriminatory policies, such as a 1938 ordinance banning row houses, which were a popular housing type but were also associated with lower-income communities. This was compounded by federal action, such as the Federal Housing Administration’s policy of “redlining,” by insuring mortgages for suburban homes and excluding minorities from these opportunities.
- From 1940 to 1950, Arlington’s demographics changed from 91 percent white to over 95 percent white as the policies implemented from 1920 to 1940 were enforced. By the mid-1950s Arlington was completely built-out, with most of the County devoted to single-family housing, mostly white neighborhoods. Arlington introduced its first General Land Use Plan (GLUP) in 1961 for planning future development. This plan, like the first zoning ordinance, reinforced the current residential patterns established during the previous decades and promoted a single-family-focused environment.
- Arlington began to shift towards higher-density and mixed-use zoning with the advent of the Metrorail in the 1970s. Arlington repealed the ban on row houses in 1969 and implemented zoning specific to townhouses to aid in redevelopment. Even with the shift towards denser housing around transportation hubs, Arlington converted less than 10 percent of land zoned for low-density residential land use to more affordable mixed use and high-density apartments and condos.
- With the construction of new higher-density housing came a massive conversion of apartments to condominiums along the Metro corridor. Many renters could not afford to buy their residences and were forced out. In one example, 93 percent of renters in the converted apartments in Claremont had to move somewhere else for housing because they could not afford to purchase. Of those renters, 45 percent had to leave the County to find affordable residences.
- Today, Arlington’s landscape remains dominated by single-family detached neighborhoods with dense multi-family development surrounding Metro stations and very few buildings that fall in between these two densities. Over 70 percent of residential land allows only single-family detached homes, but these homes are only 26 percent of Arlington’s housing.

1 According to the United States Census Bureau 2018 American Community Survey 5-year estimate
The following charts highlight key demographic and housing trends in Arlington across the study period. Snapshots of these charts are revisited throughout the report, focusing on changes specific to each era of interest.

In the early 1900s, Black or African American residents accounted for more than one quarter of the County’s population. The minority population declined, reaching its nadir in 1950, and increasing in recent decades due to a substantial decrease in the white population in the 1970s and growing Asian and Hispanic or Latino populations. [Figure 1]

The distribution of housing units across different typologies has shifted dramatically since 1940. Since 1960, the growth of single-family units slowed substantially when the County had developed its remaining undeveloped land, while the number of units in buildings of 10 or more units has grown significantly in each decennial census year. The number of single attached homes has increased modestly since 1970, after the repeal of the rowhouse ban, and there has been little or no growth in the number of homes in 2-4- and 5-9-unit buildings. [Figure 2] (Note: this report follows the Census categories of housing. For the Census to categorize a unit as single family, the unit must: be separated by a ground-to-roof wall; have a separate heating system; have individual meters for public utilities; and have no units located above or below. If each unit within the building does not meet these conditions, the entire building is considered multifamily. Thus, most rowhouses and many duplexes are categorized as single-family attached, but up and down duplexes and divided homes are considered multifamily. For more information see: [https://www.census.gov/housing/hvs/definitions.pdf](https://www.census.gov/housing/hvs/definitions.pdf)
From a countywide perspective, the nature of planned residential land uses has not changed dramatically since the inception of the first General Land Use Plan (GLUP) in 1961, despite the net addition of roughly 70,000 residents. The total land area planned for residential use has increased modestly, land intended for multifamily housing and apartments/mixed uses grew by approximately 1,100 acres, and land dedicated to single-family homes decreased by about 800 acres (about a 10 percent decline). [Figure 3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Residential (11-15 Units per Acre), High Medium, Multi Family (14-39 Units per Acre)</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>+378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments and Offices Mixed</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>+735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Residential (Single Family) (0-13 Units per Acre)</td>
<td>8,180</td>
<td>Low Residential (1-15 Units per Acre), Single Family</td>
<td>7,372</td>
<td>-808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,029</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Housing Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>+306</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Changes in Residential Zoning Acreage, 1961-2019. Note that 2019 GLUP land use types have been condensed to align with equivalent 1961 GLUP land use types.

Introduction

Like other jurisdictions in Northern Virginia and across the United States, Arlington County is grappling with a housing affordability challenge, as the County’s housing supply is not keeping pace with the demand put forth by population and economic growth. At present, residents in Arlington are struggling to find housing that is more affordable and that meets their needs. These conditions could worsen as housing demand continues to surge. According to regional housing targets published by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG), at least 320,000 housing units must be added between 2020 and 2030 in order to meet regional housing needs. The regional target also calls for at least 75 percent of new housing constructed to be affordable to low- and middle-income families.1

The region’s lack of both market-rate affordable (otherwise known as naturally occurring affordable housing) and subsidized affordable housing has come into focus, which, in addition to having adverse socioeconomic impacts from an equity perspective, also has the potential to inhibit the region’s economic growth.2 The current dearth of housing that is affordable to many County residents can be attributed to a number of factors, such as rising construction costs and land prices. Underpinning the issue, however, are local policies that stifle the construction of less expensive housing types.3 For example, in Arlington County, approximately 73 percent of residential developable land in the County is zoned for the construction of single-family detached homes by-right,2 with just under 30 percent zoned for all other housing types and densities [Figure 4].3 Single-family detached homes are typically “the most expensive ownership typology and the form that generally accommodates the least density.”4 Similar patterns of residential development have been observed in the City of Alexandria and Fairfax County. Thus, the baseline zoning in Northern Virginia’s inner suburbs makes less expensive housing more difficult to build, which has disparate impacts on different neighborhoods and demographic groups.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Category</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Residential (1-15) Units per Acre, Single-Family</td>
<td>7,372</td>
<td>71.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>7.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>18.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Residential (11-15) Units per Acre, Multi-Family</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residential</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Residential Land Use by Zone

Arlington County has expressed its commitment to addressing current and future housing affordability challenges and supply needs through the County’s Affordable Housing Master Plan (AHMP), which states that “a range of housing options should be available throughout the County affordable to persons of all income levels.” One of the ways the County is addressing these challenges is by examining “missing middle” housing, or housing forms that occupy the middle of a spectrum of housing types “between single-family detached homes and mid-to-high-rise apartment buildings.”4 The Missing Middle Housing Study, organized under Arlington County’s umbrella initiative Housing Arlington, “examine[s] how new housing types and forms could be introduced in Arlington that increase and diversify the County’s housing supply.”5

This report was assembled in support of Arlington County’s series of research bulletins for the Missing Middle Housing Study. It is the culmination of a semester-long capstone course in which Virginia Tech graduate students examined the history of planning and zoning in the County and its relationship to patterns of residential development. This research sought to identify the impacts that changes in the County’s land use regulatory and policy framework have had over time on residential development and the County population to better understand Arlington County’s present-day residential landscape. Thus, graduate students conducted extensive archival research aimed at answering the following questions:

- **When were Arlington’s residential districts created, over time?**
- **What zoning districts allowed two-family dwellings, townhouses, and/or multifamily dwellings, over time?**
- **What were the zoning district dimensional standards (e.g., setbacks and minimum lot size) and did they change over time?**
- **What do historical real estate records indicate about the establishment of subdivisions in Arlington?**
• What are the impacts of these changes over time from built environment and demographic perspectives?
• How did demographics change throughout Arlington County over time and how did planning and zoning influence those changes?
• What do changes in the General Land Use Plan indicate about the diversity of housing types over time?
• What broader historical events and trends (e.g., judicial rulings, federal lending guidelines) impacted planning, zoning, and residential development in Arlington?

This report is structured into six eras: 1880-1930, 1931-1945, 1946-1960, 1961-1979, 1980-2009, and 2010-Present. In addition, there are several vignettes distributed throughout the eras. While these vignettes stand alone from the main narrative, they are nonetheless important or illustrative of Arlington’s residential planning, zoning, and development. The report concludes with several suggestions for future research.

4 Arlington County. (2020). What is “missing middle”? Retrieved from https://housing.arlingtonva.us/missingmiddle/about/
1880-1930

Overview

In 1880, Arlington was part of Alexandria County, and most of its land was devoted to farming, with rolling hillsides dotted with small, rural villages to the southwest of Washington, D.C.\footnote{Between 1900 and 1910 the population of Alexandria County grew by 60 percent. In 1920 Alexandria County was renamed Arlington County to distinguish it from the City of Alexandria, and within the following decade, Arlington’s population grew by 66 percent.} By 1930, Arlington’s rural landscape had almost entirely been replaced by residential development, largely due to the proliferation of streetcar networks and a steady influx of federal workers.

