Arlington, VA Housing Crisis: A Case Study

Leonardo Sandoli

Teen Think Tank Project

NexGen Incubator

Independent Policy Research Program

Matthew DeSantis

August 28, 2025

Abstract

This paper examines the housing crisis in Arlington, exploring its economic, social, and policy-driven roots. The research highlights the intersection of rising housing costs, limited affordable housing availability, and policy shortcomings that disproportionately affect low- and middle-income families. Through analysis of local data, national trends, and comparative policy examples, the study outlines both the structural causes and the human consequences of the crisis. It concludes with recommendations for policy reforms and community-based solutions aimed at improving housing equity and stability in Arlington.

Introduction

Arlington County is an economic growth poster child of the Washington Metropolitan region, with a robust economy and outstanding quality of life. However, behind the growth, there is a mounting and critical affordable housing crisis. This paradox, where high median incomes are causing general housing insecurity, takes a great human toll on many vulnerable populations, including immigrant communities, low-income seniors, and people experiencing homelessness. The causes of this issue are multifaceted, the product of expanding economic disparities as well as historically deep, exclusionary land-use policies.

This report dives into the dynamics of the housing puzzle in Arlington, its profound social consequences, and its origin in a combination of economic pressures and a history of restrictive zoning. It also examines the current policy interventions, including newer ones such as the Expanded Housing Options (EHO) program, rising dependence on Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), and direct subsidies by the government. Though these are important initiatives, their current scale and implementation are riddled with deficiencies and grassroots resistance.

In order to build a genuinely equal and equitable housing future, Arlington must adopt a strategic, multi-dimensional approach that not only increases housing supply but also confronts the underlying economic disparities and challenges the deeply embedded assumptions regarding land use and community development. It will require sustained political will, innovative partnership, and an unremitting commitment to making sure that all of its residents truly share Arlington's prosperity.

Arlington's Housing Paradox

Arlington County is most famously known as being one of the Washington Metropolitan Area's most economically thriving, fastest-growing communities. Its schools are consistently best-rated, and its livability is often praised, making it an ideal suburban-urban community. However, under the prosperity narrative is a stark fact: numerous residents of Arlington grapple with a spreading affordable housing crisis that has bred entrenched disparity in which economic success is not on the table for everyone.

This housing paradox is more than a statistical issue; it is an elementary challenge to the county's social and economic order. For most residents, living expenses are synonymous with "crushing pressures and impossible trade-offs" to the danger of their ability to remain in the community. The problem is particularly dire for lower-income workers who perform the essential tasks of Arlington, such as childcare and healthcare providers, office cleaning personnel, and restaurant, retail, and construction workers. The gap between the wages these workers earn and the actual living wages required to pay rent and housing fees in Arlington is enormous, making them high-risk for displacement.

Approximately 22,134 individuals in Arlington, or 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI) for a family of four, struggle to get by on $49,170 or less annually. (Arlington County, 2023). The actual cost of living for this type of family is averaged at three times that figure. (Arlington County, 2023) More broadly, over 10% of Arlington's residents, 24,272 people, live at or below 30% AMI, at risk of being priced out of the neighborhood. (Arlington County, 2023)

This group, often referred to as the "invisible poor," toils in the shadows of Arlington's vaunted prosperity; their economic hardship is often unseen by much of the more affluent population. This dynamic suggests that policy solutions must not only address the immediate shortage of housing supply but also actually politicize the public awareness of the underground economic hardships and the vital role such low-wage workers play in keeping the functions of the community going. The exorbitantly high housing expense thereby creates a ripple effect of tension, financial burden, reduced standard of living, and potential displacement across many at-risk groups. This makes the crisis of affordable housing not only a social welfare problem but an economic development imperative, as the county risks undermining its very viability if it cannot retain its essential workforce.

In an effort to provide a better insight into the economic condition and the size of the housing problem, Table 1 presents key demographic and financial statistics for Arlington.

Table 1

Indicator	Value
Individuals at or below 30% AMI	24,272 (over 10% of population)
30% AMI for a family of four	$42,690
Average living costs for a family of four	Approximately 3x 30% AMI
Individuals subsisting on $49,170 or less	22,134 (30% of the area's median income for a family of four)
Percentage of residential land zoned for single-family homes	Over 73% (up to 75% in some analyses)

Impacts of the Housing Crisis

The affordable housing crisis in Arlington County extends far beyond mere statistics; there are profound human costs that ripple through the lives of its most vulnerable residents. The high cost of housing creates a pervasive sense of stress, economic hardship, reduced quality of life, and the constant threat of displacement across various community groups. Furthermore, a significant lack of community efficacy results from the additional hardships caused by high housing costs, which may leave these communities in danger, unable to stand up for themselves and create the necessary change.