Transportation

Beginning in the 1890s, electric streetcars and railroads began to cross through the County, spurring the development of residential communities known as “streetcar suburbs.”\footnote{For example, the Washington, Alexandria & Mount Vernon Electric Railway ran south from the District to Mount Vernon; around the same time, the Washington, Arlington & Falls Church interurban railway was laid fromRosslyn through today’s Clarendon, Ballston, and Falls Church.} In 1900, the Great Falls and Old Dominion Electric Railroad was built, which ran along what is now Old Dominion Drive to Great Falls Park.\footnote{This line spurred the development of the Cherrydale and Livingston Heights subdivisions, among others.} Most of these streetcar suburbs were built on former farmland, and the County gradually changed from an agricultural to a residential landscape.\footnote{The number and extent of farms in Arlington dropped precipitously during this time period, from 325 farms occupying 13,307 acres (nearly 80 percent of the area of the County) in 1880, to only 51 farms covering 1,505 acres (under 10 percent of the area of the County) in 1930 [Figure 5]. Within those 50 years, nearly all of Arlington’s rural landscape had either been converted to single-family residential developments or subdivided for future low-density development.}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{farm_acreage.png}
\caption{Number and Acreage of Farms in Arlington County United States Decennial Census}
\end{figure}
Housing

Between 1916 and 1918, a threefold increase of federal workers in the District of Columbia created a shortage of housing in and around the area. A steady influx of new families into Arlington’s neighborhoods increased the demand for single-family housing during this time period. Arlington continued growing at a steady pace during the 1920s, with a 40 percent population increase from 1920 to 1930 [Figure 6].

Figure 6. Population of Arlington County, 1910-1930 United States Decennial Census
During World War I (1914-1918) the demand for housing was intense, fueled by a rapidly growing federal workforce. Because of this growth, local railway and trolley lines were extended deep into the County, creating new commuter communities on top of old side streets. Neighborhoods platted for or founded during this time period included Arlington Ridge (1900), Maywood (1906), Arlington Heights (1909), Columbia Heights (1913), Lyon Park (1919), and Lyon Village (1923) [Figure 7].
Freedmans Village, located near Arlington Estate, was a community established during Reconstruction by the federal government for formerly enslaved persons, where it was home to a thriving African American community until about 1900, when it was acquired by the federal government (see the Arlington’s African American Community vignette for more details). The following year, the government bought out the area’s longtime residents, displacing them and causing them to resettle in nearby historically African American neighborhoods, such as Hall’s Hill, Arlington View, and Green Valley.9

The Virginia Legislature passed a statute in 1912 enabling cities and towns to legally establish ‘segregation districts’ and enforce penalties for violating the terms of these districts (another state law allowed Arlington County to be treated as a city/town based on its surpassing a population density threshold).10 While other cities in the Commonwealth used this power to legally segregate, Arlington did not implement segregation districts.11 The state law enabling segregation districts held for roughly the next five years, until the 1917 U.S. Supreme Court case of Buchanan v. Waverly deemed that the government-instituted segregation of residential areas and legislation supporting these practices were unconstitutional, ending this particular practice of legal discrimination.12

Despite not establishing segregation districts in accordance with state law, segregation was still implemented in Arlington through other means. As the creation and control of the subdivision development process began to flourish in Arlington, segregation of its neighborhoods was formally undertaken. The segregation of many Arlington neighborhoods, including Lyon Park and Alcova Heights, was widespread. Some individual neighborhoods in Arlington already used community-level restrictive covenants to deny African Americans the opportunity to live within their borders, with language stating that “neither said property nor any part thereof nor any interest therein shall be sold or leased to any one not of the Caucasian race”.10

1910 represented the height of the African American population as a share of the total population (26 percent); following that year, the population share fell steadily until its lowest point in 1950 (5 percent) [Figure 8].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>County Total Population</th>
<th>Black or African American Population</th>
<th>Black or African American Population Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>10,231</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>16,040</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>26,615</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>57,040</td>
<td>5,032</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>135,449</td>
<td>6,669</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>163,401</td>
<td>8,590</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>174,284</td>
<td>10,093</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>152,599</td>
<td>14,028</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>170,936</td>
<td>17,940</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>189,453</td>
<td>17,705</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>207,627</td>
<td>17,632</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>231,803</td>
<td>20,777</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Black or African American Population in Arlington County Over Time United States Decennial Census and American Community Survey

Planning and Zoning

In 1922, Congress passed the State Zoning Enabling Act (SZEA), which was a model for states to enable zoning regulation in their jurisdictions, and it enabled Virginia to adopt its first zoning enabling legislation later that year.13 In Arlington, the first land use ordinance was adopted in 1927; however, it dealt primarily with the land use permitting process, and Arlington’s first zoning ordinance was not approved until 1930. This ordinance established six zones: two residential (A for single-family and B for any/other), two commercial, and two industrial, with height and set-back restrictions, yard requirements, and accessory building regulations. For the most part, it codified the County’s existing land use, permitting single-family detached dwellings in existing single-family neighborhoods and multi-family dwellings in existing areas of multi-family development. An exception to this alignment between the new Zoning Ordinance and existing land use occurred in several African American neighborhoods (e.g., Green Valley10),
which were zoned as Residential A yet included multi-family dwellings, thus rendering the existing multi-family dwellings non-conforming. Before the zoning ordinance, Arlington’s housing production heavily favored single-family residential development; after, zoning perpetuated this pattern.

Arlington’s African American Community: Freedmans Village and the Diaspora

Following the Civil War, Arlington Estate was confiscated by the federal government and established as a military reservation, while the grounds became Arlington Cemetery. The land surrounding the southern portion of Arlington Estate was subdivided in the late 1800s into four parcels and sold off. The northwest corner parcel, a nine-acre tract of land in Johnson’s Hill, was bought by formerly enslaved persons Harry Gray and his wife Martha in 1880, while the other three parcels were sold to other formerly enslaved people and grew as predominantly black, middle-class neighborhoods called Freedmans Village.

In 1879, two farm laborers, William Butler and Henry Holmes, who were community leaders in Freedmans Village, purchased parcels of land west of Fort Myer, in what is today Penrose. They built homes there, relocated their families, and improved the area with substantial construction of freestanding dwellings. In 1882, the neighborhood was ultimately platted as the Butler-Holmes subdivision, and because of its proximity to Freedmans Village and the lack of restrictive covenants, it became home to a vibrant African American community. Among the residents was the famous Dr. Charles Drew, an African American scientist who gained international acclaim for his scientific advances in blood plasma transfusion research.

Similarly, in 1880, Harry Gray finished building the Harry Gray House on South Queen Street (now Quinn and Rolfe Streets), which was subdivided and named Gray’s Subdivision after his death in 1913. The Harry Gray House, which still stands today, was the area’s first brick Italianate-style row house and is the only surviving type of this building in Arlington. Despite minor exterior alterations, the property has retained “integrity of design, workmanship, materials, location, and feeling.”

The population of Freedmans Village fluctuated significantly from 1863 to 1900. However, the living conditions of the area were above average, with many employment and personal support opportunities that allowed the community to remain strong, despite many attempts by the government to close it down. Although residents rallied and resisted closure in the face of a potential shutdown for almost 40 years, the government finally succeeded in closing the village permanently in 1900, and paid off its residents to vacate and relocate by the end of 1901. The map to the right illustrates African American settlement patterns by 1900.

---

1931-1945

Overview

Neighborhoods of single-family houses continued to spread through Arlington during the 1930s, and over the next 20 years, a building boom occurred that also added apartment communities like Colonial Village (1935) and Buckingham Village (1936). Arlington experienced intense development during the New Deal and World War II that provided housing for government workers, soldiers, and returning veterans. During this time period, developments in federal and state housing policies, land use and zoning ordinances, and private transportation drastically changed the state of Arlington’s residential housing landscape.

Housing

In 1933, Lee Boulevard (now known as Arlington Boulevard/Route 50) was paved along Buckingham Village’s southern border, which coincided with the beginning of President Roosevelt’s New Deal. This prompted many neighboring property owners to subdivide their land and sell to speculators and developers to service new residential communities. The Housing Act of 1934 established the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), which later increased the practice of ‘redlining’ by insuring mortgages for homes in majority-white neighborhoods while not providing mortgage insurance in primarily African American areas. This gave banks the necessary tools to exclude racial/ethnic minorities and low-income buyers from predominantly white neighborhoods. For example, Colonial Village, the first FHA-backed apartment complex in Arlington, included explicit racially-based restrictive covenants in its subdivision application, and eventually became a model for single-race and single-class communities in Arlington. It was common practice in Virginia during the late 1930s and onward to establish restrictive covenants to ‘protect’ neighborhoods and insure racial homogeneity for new subdivisions, such as Bellevue Forest. In addition, a “segregation wall,” separating the neighborhoods of Hall’s Hill/High View Park and Waycroft-Woodlawn that went up in segments extending from North Edison Street to North Glebe Road, was later described by Arlington County officials as “a patchwork barrier of fencing and brick or cinder-block segments that has separated the [black and white] neighborhoods for years.”

In 1941, the construction of the Pentagon was completed on the site where the former communities of East Arlington and Queen City once stood, effectively displacing the African American community that had been settled in the area for almost 100 years. After losing their homes, those displaced were relocated into temporary housing cities of Army trailers, where they remained for almost half a decade. After being relocated to the edges of Green Valley, most of these individuals remained there with little help from the government, until either relocating their families, securing federal housing, or finding a place in one of Arlington’s remaining African American communities, such as Green Valley, Johnson’s Hill, or Hall’s Hill.

As the war effort in the early 1940s began to pick up, the defense population in D.C. began to increase significantly. This new influx of workers needed housing, and Arlington’s suburbs were deemed appropriate. Between 1942 and 1945, the federal Defense Homes Corporation constructed various projects to house the defense industry’s civilian workforce and their families, including the Fairlington Village garden apartment complex. In 1944, President Roosevelt’s Serviceman’s Readjustment Act (G.I. Bill) provided veterans funding for college education, unemployment insurance, and housing, in the form of home loan guarantees and favorable mortgage rates. These benefits and incentives further accelerated post-war suburbanization, and significantly increased the demand for single-family residential housing in Arlington.

In 1944, the federal Public Housing Authority constructed the Paul Lawrence Dunbar Homes with 86 units and the George Washington Carver Homes with 44 units to house African Americans displaced by the demolition of Queen City and East Arlington. At the end of the war the housing authority had to dispose of the properties and “the Lanham Act of 1949 gave priority for disposition of publicly held housing for conversion to affordable housing.” The tenants of both developments formed cooperative organizations to pool their resources and submit proposals for purchase.
Planning and Zoning

Following the landmark U.S. Supreme Court ruling of *Village of Euclid, Ohio v. Ambler Realty Co.* in 1926 which found there was valid government interest in maintaining the character of a neighborhood and in regulating where certain land uses should occur, many U.S. towns, villages, and cities developed zoning ordinances and controls that divided uses such as residential, commercial and industrial, in addition to restricting the size of buildings and the density of housing. At the end of the Great Depression, city planning became a primary function of local governments, and various theories and models for planning the ideal city rose out of the early- to mid-20th century’s Modernist movement that saw the dense development of contemporary American cities as undesirable and unsanitary. Arlington’s first planning commission was founded in 1937, after which Arlington developed new zoning ordinances in 1938 and 1942 in this spirit.

The 1938 ordinance banned row houses, as they were deemed to detract from the single-family character of the County, and defined “semi-detached” housing as two units. Row houses were long a staple housing type in Washington and Alexandria, but many considered urban densities to be distasteful. An April 1938 editorial in *The Sun*, dismissed row houses as “solid blocks of residences, such as found in most of the crowded cities” and argued that the County had enough excess land to continue growing in a less dense, suburban style pattern. Though the ban was eventually lifted through introduction of zoning standards for townhouses in the late 1960s and 1970s, Arlington would never develop row house neighborhoods like the District and Alexandria. The 1938 ordinance did allow for one-family units to accommodate two households, but this provision was reversed in the 1942 ordinance.

In the 1942 zoning ordinance and corresponding zoning map, the majority of Arlington County was limited to the production of single-family detached dwelling units. The 1942 ordinance expanded residential zones beyond the 1930 zoning ordinance’s classification of residential zones as either A (single-family) or B (other) and introduced restrictions on residential lot coverage [Figure 9]. The updated zoning ordinance applied the more restrictive setback requirements that formerly applied only to single-family homes to all residential housing zones. Areas in which garden-style apartments had already been constructed were zoned for apartments, and pockets in central Arlington along streetcar lines were zoned to allow for duplexes (see the *Garden Apartments in Arlington, Virginia* vignette for more details). These areas were primarily in central and south Arlington. A comparison of the 1942 zoning map with the 1935 zoning map confirms that formerly Residential B zones were rezoned to continue allowing more density than single-family uses; in fact, the 1942 zoning map expanded areas in the County available for higher-density residential development (e.g., Fairlington).
Figure 9. Arlington, VA 1942 Zoning Map
The 1942 zoning ordinance also updated the 1938 version to expand the number of residential districts in the County from two to nine [Figure 10]. Four of the residential zones were dedicated to single-family detached homes on lots of at least 6,000 square feet. The remaining five residential zones allowed single-family detached homes along with limited multi-family dwellings. The 1942 zoning map depicts the majority of Arlington County as restricted to the production of single-family detached homes. Areas in which garden-style apartments had already been constructed were zoned for apartments. Pockets of land, primarily along streetcar lines, were zoned to allow for duplexes (one dwelling unit above another) and semi-detached (side-by-side dwelling units divided by a party wall) residences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Residential Zoning District</th>
<th>Single-Family</th>
<th>Duplex</th>
<th>Semi-Detached</th>
<th>Town/Rowhome</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-8</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS-6 (Semi-Detached)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA-14-26 (Apartments)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA-8-18 (Apartments)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA-7-16 (Apartments)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Allowed Housing Types by Residential Zoning District, 1930-1942

Transportation

In 1931, the construction of Route 50 through Arlington was both a response to and an enabler of the automobile and allowed workers to affordably commute from Arlington to the District for work. The ease of access to the city made commuting by car more attractive, while the influx of federal workers raised the demand for housing in Arlington. Both trends were responsible for the low-density, single-family housing stock that spread throughout Arlington’s brand-new suburbs during this era.

7 Bellevue Forest Citizens’ Association (n.d.) Retrieved from: https://bellevueforest.org/about/history/
Buckingham Village

The increased ease with which Washingtonians could live outside of the capital in the late 19th century and early 20th century, spurred by the introduction of the electric railway and other transportation developments, made Arlington an appealing location. The growth of the federal government in the first decades of the 20th century brought an increasing number of middle-class families to the area and consequently a demand for a decent standard of living, quality housing, and moderately-priced housing. This was the impetus for the planning of Buckingham Village, a large, unified garden apartment complex in Arlington, built between 1937 and 1953, that is “a remaining product of a vanishing record of Federal New Deal Program architecture.”

Buckingham Village, the third FHA project built in Arlington, “represent[ed] a pivotal change in how federal government supported housing initiatives – from building its own (e.g., Greenbelt, MD) to supporting FHA developer-sponsored housing projects.” The Colonial Revival style of the apartment complex is historically significant as a “well preserved example of the planned garden-style residential communities that became popular during the suburbanization of many metropolitan areas during the first decades of the 20th century.” Buckingham exemplified successful development of inexpensive housing in a well-planned garden-style community that acted as a model and contributed to broad patterns of residential development in our nation’s architectural history.

Buckingham was highly regarded as an American achievement at the time it was built. First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt visited Buckingham and stated, “It is a delightful development—well planned—gives one a feeling that there is a possibility of doing many things on a community basis that would make life easier for the individual family.” However, this was not the case for all American families, as it—like all residential developments in Arlington at the time—was segregated. In the 1960s, protests surrounded Buckingham Village, aiming to promote equal access to housing.