Impacts on Immigrant Communities. For both Spanish-speaking and other immigrant communities, housing cost is often the dominant factor shaping their daily existence. (Arlington County, 2023). Spanish-speaking immigrants, many from Central and South American countries, frequently work multiple jobs, take in boarders, or even go without food to meet rent obligations. Rent increases, often exceeding $100 per month in the unregulated market, severely erode their economic margin (Arlington County, 2023), necessitating sacrifices such as foregoing a car, limiting shopping, or having no weekends off. Parents in these communities face the agonizing reality of less time with their children due to the relentless pressure to earn enough for rent. Despite these immense challenges, they chose Arlington for its job proximity, convenient schools, public transportation, and perceived safety. Beyond financial strain, they report problems with building management, prejudiced treatment, and anxiety stemming from renovation projects. Their pleas for relief often center on increased government assistance or rent/price controls.

Other immigrants, hailing from diverse countries like Iraq, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Iran, and Mongolia, similarly value Arlington for its safety and convenient services. Even with some government assistance, their incomes are often so low that any rent increase, no matter how small, forces them to consider relocation or sacrifice essential needs like food or medicine. The relentless pressure of high housing costs leads to a marginalized existence characterized by a lack of personal vehicles, no travel, no dining out, constant work, a poor diet, and a perpetually stressful and unhealthy lifestyle.

A pervasive issue among these groups is poor credit, an "inevitable" consequence of their precarious economic circumstances. This poor credit often prevents them from leasing apartments in their names, rendering them reliant on others for housing opportunities. To avoid homelessness, it is common for multiple individuals, sometimes up to five, to share small one or two-bedroom units. This systemic nature of "bad credit" and overcrowding highlights how the housing crisis perpetuates a cycle of vulnerability, where financial strain becomes a direct barrier to stable housing, trapping individuals in precarious living situations. Like their Spanish-speaking counterparts, they advocate for rent control and more government-owned housing.

Impacts on Low-Income Seniors. Low-income seniors in Arlington, many living on modest Social Security incomes in multi-family condos or single-family homes, face significant threats to their continued homeownership and overall well-being. For condo owners, rising Homeowners Association (HOA) assessments and increasing condo fees pose substantial financial challenges, often in addition to ongoing mortgage payments. These fees are exacerbated by the aging infrastructure of their buildings, which requires more costly repairs over time.

Single-family homeowners, meanwhile, are burdened by high property tax bills, sometimes as much as $6,000, often unaware of county-provided senior tax break programs that could offer relief. These "extra" costs of homeownership push seniors to make difficult sacrifices, such as foregoing air conditioning in summer or lowering the heat in winter, compounded by high food prices.

Despite the financial strain, most seniors express a strong desire to "age in place". They cherish their current units, their locations, and the established lives they have built within their buildings and neighborhoods, valuing Arlington for its reliable public transportation, accessible county services, walkable retail, and quality healthcare. Selling their homes presents a dilemma, as finding an affordable replacement rental property is challenging, and the proceeds from a sale might make them ineligible for subsidized housing. They observe demographic shifts in their neighborhoods, with younger populations moving in and developers frequently offering to purchase their single-family homes as tear-downs. They also question why affordable housing projects are concentrated in their areas rather than in more affluent parts of Arlington. Their primary request to the County is assistance with condo fees, mirroring the property tax assistance available to single-family homeowners. This situation illustrates a paradox of choice and constraint, where the desirability of Arlington, coupled with limited affordable options, compels residents to endure severe hardship to stay, rather than freely choosing to leave. This is not a voluntary choice but a constrained one, driven by existing social networks, job access, and community services.

Impacts on Homeless Persons. Individuals experiencing homelessness in Arlington confront immense barriers to securing stable housing, leading to prolonged periods of stress and vulnerability. The county's high cost of living, a challenging job market (particularly for those with limited skills or criminal backgrounds), and poor credit histories make obtaining housing exceptionally difficult. Many struggle to find employment, which in turn makes housing unaffordable. A significant concern is the lack of support for single individuals, who often do not qualify for housing grants or assistance programs that are typically geared towards working families, the elderly, or disabled individuals. This leads some to feel that the "working poor" are left without adequate support, despite their efforts. Their living situations are inherently stressful, ranging from living on the streets to temporary shelters or unstable arrangements with family. While some perceive Arlington as caring due to available support networks, others believe the city prioritizes luxury apartments over sufficient homeless facilities and find the system difficult to navigate.