---

Restrictive Covenants

Restrictive covenants, a form of “organizational enforced segregation,” were prevalent in Arlington County, Virginia.\(^1\) This type of segregation stems from “practices that are legal or illegal, coercive or exclusionary, open or covert, kindly or malicious.”\(^1\) Neighborhoods including, but not limited to, Alcova Heights, Bluemont, Glebewood Village, Monroe Courts and Westover had some variation of restrictive covenants that prohibited home sales to African Americans and other racial groups. In Bluemont, one deed (1938) stated, “No persons of any race other than the Caucasian Race shall use or occupy any building or any lot” with exception of slaves or servants who lived in residence.\(^2\) Other variations explicitly restricted sale only to Whites. In Bellevue Forest, one deed (1937) stated that:

No part of the land herein conveyed shall ever be used, occupied by, sold, demised, transferred, conveyed unto or in trust for, leased, rented or given to negroes…or to any person or persons not of the Caucasian race, which racial description shall be deemed to include Armenians, Jews, Persians and Syrians.\(^3\)

These covenants demonstrate one-way systemic institutional racism operated: private developers placed racially restrictive covenants on properties, and at the same time banks and federal housing financing programs mandated segregated housing as part of their underwriting guidelines. Thus, opportunities for wealth creation through homeownership were unavailable to black and other minority groups. Covenants could also be used to prohibit businesses deemed undesirable, like taverns and hotels, exacerbating geographic disparities. Covenants could also ban less expensive housing types, in favor of single-family detached dwellings. A deed in Bellevue Forest, dated January 30th, 1947, stated “no part or portion of the property…shall be used or permitted to be used for any trade, business, manufacturing or mercantile purposes.” It also prohibited the construction of apartments.\(^3\) In Bluemont, only single-family detached structures were to remain with set height limits and permissible car types.\(^4\) In the Waycroft neighborhood, there was a prohibition on occupying outbuildings as residences.\(^5\)

In the 1948 landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision *Shelley v. Kraemer*, the court found the enforcement of racially restrictive covenants to be unconstitutional, pursuant to the 14\(^{th}\) Amendment Equal Protection clause.\(^6\) The decision did not find the covenants themselves unconstitutional, but rather the enforcement of these covenants by the state. These covenants were prevalent in Arlington until the Fair Housing Act of 1968, which outlawed housing discrimination based on “race, color, religion, or national origin.”\(^7\)

\(^1\) Perry, N., Crew, S., & Waters, N. M. (2013). “We didn’t have any other place to live” Residential Patterns in Segregated Arlington County, Virginia. Southeastern Geographer, 53(4), 406.
\(^2\) Arlington County, Virginia, Deed Book 432: 152-160. (1938)
\(^3\) Arlington County, Virginia, Deed Book 766: 286. (1937)
\(^4\) Arlington County, Virginia, Deed Book 476: 122. (1939)
\(^5\) Arlington County, Virginia, Deed Book 297: 78. (1929)
\(^7\) Perry, N., Crew, S., & Waters, N. M. (2013). “We didn’t have any other place to live” Residential Patterns in Segregated Arlington County, Virginia. Southeastern Geographer, 53(4), 417.
Garden Apartments in Arlington, Virginia

In the United States, garden apartments became prevalent starting in the 1920s. A garden apartment is a multiple-unit low-rise dwelling having considerable lawn or garden space. The apartment buildings are often arranged around courtyards that are open at one end. Each apartment has its own building entrance or shares that entrance via a staircase and lobby that adjoins other units immediately above and/or below it. Unlike a townhouse, each apartment occupies only one level. Such garden apartment buildings are almost never more than three stories high, as they typically lack elevators. The interior grounds are often landscaped.¹

Arlington is dotted with garden apartments, many of which have been listed in the National Register of Historic Places, as they were an important part of the national trend in garden apartments built between 1934 and 1954. There are three such garden apartment developments in Arlington that are listed as Historic Districts: Colonial Village, Buckingham Village and Cambridge Village.

As the economy rebounded from the Great Depression, the construction of garden apartments in the Washington area reached a peak in the mid-1930s and early 1940s. In Arlington, local officials wanted to avoid the construction of sub-standard, large-scale developments that they thought would dissolve into slums after the housing emergency eased.² Backed by Federal Housing Administration (FHA) loans, garden apartment developments built between 1934 and 1954 aimed to provide affordable, attractive, and permanent housing. Cost-efficiency was continuously emphasized in the construction process, especially for projects backed by the FHA. Between 1934 and 1940, the FHA had insured mortgages on 240 rental projects throughout the United States, 200 of which were garden apartment complexes. Although FHA-funded housing development created residential opportunities for many White Americans, in Arlington and elsewhere, restrictive covenants excluded African Americans — until these types of discriminatory practices were outlawed nationally in 1968.

Colonial Village, Buckingham Village and Cambridge Village were the area’s first garden apartment complexes designed as planned communities, with adjacent shopping. Meticulous attention was paid to the amenities and comforts of the renters. Colonial Village, for example, was created from an approximately 40-acre tract of land off Wilson Boulevard. The site was just 10 minutes from the heart of Washington by bus. There were a few scattered farms and suburban homes in the neighborhood, but nothing distinctive aside from the natural beauty of the terrain. Although a modest number of apartment buildings had been constructed in Arlington before Colonial Village, the success of Colonial Village was immediate. The first phase was completed in 1935 with 276 apartments and a waiting list of 10,000 people.³ Upon completion, this premier garden-apartment complex, with over 1,000 units represented an entirely new scale of rental development and community planning for the region. This architectural style continued in popularity, and it was soon followed by other garden apartment complexes, including Arlington Village, apartments at Lyon Village, and Fairlington. Garden apartments became the dominant form of apartment construction in Arlington for the next 15 years.³

1946-1960

Overview

Northern Virginia grew rapidly after World War II. Arlington’s population nearly tripled from 57,040 in 1940 to 163,401 by 1960 [Figure 11]. This explosive growth created tremendous need to construct housing. Housing units increased from 16,245 in 1940 to 56,946 in 1960 [Figure 13]. While many of these housing units were single-family detached homes, significantly more were apartments. To meet the need for housing while controlling the form and location of housing construction, Arlington County made significant changes and refinements to the zoning ordinance during this period. Arlington initiated a long-term visioning process to direct land use and development into the future, resulting in the 1960 Comprehensive Plan.

Many properties had restrictions on their use and/or affirmative obligations imposed on their owners. As discussed earlier, it was common practice in the 1930s and 1940s to include restrictions preventing the sale or rental of properties to African Americans or other racial and ethnic groups. Neighborhoods including Alcova Heights, Bellevue Forest, Bluemont, Glebe wood Village, Monroe Courts and Westover had some variation of such covenants. In the 1948 landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision *Shelley v. Kramer*, the court found the enforcement of racially-restrictive covenants to be unconstitutional, pursuant to the 14th Amendment equal protection clause. However, it was not until the 1968 Fair Housing Act that such covenants were outlawed.
In 1940, 91 percent of Arlington’s population identified as white. By 1950, that had grown to 95 percent as African Americans and other non-whites were forced to find housing in existing African American communities within the County or move outside of Arlington [Figure 12].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>County Total Population</th>
<th>White Population</th>
<th>White Population Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>10,231</td>
<td>7,586</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>16,040</td>
<td>13,530</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>26,615</td>
<td>23,269</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>57,040</td>
<td>51,998</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>135,449</td>
<td>128,780</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>163,401</td>
<td>154,172</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>174,284</td>
<td>161,581</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>152,599</td>
<td>126,121</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>170,936</td>
<td>130,873</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>189,453</td>
<td>130,601</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>207,627</td>
<td>148,970</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>231,803</td>
<td>165,609</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. White Population in Arlington County Over Time

Planning and Zoning


To meet the need for more housing, while controlling the form and location of housing construction, Arlington also made significant changes and refinements to the zoning ordinance during this period. The 1938 row house ban remained in effect for the duration of this time period.

A new zoning ordinance in 1950 replaced the 1942 zoning ordinance’s RS-6 two-family semi-detached residence district with the R2-7 district. RS-6 allowed for single-family detached homes, duplexes, and semi-detached residences on lots with a minimum of 3,000 square feet; the revised R2-7 more than doubled the minimum lot size to 7,000 square feet and required a minimum of 3,500 square feet per dwelling. This change created a requirement for lower density duplexes and semi-detached residences. Additionally, updates to the 1942 R-6 One-Family Dwelling District and R-5 One-Family Restricted Two-Family Dwelling District allowed duplex dwellings as transitional uses if the R-6 or R-5 lot was abutting a C (Commercial) or M (Manufacturing) district. This set the precedent of allowing for higher residential density along commercial corridors.

The 1960 ordinance added two residential districts (RA-R and RA-H), bringing the total number of residential districts in Arlington to 11. Unique among residential districts, RA-R Restricted Apartment Dwelling Districts did not allow for single-family detached homes. RA-R allowed only apartment houses with density of 20-30 dwelling units per acre. The 1960 ordinance reclassified hotels from RA6-15 Apartment Dwelling Districts to RA-H Apartment Hotel and Hotel Districts.
Housing

Housing production exploded after World War II. For example, within five years of the end of the war, large scale housing construction transformed Williamsburg (one of the last tracts in Arlington to be developed) from open farmland into a community of nearly 600 single-family detached homes.\(^2\) Between 1946 and 1953, six additional Arlington neighborhoods were established: Claremont, Highland Park, Park-Overlee Knolls, Columbia Heights West, Gulf Branch and Dover-Crystal. Construction of single-family detached homes continued in existing neighborhoods, including Waverly Hills and Waycroft-Woodlawn. “A 1952 map of Arlington shows Waverly Hills in essentially its 1998 state.”\(^3\) The single-family detached homes that define the character of many neighborhoods in Arlington were in place by the mid-1950s.

Housing units increased 152 percent from 16,245 units in 1940 to 41,016 in 1950. 15,930 units were added between 1950 and 1960, a 39 percent increase. The number of single-family detached homes grew from 10,962 units in 1940 to 25,548 units in 1960. What is more significant is the increase in apartment units, including buildings of five to nine units (742 units in 1940 to 7,766 in 1960) and 10 or more units (370 units 1940 to 16,933 in 1960). In 1960, the production of single-family detached homes leveled off. Further growth in apartment units was limited to specific areas of the County [Figure 13].

![Figure 13. Housing Typology in Arlington County, 1940-1960 United States Decennial Census](https://projects.arlingtonva.us/plans-studies/comprehensive-plan/)

Arlington’s Push to House Defense Workers and Veterans

Arlington’s proximity to Washington made it an ideal location for U.S. military veterans to settle down once they returned home during and after World War II. During the war, a number of military and other governmental agencies located in Arlington, including at the Pentagon (opened in 1942), the Navy Annex, Arlington Hall, and Henderson Hall. The increase in federal job opportunities coupled with the war effort and soldiers returning from war created a steep demand for housing.

In 1940, in an effort to accommodate the ever-increasing housing demand, the Defense Homes Corporation (DHC) was established to build homes for federal workers. The Fairlington Village neighborhood was one of the most important complexes developed to house defense workers, in direct response to housing needs after World War II. It was composed of garden apartments in close proximity to Henry G. Shirley Highway and the Pentagon. “At the time it was the largest apartment complex in the country and also by far the largest project financed by Defense Homes Corporation… There were 3,439 units in the original Fairlington.”

Fairlington is an important landmark of Arlington and, although it was established during a time of funding constraints, critical attention was paid to materials and detail. The careful consideration of the building construction, community layout and longevity of the homes deemed Fairlington one of the first examples of community planning and merited its listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

While Fairlington was built as a segregated community exclusively for white people, as financing racially segregated housing was the practice of the DHC, the 1942 Paul Dunbar Homes and the 1944 George Washington Carver development were built specifically for African American veterans. The Dunbar and Carver developments were redeveloped into larger and pricier housing in 2006 and 2016, respectively.

1961-1979

Overview

While regional growth continued at a steady pace, Arlington’s population growth slowed between 1960 and 1970, with the County reaching a population of 174,284 in 1970 [Figure 14]. By 1980, the population shrank by 12 percent to 152,599, as people were increasingly drawn to outlying suburbs near and beyond Interstate Highway 495. An additional 18,190 housing units were built between 1960 and 1980, bringing the total units to 75,136.

During this time period, transportation quickly reemerged as a key driver of development and became a catalyst that changed the prevailing planning ethos within the County to transit-oriented development, as reflected in changes between the 1961 and 1979 General Land Use Plan (GLUP) maps (e.g., scaled back thoroughfares and increased residential density around Metro corridors).

Housing affordability began to emerge as a significant issue in Arlington. Between 1970 and 1980, following the enactment of the Horizontal Property Act in Virginia, 18 percent of all apartment units had been converted or were being converted to condominiums, significantly reducing the affordable rental housing stock. While federal housing programs expanded significantly in the 1960s and 1970s, impacts of these programs in Arlington were minimal.

Transportation

Enabled by the automobile, Americans fled cities and flocked to suburbs. As commuter congestion worsened, the demand for more efficient and faster roadways increased. In 1956, the National Defense and Interstate Highways Act (U.S. Federal Highway Act) made an initial $25 billion available for the construction of highways throughout most of the country. In 1958, designers at the Virginia Department of Highways proposed two interstate highways through Arlington to connect Washington, D.C. to I-495. The first proposal upgraded and expanded the existing Shirley Highway to Interstate Highway 395. The second proposal constructed Interstate Highway 66 through Arlington County, the City of Falls Church and Fairfax County. Four routes were considered for I-66, including two along old railroad lines and one to upgrade Arlington Boulevard (now U.S. Route 50).

After significant constituent opposition to the proposed routes, the existing route for I-66 was endorsed by the Arlington County Board. I-66 construction was delayed in order to complete acquisition of the right-of-way and design. Development of I-66 was delayed for three primary reasons. First, residents of Arlington County opposed the construction of highways in general and preferred mass transit. Second, the initial design of I-66 called for eight lanes which would have significantly impacted the single-family neighborhoods adjacent to it within Arlington. Finally, the initial metropolitan rail system (Metro) proposal routed
the Orange line along the median of I-66. Arlington officials preferred that the Orange Line follow along Wilson Boulevard to Falls Church before connecting with I-66.

In 1962, the National Capital Transportation Agency (NCTA) developed a plan for a regional subway system. In 1963, the Arlington County Board voted to support a mass transit system. Plans for mass transit got seriously underway with the establishment of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) in 1967. In 1968, WMATA unveiled a map of the planned Metro and sought the first round of funding. The map included two lines through Arlington – a southern line that connected the Pentagon, Crystal City and National Airport (the Blue line) and a northern line that ran along I-66 to Fairfax (the Orange line).

County officials viewed Metro as an opportunity to revitalize neighborhoods experiencing economic decline through dense development with a mix of retail, office, and residential space. They argued for an underground Orange Line along Wilson Boulevard and sought a third line along Columbia Pike. The County lost the Columbia Pike proposal but eventually won an underground line from Rosslyn to Ballston.

Concerned over the form of development along Metro corridors and its impact on the character of single-family neighborhoods, Arlington constituents formed opposition groups. In 1973, Arlington County officials established a Long-Range Improvement Project Committee tasked with proposing land use policies along Metro. “The Bull’s-Eye Concept” was born, allowing tall buildings close to Metro stops with building heights tapering to meet surrounding single-family neighborhoods within a quarter mile radius of the transit stop. The concept traded high density development concentrated close to transit stations while preventing denser development of established single-family neighborhoods nearby. As a culminating action from the County’s Long Range County Improvement Program established in 1973, the County Board adopted Development and Growth Goals, which were incorporated into the General Land Use Plan and still guide the County’s development today.

In 1976, a four-lane version of I-66 was approved. In 1978, construction of I-66 following the former line of the Washington & Old Dominion (W&OD) railroad between Rosslyn and Ballston started. I-66 opened in 1982. Concurrently, construction of Metro through Arlington proceeded. In July 1977, the Blue line opened. On December 1, 1979, the Orange line began service to Ballston including stops in Court House, Clarendon, Virginia Square, and Ballston.
Planning and Zoning

The General Land Use Plan (GLUP), Arlington’s first land use plan establishing the overall character, extent and location of residential, commercial, industrial and open space land uses, was adopted in August 1961 [Figure 15]. The residential land use type was split into three categories of density: Low (0-8 dwelling units per acre), Low Medium (9 to 13 dwelling units per acre) and High Medium (14-39 dwelling units per acre). The GLUP’s stated purpose was to be the primary policy guide for future development in the County. However, as Arlington was more than 90 percent developed at the time of the first GLUP’s publication, the initial GLUP focused on conservation of the “existing suburban residential character” (i.e., largely single-family residential pattern of development). In comparing the GLUP map to the 1950 zoning ordinance map, there is little difference between those areas designated for residential, commercial, and industrial use. As evidenced by the inclusion of several major thoroughfares, it reflected an automobile-centric ethos.
When an update to the 1950 zoning ordinance was published in 1969, several notable changes had occurred. In 1962, two-family dwellings (i.e. duplexes) were removed as a by-right use in the R-5 zoning and permitted only by use permit. In addition, a residential district, R-10T, had been added for one-family residential town house dwellings and introduced RA4.8 and RA7-16 for apartments. R-10T was for town houses “in well-designed living units offering optimum residential environmental amenities” arranged in “clusters … to achieve an intimate internal relationship.” The emphasis was on quality and aesthetics, as townhouses were to be distinctly different from the formerly-banned row houses. The purpose of the RA4.8 classification was to “encourage high value apartment buildings with densities and heights varying to the most intensive residential use deemed in the welfare of, or healthful for, residents of Arlington County.” To be eligible, sites were to have “unique site environmental character, such as vistas and prestige location.” The maximum density of such districts was 30 units per acre unless specially permitted up to 90 units per acre. These changes represented a shifting ethos towards higher density along specific transit corridors to accommodate growth while preserving existing single-family neighborhoods.