Broader Societal Impacts. Beyond these specific demographic groups, the housing crisis inflicts broader societal damage. The pervasive high housing costs create a ripple effect of stress and economic hardship across all vulnerable populations. This manifests as reduced family time for parents, a constant need to work multiple jobs, poor dietary habits, and a generally stressful and unhealthy lifestyle. The pressure to afford housing also leads to potential displacement, which directly threatens the diversity and social cohesion that define Arlington's community fabric. Seniors, for instance, observe these demographic shifts and express fears of being pushed out of their long-standing neighborhoods.

While specific Arlington data on health and education impacts are limited, general research underscores the severe consequences of housing insecurity. Families paying excessive amounts for housing often lack sufficient resources for essential needs like food and healthcare, jeopardizing the health of all family members, particularly children. Adults in unaffordable housing are more likely to report fair or poor health and may fail to fill prescriptions or adhere to treatments due to cost. (Sandel et al., 2018). Residential instability, including frequent moves, doubled-up housing, eviction, and foreclosure, is linked to elevated stress levels, depression, and hopelessness (Sandel et al., 2018), with adverse effects on children's mental health, developmental outcomes, and access to regular healthcare. Similarly, frequent or unwanted residential moves negatively impact children's educational outcomes (Sandel et al., 2018), leading to interruptions in instruction, absenteeism, and disruption of peer networks. This interconnectedness of vulnerability means that policies must move beyond siloed approaches for specific demographics and consider intersectional challenges. A holistic strategy addressing the fundamental economic squeeze (low wages versus high costs) would benefit multiple groups simultaneously.

Root Causes of the Affordability Challenge

Arlington's housing affordability crisis is not a singular phenomenon but the culmination of deeply intertwined economic forces and historical policy decisions, particularly concerning land use and zoning. Understanding these root causes is essential for developing effective and equitable solutions.

Economic Disparities: The Gap Between Living Wages and Actual Wages

Arlington's celebrated economic prosperity is, unfortunately, not shared equitably across its entire population, leading to significant disparities in income and purchasing power. A fundamental driver of the affordability challenge is the substantial gap between the living wages necessary to afford housing in Arlington and the actual wages earned by many residents who perform critical community functions. This includes essential workers in sectors such as childcare, healthcare, office cleaning, restaurants, retail, and construction. These individuals, whose labor significantly contributes to the county's vibrant economy, often find themselves unable to afford to live in the very community they serve.

The economic challenge of these workers is underscored by the fact that approximately 24,272 individuals, representing over 10% of Arlington's population, live below 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI). (Arlington County, 2023). While this income level might be 150% of the federal poverty line, it pales in comparison to the actual cost of living in Arlington, which averages three times that amount for a family of four. (Arlington County, 2023). This stark contrast means that tens of thousands of people are attempting to subsist on incomes that are fundamentally insufficient for the local housing market, placing them at an extremely high risk of displacement. The housing crisis, therefore, is not merely a social issue but an economic development challenge. If Arlington cannot retain its essential workforce due to unaffordable housing, it risks undermining the very prosperity that defines it, transforming affordable housing into an economic imperative.

Discriminatory Zoning Practices

The second, and perhaps more insidious, root cause of Arlington's housing crisis lies in its historical and current zoning practices. These regulations, seemingly neutral on the surface, have a profound and often discriminatory legacy.

Origins of Exclusionary Zoning in Virginia (Racial Segregation). Zoning in Virginia did not begin as a benign land-use planning tool; its origins are deeply rooted in explicit racial segregation. The city of Richmond adopted the first ordinance in April 1911, dividing the city into separate blocks for white and 'colored' residents. (Dvorak, 2023). This practice was subsequently approved by the General Assembly, enabling all cities and towns in Virginia to adopt similar residential segregation statutes. While the U.S. Supreme Court's landmark decision in Buchanan v. Warley (1917) declared explicit racial segregation zoning unconstitutional (Buchanan v. Warley, 1917), the underlying intent to segregate persisted and evolved.