In 1973, the County expanded the residential land use types in the GLUP from three categories of density to six to facilitate the application of the bull’s eye approach to development around Metro stations:

1. Low (1 to 10 dwelling units per acre)
2. Low (11 to 15 dwelling units per acre)
3. Low Medium (16 to 30 units per acre)
4. Medium (31 to 72 units per acre)
5. High Medium (73 to 90 units per acre for apartments; 72 to 135 units per acre for hotels)
6. High (91 to 135 units per acre for apartments; 136-210 units per acre for hotels)

This bull’s eye approach, supported by increased density categories, allowed development to transition from high-rises near Metro stations down to preserved single-family neighborhoods in the surrounding areas.

As planning for Metro through Arlington accelerated, the County Board adopted major land use changes for the Jefferson Davis Metro Corridor (February 9, 1974) and the Rosslyn-Ballston Metro Corridor (December 7, 1974), as reflected in the 1975 GLUP map.8 Several major thoroughfares found on the 1960s GLUP maps are gone or significantly scaled back in the 1975 GLUP map (e.g., the County initially planned for Four Mile Run Drive and Bluemont Drive to be parkways with grade-separated interchanges).9 As a culminating action from the County’s Long Range County Improvement Program established in 1973, the County Board adopted Development and Growth Goals, which were incorporated into the General Land Use Plan and still guide the County’s development today. New residential land use categories around Metro stations are evident in the 1979 GLUP map.

**Housing**

During the 1960s, 14,238 housing units were added, bringing the County’s total housing stock to 71,184. With few new tracts to subdivide, most of the new units were in apartments. During the 1970s, housing production slowed, almost no net single-family housing was built, and much fewer apartments were built than in the decade previous[Figure 16]. Concurrently, rental housing units were upgraded, converted to condominiums, or demolished for non-residential development. By 1980, there was a severe shortage of moderate-cost rental units in Arlington.10
In 1962, Virginia adopted the Horizontal Property Act enabling the conversion and construction of condominiums. Before 1970, Arlington County did not have condominiums but by 1981, 24 percent of garden apartments built prior to 1966 were converted to condominiums and 18 percent of all apartment units had been converted or were being converted to condominiums. Between 1972 and 1980, 7,393 apartments in Arlington were converted to condos. Of those conversions, 3,438 occurred in Fairlington between 1972 and 1976, and all converted units were sold out by April 1978. Conversion of apartments to condominiums was a primary cause of the decrease in moderate cost rental stock. Many families could not afford to purchase their units once converted to condominiums and were displaced. “In some conversions, such as Claremont, the displacement of previous residents was as high as 93 percent … In the Claremont conversion, almost 45 percent had to leave the County to find replacement housing.”

The Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Act was signed in 1965. The act instituted several expansions in federal housing programs. Unlike other jurisdictions in the Metropolitan Washington region, by the end of 1979 there were no federally subsidized public housing units in Arlington. There were a few private developments partially financed through HUD programs. Specifically, there were 1,154 occupied units developed under the HUD Section 236 mortgage interest subsidy program or through Section 8 project-based multifamily program support. Both programs offer support to the owner of multifamily properties rather than occupants.

---

By mid-1981 about 20 percent of Arlington’s 40,000 apartments had been converted to condominiums, and of these, about 75 percent involved low- to moderate-income rentals.1 Many of these apartments included those in Claremont, Arlington Village, Diplomat, Lee-Cleveland, Horizon House, Ridge House, and George Mason Village, among others.2 The existence of condominium units created an increase in owner occupancy in the County, and the rapid rate of condominium conversion was the primary cause of the overall decreased moderate rental housing stock.

Many low- to moderate-income tenants whose units were converted could not afford to purchase their units, as the cost increase from rental to condominium units was significant. In 1979, “the average price of a converted condominium unit in Arlington was approximately $55,000, in order for a tenant to purchase a condominium unit at this average price, their household income would need to be at least $22,000.”3 The monthly debt service alone on a $55,000 loan (30-year term) at the interest rates at the time would have been $565 a month, which didn’t include costs of condominium ownership, condominium fees, and utilities. Once all costs were accounted for, the total monthly cost for owning a condominium was around $725 a month. Based on an average of all rental units converted to condominiums, the monthly pre-conversion rental price was about $293.3

As a result of these conversions, many in Arlington faced displacement; at least 20 percent of the tenants in one 500-unit Arlington conversion were forced to leave the County in a sample conducted in 1980.3 Consequently, this led to great tenant opposition. For instance, when Mobil Oil Corporation announced its intention to convert the 1,086-unit Colonial Village complex to condominiums near Rosslyn in 1978, Colonial Village engaged its existing tenants’ group to resist the conversions. This activation eventually led to the creation of the Tenants of Arlington County (TOAC), which advocated for the preservation of affordable rental units.4

---

The Fair Housing Act

The Civil Rights Act of 1968, signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson, expanded on previous civil rights legislation and “prohibited discrimination concerning the sale, rental, and financing of housing based on race, religion, national origin, sex, (and as amended) handicap and family status. Title VIII of the Act is also known as the Fair Housing Act (of 1968).” The Fair Housing Act of 1968 banned zoning and land use decisions that “contribute to patterns of broad social segregation.” Subsequently, select Arlington residential neighborhoods became integrated for the first time. For example, a Ms. Dabney, who grew up in Green Valley, became one of the first, if not the first, African American to move to Waycroft-Woodlawn soon after the passage of the Fair Housing Act.

The Fair Housing Act was regularly considered from 1966 to 1967 and took some time to garner sufficient support for passage. October 19, 1966 marked the climax of a three-day, 14-mile open housing march through segregated neighborhoods of Northern Virginia. During this time the Vietnam War created a large casualty list, and “deaths fell heaviest upon young, poor African-American and Hispanic infantrymen.” However, the families of these men had difficulties finding housing due to discrimination based on race or national origin. The excerpt below from the hearings on the Fair Housing Act shows the testimony of Lieutenant Campbell, an African American who sought housing in Arlington but was discriminated against on the basis of race. He also explained that two of his friends, one returnee from Vietnam and the other an operations officer in a fighter squadron, had similar experiences:

Lieutenant Campbell: “In March of 1965 I arrived in Arlington, VA for duty with the Defense Intelligence Agency. It was a rude awakening indeed to encounter the vast amount of resistance that I did when I attempted to find housing in northern Virginia.”

Senator Mondale: “What radius were you looking in? What general vicinity?”

Lieutenant Campbell: “I started out, sir, looking fairly close to the area of Glebe Road and Columbia Pike and as I encountered resistance I just began to fall off and get farther away. I finally ended up looking around Andrews Air Force Base”

Senator Mondale: “How far is that from your employment?”

Lieutenant Campbell: “It would have been 12 to 14 miles”

Senator Mondale: “That would be a round trip of about 25 miles and that would be heavy commuting traffic all the way, wouldn’t it?”

Lieutenant Campbell: “Yes sir, that is essentially correct. At any rate, I tried in vain to secure housing and I continually ran into a brick wall of sheer, unadulterated prejudice … A variety of explanations were offered as to why I couldn’t be accommodated. These ranged from such things as, we have a rather long waiting list or, we will contact you later or simply that, we just aren’t integrated. I was often told it took anywhere from 4 weeks or so to process a routine application. This is what I call another stall tactic. In all, I covered well over three dozen or so apartments and found myself getting further away from the northern Virginia area. After about 3 weeks had passed I succeeded in obtaining my present quarters, a three bedroom rambler in the Mount Vernon area.”

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s assassination in 1968 and the ensuing civil unrest catalyzed the bill’s Congressional approval. His close association with fair housing legislation is what spurred President Johnson to pass the bill as a tribute to Dr. King’s work.