Following *Buchanan*, cities found alternative means to perpetuate racial separation. They continued racial zoning through practices like "block zoning," which legally prevented white homeowners from selling to Black buyers and vice versa. Professional planners were engaged to prepare "racial zoning plans," marshalling the entire planning process to create completely separate Black communities. A particularly egregious example involved applying industrial zoning categories to areas predominantly inhabited by African Americans, while simultaneously applying residential protections to white neighborhoods. For instance, Alexandria's first zoning map applied industrial zoning to approximately 100 residential structures, the majority occupied by 'Negroes,' despite African Americans comprising only 20% of the population. (Dvorak, 2023)

This direct link between early 20th-century racial segregation ordinances and the subsequent evolution of zoning laws that limited density reveals that current single-family zoning, while appearing race-neutral, emerged from a system explicitly designed to segregate. This historical context is crucial for understanding why zoning reform is not just about increasing housing supply but also about addressing historical inequities and promoting social justice.

Evolution of Zoning to Limit Density (Large Lots, Single-Family Zones). The post-*Buchanan* era saw exclusionary practices continue through less explicit but equally effective means, primarily by limiting housing density. The Standard State Zoning Enabling Act (SZEA) of 1922 provided a blueprint for states to grant zoning powers to localities, a power upheld by Euclid v. Ambler (1926), (Euclid v. Ambler, 1926), establishing the precedent for "Euclidean" zoning. This framework allowed for the division of land into districts to regulate land and building use, leading to the widespread adoption of residential-only zones.

These residential districts were often divided by minimum lot size and prohibitions on multi-family housing, like row houses or apartments. The effect was to prioritize single-family detached housing on large lots, making homes inherently more expensive. This, in turn, concentrated poorer households of color into higher-density commercial and industrial areas, perpetuating segregation through economic means rather than explicit racial categories. The argument that private profit from zoning ordinances preserving and enhancing "investment values" was a significant goal of zoning further clarifies this evolution. This suggests that zoning became a mechanism for wealth preservation, not just land use, creating a natural incentive for homeowners and governments to protect property values.

Current Impact of Single-Family Zoning in Arlington. The legacy of these historical zoning practices profoundly shapes Arlington's current housing landscape. Today, nearly half of Arlington County's total land area restricts housing development exclusively to single-detached dwellings. (Arlington County, 2023). While single-family detached housing constitutes only 24% of Arlington's total housing stock, it occupies a disproportionate amount of land—approximately 5,500 acres, comprising over 73% of the land area dedicated to housing. (Arlington County, 2023). Other analyses indicate that as much as 75% of residential land in some cities is zoned exclusively for single-family homes, with Arlington, Texas, at 89%. (Dvorak, 2023). The 73.2% figure for Arlington, Virginia, from county documents confirms a significant majority.

These restrictive laws, which largely exclude multi-family buildings or townhouses from vast swathes of the county, date back to the 1930s and have demonstrably contributed to a lack of housing opportunities for a diverse community. This restrictive zoning, coupled with rising land costs and housing demand that consistently outstrips limited supply, has led to a concerning trend: the replacement of original, smaller, more modest single-detached homes with much larger, luxury single-detached houses that are financially out of reach for most households.

This phenomenon directly creates the "missing middle" in Arlington's housing stock, a shortage of moderately priced housing types such as duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes that bridge the gap between single-family homes and high-rise apartments. The "missing middle" is not merely an architectural gap; it is a direct consequence of policy choices that have prioritized a specific, low-density housing form over diverse, more affordable options. Addressing it requires fundamental changes to the regulatory framework, which will inevitably challenge existing property value expectations and perceptions of neighborhood character.

Policy Responses and Shortcomings

Arlington County has begun to implement and explore a range of policy responses to address its affordable housing challenge, encompassing zoning reforms, public-private partnerships, and direct government subsidies. Each approach offers unique benefits but also faces distinct limitations and challenges.

Zoning Reforms: Expanded Housing Options (EHO) / Missing Middle Housing

In a significant policy shift, the Arlington County Board adopted the Expanded Housing Options (EHO) development framework on March 22, 2023. This landmark decision allows for the construction of 2-6 unit buildings, or 2-4 unit buildings on smaller lots, in areas previously zoned exclusively for single-family homes." (Arlington County, 2023). The policy aims to increase housing supply and lower barriers to entry into neighborhoods, directly confronting the county's housing crisis and its history of exclusionary zoning. To manage the transition, certain conditions apply, such as maintaining similar building height, setbacks, and overall size as single-detached homes. An annual cap of 58 permits is distributed across different residential districts (R-5, R-6, R-8, R-10, R-20), with 66% allotted explicitly to the R-6 zoning district." (Arlington County, 2023). These changes officially took effect on July 1, 2023 (Arlington County, 2023).

The concept of the "missing middle" refers to a range of multi-family housing types that are a blend of single-family homes and large apartment complexes. Think of them as buildings that are between one and a half to three stories, like duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, and townhomes. They are called the "missing middle" because they were common in American communities for decades before restrictive zoning laws, which largely prioritized single-family detached homes, made them illegal to build in many areas. The relevance of this type of housing lies in its provision of a diverse range of housing types and price points, offering an option for those who may be priced out of a traditional single-family home but are not looking for a high-rise apartment. A key pro is that these homes can add more density to a neighborhood without significantly altering its overall character, and they can be more affordable to build and buy than single-family houses. However, a major con is the potential for opposition from existing residents who may be concerned about increased traffic, parking issues, a change in the neighborhood's feel, and lowered property values.

Projected Impact on Housing Diversity and Affordability. The county projects that the EHO policy will result in the conversion of approximately 20 lots per year from single-family housing to smaller multi-unit residences (Arlington County, 2023). These new units are intended for both ownership and rental, aiming to provide greater flexibility and a wider range of price points for families. A key objective of the proposal is to encourage affordability, with a target for units to be affordable for families earning $108,000 per year, which is equivalent to 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) for a family of three. Furthermore, some of these "missing middle" housing units will be eligible for the Moderate Income Purchase Assistance Program (MIPAP). This Arlington County initiative provides deferred-payment, no-interest loans of up to 25% of the home purchase price for qualified first-time homebuyers. The Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing (APAH), a prominent non-profit developer, actively supported this initiative, viewing it as a positive step towards promoting broader housing affordability without solely relying on direct subsidies.

Despite these intentions, a significant disconnect exists between the policy's ambitious goals and its projected impact. While EHO is a crucial symbolic step in challenging exclusionary zoning, the projected addition of only around 20 lots per year, even if each yields six units (totaling 120 new units annually), is unlikely to substantially alleviate Arlington's affordable housing crisis, given that over 24,000 individuals live below 30% AMI. This suggests that EHO, as currently structured, serves more as a foundational policy shift than a comprehensive solution, potentially addressing only a niche market segment rather than the widespread need.

Community Opposition. The adoption of the EHO policy has been met with considerable community opposition, primarily from existing residents of single-family neighborhoods. Concerns frequently voiced revolve around the potential negative impact on "neighborhood character," with many participants expressing worries that new missing middle housing would not be suitable alongside existing housing stock. Specific fears include the loss of privacy, quiet, distance from neighbors, private yards, and ease of parking. Some residents articulate a broader sentiment that Arlington is "growing too quickly" and that the proliferation of condos "takes away from neighborhoods". Beyond aesthetic and lifestyle concerns, opponents also raise fears about "infrastructure strain". They stress the need for significant investment in county schools and stormwater management infrastructure to keep pace with a growing population, expressing worries about "more overcrowding in schools; more vehicular traffic on neighborhood streets; and more fights over limited parking". Skepticism about the actual affordability of new missing middle housing is also prevalent, with critics citing examples of new duplexes and condos priced over $1 million, arguing that increased density results in an "upward inflationary spiral on land values".

This opposition highlights the deeply entrenched nature of resistance to zoning reform, often rooted in concerns about property values and the preservation of existing assets. The debate is usually seen as a conflict between existing residents who benefit from low-density, private homes and those who are excluded by these characteristics.

Legal Challenges and Their Implications. The EHO policy has also faced legal challenges, underscoring the political and social difficulty of unwinding decades of exclusionary policy. A lawsuit has been filed against Arlington County, alleging procedural violations, such as bypassing necessary environmental reviews and public hearings during the policy's enactment." (Associated Press, 2023). Plaintiffs contend that increased density could strain infrastructure, alter neighborhood character, and negatively impact property values. As of June 24, 2025, the Virginia Court of Appeals reversed and remanded the Circuit Court's ruling in the Expanded Housing Options trial, with a rehearing granted on July 8 (Virginia Court of Appeals, 2025), leaving the future of EHO development uncertain. This ongoing legal battle demonstrates that even progressive zoning reforms, while necessary, face significant hurdles and can be delayed or overturned by well-organized opposition. Overcoming this resistance requires not only policy changes but also robust public education campaigns, transparent infrastructure planning, and potentially direct financial incentives or guarantees to alleviate homeowner fears.