The Vietnamese Community in Arlington

The arrival of Vietnamese in the United States occurred in waves, starting in 1975 after the fall of Saigon. Each wave brought different social groups of Vietnamese. Initially, the Vietnamese found the Clarendon area available and affordable for establishing businesses, from restaurants to clothing stores, and it soon developed into a hub for the East Coast Vietnamese community and became known as “Little Saigon.” Many Vietnamese residents occupied garden apartment complexes and leased space in older low-rise commercial buildings. While these older developments lacked amenities found in newer high-rise buildings, they remained affordable to those of modest means and offered a sense of community.1 By 1986 Arlington had “the highest per capita concentration of Indochinese in the United States, many of whom are Vietnamese.”2 Within Arlington, places like Buckingham Village were seen as attractive for Vietnamese immigrants due to their affordability.3 Relative to other minority groups, Vietnamese immigrants were less geographically concentrated, because their living arrangements were “largely dependent on the location of their sponsors”3 and they tended to prioritize shopping locations over those of homes.4

Reactions to the arrival of the Vietnamese in Arlington were not all positive.5 County officials and Arlington residents felt that immigrants were putting a strain on “county resources.”6 Long-term residents of Buckingham Village asserted that “foreign-born residents had led to overcrowding and decreased maintenance.”6 Unfortunately, with the opening of Metro's Orange Line and the County's transit-oriented development strategy, rising rents forced most Vietnamese businesses out of Clarendon in the 1980s, and many Vietnamese settled near Seven Corners in Fairfax County. Today, Eden Center in Falls Church “is the largest Vietnamese commercial center on the East Coast.”7

1980-2009

Overview

Between 1980 and 2010, Arlington's population increased by more than 55,000 residents [Figure 17] as the County gained 28,836 new housing units. The opening of the Orange and Blue Metro lines was associated with a substantial increase in residential density along the new transit corridors, particularly in Crystal City and Ballston. The county embraced more flexibility in zoning and land use on transit corridors and began focusing on housing affordability issues.

From 1980 to 2010, Arlington became continuously more ethnically diverse. The population representing non-white races grew from 17 percent in 1980 to 28 percent of the County’s population in 2010, with the most growth generally occurring in census tracts in south Arlington, an area that has also had a diversification of housing types. By 2010, no tracts in south Arlington were less than 5 percent non-white, with most tracts between 10 percent and 49.9 percent non-white [Figure 18]. The tracts that increased diversity the least from 1980 to 2010 tended to also be the tracts with the most single-family detached homes, the least missing middle housing, and the fewest renter-occupied units [Figure 19].
Figure 18. Concentrations of Non-White Persons by Census Tract in Arlington County, 2010 United States Decennial Census
Countywide, the African American population share has remained at about 9 percent of total residents since 1980, up from its low point of 5 percent in the 1940s and 1950s, but substantially lower than the 25 percent share in 1910. This bump is due both to an increase of African American residents from 1970 to 1980, and a massive decrease of over 30,000 white residents during that same decade [Figure 20]. This exodus was part of a nation-wide trend commonly referred to as “white flight” where white residents fled cities with increasing African American populations.1 This demographic shift in Arlington coincides with the County’s institution of busing African American students to white dominated schools in order to finally comply with desegregation ordered by Brown v. Board of Education.2 The pattern of African American settlement also changed, 1990 marked the start of a significant decline in the African American population within the three historically African American census tracts.* Since at least 1960, over 80 percent of the population within these three tracts identified as African American, whereas by 2010, the African American population represented only 35 percent of the total population within these tracts. The Asian population grew considerably; from 4 percent in 1980 to 10 percent in 2010. American Indian, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander groups have historically remained less than 1 percent of the County’s population. Since 1970, the Hispanic population has grown considerably; from 3 percent in 1970 to 13 percent in 2010. The white population grew rapidly in the 2000s but was still more than 20,000 below its 1970 peak in 2010.

* These three tracts correspond generally with Hall’s Hill (High View Park), Johnson’s Hill (Arlington View), and Green Valley neighborhoods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>174,284</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>152,599</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>170,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population of One Race</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>161,581</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>126,121</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>130,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black or African American</strong></td>
<td>10,093</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>14,028</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>17,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian and Alaska Native</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6,631</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>11,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some Other Race</strong></td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5,435</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>10,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two or More Races</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic or Latino (Of any race)</strong></td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>8,863</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>23,089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 20: Population of Arlington County by Race, 1970-2010 United States Decennial Census*

Planning and Zoning

During this period, Arlington’s planning and zoning became more flexible to accommodate and incentivize new transit-oriented development and higher density, specifically in the three major corridors: Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor, Columbia Pike Corridor and U.S. Route 1 Corridor (referred to as the Jefferson Davis Corridor in pre-2019 documents). Changes to the GLUP were made in 1983, 1987, 1990, 1996, and 2004 to reflect changes to area plans and new planning districts. The new districts did not drastically change the amount of by-right residential units. Starting in 1987, more detailed maps of the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor and the U.S. Route 1 Corridor were added to a second page of the GLUP map to provide additional information and context about the history and vision for both areas. Also in 1987, the density definitions for residential uses were updated (i.e., the threshold between low medium and medium was changed from 30 to 36 units/acre; the units/acre density limits for high medium and high uses were changed to Floor Area Ratio [F.A.R.] maximums). These changes in density definitions allowed areas already planned for medium, high medium, and high residential uses in the 1983 GLUP to support further increased density. In 2004, the Columbia Pike Corridor was also added to the second page. Transit corridors were added in Metro station areas, and medium density mixed-use and high-medium residential mixed-use were added to land use categories.3

In the late 1980s, Arlington increased its local affordable housing incentives. These efforts focused on increasing the number of affordable units through zoning mechanisms and preserving existing affordable units. In 1988, the Affordable Housing Investment Fund (AHIF) was implemented, creating a revolving loan fund to provide incentives for developers through low-interest loans for new construction, acquisition and rehabilitation of affordable housing.4 The Housing Policy Principles were adopted in 1991, which set forth “broad targets for populations to be served, ending housing discrimination, the role of affordable housing in overall County policies, preserving existing affordable units, integrating affordable housing into other planning and land use activities, and homelessness.”4 The Affordable Housing Ordinance, established in 2005, required commercial and residential site plan projects to provide on-site or off-site affordable units or to provide a cash contribution to the Affordable Housing Investment Fund.4 In 2008, the Commonwealth of Virginia expanded the definition of incentive zoning for municipalities and required that comprehensive plans in urban areas provide a mix of housing types, including affordable units, to accommodate projected residential growth.5 Developers within Arlington also became more interested in affordability, with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits resulting in 4,966 low-income units at 47 projects in the County between 1991 and 2017.6

Form Based Codes, flexible codes that focus primarily on building form, mass, and scale instead of land use, were introduced in Arlington during the 1990s. The Columbia Pike Form Based Code was passed in 2003 and, in keeping with community stakeholders’ desire for moderate increases in density, the code allows for mid-rise, mixed-use buildings along the Pike frontage and lower buildings to ease heights into the adjacent neighborhoods.
Housing

Areas of dense housing increased during this period. Between 1980 and 2010 the number of units in buildings with 10 or more units increased 75 percent, with more than 77 percent of those units in buildings of 50 or more units [Figure 21 and Figure 22]. For comparison, single-family attached units (town houses, rowhouses, and duplexes) and buildings with two-to-nine units increased by 17 percent and single-family detached homes increased by only 10 percent. By the 1990s, multi-unit dwellers outnumbered those in single-family units, and almost all the land in the County was developed.

Figure 21. Housing Typology in Arlington County, 1940-2010 United States Decennial Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single detached</th>
<th>Single attached</th>
<th>2 to 4</th>
<th>5 to 9</th>
<th>10 to 49</th>
<th>50+</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>26,316</td>
<td>5,352</td>
<td>5,815</td>
<td>6,790</td>
<td>11,581</td>
<td>19,282</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>75,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>27,004</td>
<td>8,635</td>
<td>5,297</td>
<td>7,048</td>
<td>11,957</td>
<td>24,172</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>27,668</td>
<td>9,214</td>
<td>5,485</td>
<td>6,999</td>
<td>10,747</td>
<td>30,212</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>90,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28,935</td>
<td>10,180</td>
<td>4,298</td>
<td>6,642</td>
<td>12,047</td>
<td>41,870</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>103,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>4,828</td>
<td>-1,517</td>
<td>-148</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>22,588</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>28,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22. Change in Number of Housing Units in Arlington County, 1980-2010 United States Decennial Census
In 1980, 38.6 percent of the units were owner-occupied, mostly because of the condominium conversion discussed in the previous section, and home ownership increased in the early 1980s [Figure 23]. Since 1990, the proportion of renter and owner-occupied units has generally remained the same, with renter-occupied housing (~56 percent) representing a slightly larger share than owner-occupied units (~43 percent). From 1980 to 2010, the census tracts with the highest number of rental units tended to be in tracts within the Metro or transit corridor areas.

![Figure 23. Housing Tenure in Arlington County, 1940-2018 United States Decennial Census and American Community Survey](image)

---

2010-Present

Overview

With steady population growth [Figure 24] and increased economic development in the region there will be an increasing need for more residential units in Arlington County. Based on the GLUP vision, these units will likely go in areas of higher density in the three major corridors. Planning continues to be focused on affordable housing efforts, with interest in increasing density where appropriate and incentivizing developers to dedicate some units for long-term affordability or contribute to the County’s Affordable Housing Investment Fund. The County’s original vision, which the GLUP laid out in the 1960s and the 1970s has been mostly been realized, and the County is now experiencing a second generation of reinvestment, guided by the sector, area, and revitalization plans and plan updates adopted for places such as Crystal City, Columbia Pike, Clarendon in the form of in-fill, replacement of existing structures.

![Figure 24. Population of Arlington County, 2010-2018 United States Decennial Census and American Community Survey](image)

Planning and Zoning

The 2020 GLUP’s overarching vision of high-density use within the transit corridors that transitions to low-density residential use farther away from these corridors is similar to the vision articulated in the 1975 GLUP, which had first established additional density along these corridors in preparation for introduction of the Metro. There have been some minor terminology and density changes, as well as an increase in areas that are designated mixed-use. In addition, the area plans have allowed for an increase in units overall, which also increased the number of affordable units. The most recent GLUP carries forward key goals directly relating to housing that will continue to help guide future planning in Arlington, calling for 1) continued concentration of high-density residential and mixed-use along the three major corridors, 2) an increased supply of housing types at a range of prices, 3) the preservation and enhancement of housing at a range of price levels and densities, and 4) the preservation and enhancement of neighborhood retail areas.1

Because of the increase in housing costs, Arlington is continuing its work to both preserve existing affordable units and create new ones. Arlington developed the AHMP in 2015 as a part of the County’s Comprehensive Plan.2 The Housing Conservation District (HCD) was created in 2017 to protect market-rate affordable housing in 12 areas of the County by allowing renovation, in-fill, and redevelopment in exchange for dedicated affordable housing units. Arlington will consider the development of a new set of housing affordability zoning and financial tools in 2020. In 2017 and 2019, the County also revised the accessory dwelling ordinance to provide flexibility to single-family homeowners to establish accessory dwellings.

Arlington expanded its use of Form Based Codes, adopting the Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Form Based Code in 2013.3 By early 2020, the Columbia Pike Form Based Code and the Columbia Pike Neighborhoods Area Form Based Code will have delivered more than 3,000 residential units, more than 700 of which will be committed affordable units.
Housing

Between 2010 and 2018, Arlington’s population grew by roughly 24,000 and the County gained 9,112 new housing units. Arlington had a net gain of 552 single-family detached homes, 926 single-family attached homes, and 1,205 units in buildings of two to four units. The County had a net loss of 194 units in buildings with five to nine units. The majority of the housing supply added in the last decade has been in buildings with more than 20 units where 8,449 units were built. [Figure 25 and Figure 26].

Demolitions have occurred consistently in the County, mostly of single-family detached homes that were replaced with either higher-density projects or new, larger single-family detached homes (so-called “tear-downs”). Between 1981 and 2018, a total of 78 garden apartments buildings (2,690 units) were demolished in Arlington. Except for 2007 (when 14 garden apartment buildings were demolished), fewer than 10 garden apartment buildings were demolished each year. Between 2000 and 2018, a total of 2,255 single-family detached homes were demolished. Demolition of single-family detached homes peaked in 2006 with 126 homes removed, followed by a steady decline in demolition activity until 2010. This decline can likely be attributed to the Great Recession as development slowed during this time frame. Demolition of single-family detached homes since 2011 has generally been on the rise, with the most demolitions occurring in 2015 (199 homes demolished).  

When demolitions replace older single-family housing with larger single-family houses, the result is typically more expensive housing stock—new construction is usually more expensive and new single-family houses are much less accessible to lower income or first-time buyers. A study by the Terner Center found that new single-family detached housing was much more likely to be priced higher than newer multi-family construction. In Arlington County, average rent is substantially lower in garden and low-rise apartments than elevator apartments. Average rent for a one-bedroom home in an elevator apartment was

![Figure 25. Housing Typology in Arlington County, 1940-2018 United States Decennial Census and American Community Survey](image)

![Figure 26. Change in Number of Housing Units in Arlington County, 2010-2018 United States Decennial Census and American Community Survey](image)
$2,056 in 2019, meanwhile a one-bedroom in a garden or low-rise apartment was just $1,511 in 2019. Replacing older single- and multi-family buildings with new single-family dwellings means less additional net housing overall, and that the remaining housing units remain expensive or increase in price.\(^6\)

Arlington County needs more housing that is affordable to lower- and middle-income families and individuals. The County’s 2015 Affordable Housing Master Plan identifies: “the ability to provide sufficient housing affordable to people at all income levels” as a key piece of meeting Arlington’s economic development goals of supporting people in the County and improving Arlington’s neighborhoods. The plan identifies the need to create 21,000 new rental units between 2010 and 2040.\(^2\) Meanwhile, thousands of families and individuals are cost burdened. In Arlington County, 32,921 households spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing; this represents 31 percent of households in the County.\(^6\) As the County’s economy and population continue to grow, these challenges will likely continue.

---

4 Housing and Urban Development. Low Income Housing Tax Credit Database. Retrieved from: https://lihtc.huduser.gov/
The Arrival of Amazon’s HQ2

The next chapter in Arlington’s history is being written as Amazon prepares to roll out its second headquarters. The addition of 25,000 high paying tech jobs and the investment in a large corporate campus in Pentagon City and Crystal City, an area rebranded as National Landing, will have profound effects on the economy and housing landscape of the area.

The headquarters, which will be housed in four million square feet of office space, was announced in late 2018 after a nationwide search. Amazon was attracted to the National Landing area because of its proximity to Washington, D.C., its location as a transportation hub; and its ability to provide and attract the type of workforce that Amazon needs to grow. In addition, the public is providing hundreds of millions of dollars in infrastructure and education investments (including a $1 billion new campus for Virginia Tech), as well as direct incentives. The location is especially serendipitous to both the region and the company as it has a glut of office space left behind by a downsized Department of Defense.

This growth will have costs though, as tens of thousands of new workers will arrive to compete for housing in an already strained market. The average salary of the new workers will be more than $150,000 per year, and Arlington is already struggling to preserve its naturally occurring affordable housing. The new high-income residents could drive up the price of the region’s scarce housing. Projections by George Mason University’s Fuller Institute indicate that the effects of Amazon’s move will be diffused over the course of years and across the region; only 16.4 percent of the workers are projected to live in Arlington, and the authors predict that the effect on home prices from Amazon will be relatively small and only slightly above the level of price increase expected without Amazon.

However, this has not quelled fears among vulnerable populations and housing advocates. Home prices have already spiked near the future HQ2, and the Latino community that has thrived for decades in Arlandria is bracing for rising prices and the possibility of displacement. Arlington and Alexandria collectively have pledged to dedicate $150 million to create and preserve over 2,000 units of affordable housing. Amazon itself has also recently pledged $20 million toward affordable housing efforts in exchange for greater office density. Even these funds will likely be inadequate if there is not significant new construction in market rate housing to support the economic growth that the region continues to experience.

---


Next Steps and Further Research

Below is a list of a few avenues for additional research that are beyond the scope of this report.

- **A discussion of the County's Neighborhood Conservation Plan program.** Since the mid-1960s, this program has grown to provide funding for improvements, empowering citizens to identify and plan projects in their own neighborhoods. The County may benefit from a fuller analysis of the impacts of this program and its contribution to Arlington’s residential development history. Particular focus should be paid to the effects of neighborhood-defined goals of preserving single-family character and limiting infill development on the ability to increase the supply of housing in the County.

- **A fuller analysis of changes to the GLUP and zoning maps over time.** More granular data depicting residential construction dates, typologies, and locations could improve the ability to draw out causal relationships between planning/zoning and residential development. The County may benefit from a case study-type approach that traces the development (and re-development) of representative small areas in the context of site-specific GLUP and zoning designations. Specifically, a comparison of the 1942 and 1960 zoning maps could assess where and how the areas zoned for single-family homes changed in the absence of a GLUP to guide land use development decisions. Additionally, a review of the 1969 zoning map could analyze whether any land was zoned for R-10T, or whether this new zoning district was created as a possibility for rezoning, pending future approval.

- **Research and analysis into the extent and legacy of restrictive covenants.** While the research in this report identified several examples of implementation of racial covenants in the County, it was beyond the scope to comprehensively catalogue the use of these instruments and how they reinforced spatial segregation. Open questions remain with respect to the relationship between the application of racial covenants and housing typology and affordability.