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs)

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) represent a crucial mechanism for developing affordable housing by fostering collaboration between governments, for-profit entities, and non-profit organizations. In this model, the private sector typically handles the development, ownership, and operation of housing, with a significant portion of the financing derived from public sources. These public contributions can take various forms, including grants, loans, waivers of fee requirements ("soft subsidies"), and indirect subsidies through tax credits, notably the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC).

The benefits of PPPs are substantial. They can significantly increase the total amount of subsidies available for affordable housing by leveraging both government and private capital. Elected officials, often hesitant about direct government housing production, may be more inclined to support projects where public and private sectors jointly perform financing, production, or management. PPPs also enable and encourage affordable housing providers to experiment creatively with diverse partnership models, potentially creating outcomes "greater than the sum of their parts" by combining the roles and responsibilities of various partners.

Furthermore, PPPs can help to change negative public perceptions of affordable housing, which often suffer from associations with poverty and the "Not-In-My-Back-Yard" (NIMBY) phenomenon. By involving private sector partners, PPPs can demonstrate how appropriately designed and professionally managed affordable housing benefits the entire community. This approach can reposition affordable housing from being viewed as merely "welfare rights" to a pragmatic component of community development, fostering more constructive conversations about the roles of different sectors in addressing the housing crisis.

Challenges and Risks of PPPs. Despite their potential, PPPs are not without significant challenges and risks. One primary concern is the potential for a contraction of federal subsidies if Congress perceives that state, local, and private sources are dedicating substantial resources to affordable housing PPPs. This could inadvertently reduce the overall pool of funding available. PPPs also introduce complex issues related to efficiency, public accountability, and contracting. While they aim for synergy, substantial experimentation can lead to public and significant failures, potentially backfiring on efforts to improve public perception if they are widely seen as inefficient or unaccountable.

Moreover, the discourse surrounding PPPs can become entangled in "market fundamentalism," where some free-market proponents frame them as mere privatization, thereby limiting goals to "private" ones and excluding public values. This ideological framing can undermine the collaborative spirit and public good objectives. Another significant challenge is the lack of substantial unity within the affordable housing movement itself regarding its approach to PPPs. The ambiguity of the term "PPP" can make it difficult for diverse stakeholders to agree on common goals, partners, and regulatory strategies. More generally, critics argue that PPPs do not "bring extra money" but are ultimately paid for by the public sector through taxation or user charges, often incurring higher capital costs and lacking efficiency gains compared to direct public projects. They also raise concerns about incentives for corruption, systematic underestimation of costs, and a loss of transparency due to commercial confidentiality.

Case Studies in Arlington. Arlington County has actively engaged in various PPPs to address its affordable housing needs, leveraging private capital and expertise to achieve public housing goals.

Barcroft Apartments. A notable example is the partnership between Arlington County and Amazon to preserve the affordability of 1,334 housing units at the Barcroft Apartment community. This initiative involved a substantial $150 million loan from the County, complemented by $160 million from Amazon's Housing Equity Fund. This collaboration enabled Jair Lynch, an affordable housing provider, to acquire the property, preventing the loss of what was the largest market-rate affordable community in the County. The acquisition also facilitates immediate repairs, amenity additions, and property upgrades, preserving units for low-income families (60% AMI or below) for a remarkable 99-year term.

Crystal House Apartments. Amazon also secured an option for future residential development in the infill areas at the Crystal House Apartments site. This development, combined with the preservation of existing units, is projected to result in nearly 1,200 affordable homes in a high-cost area close to Amazon's new headquarters.

Ballston Station. Non-profit real estate developer Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing (APAH) broke ground on a new 144-unit affordable housing complex at the Central United Methodist Church site. This development, located near Ballston Station Metro, will provide one-, two-, and three-bedroom apartments with rents at or below 60% AMI. Virginia Housing contributed $21.5 million in financing, including an $8.75 million Amazon REACH Virginia Grant through Arlington County, alongside $27.6 million in federal Housing Credits.

Gilliam Place. This mixed-use development features 173 affordable rental units, retail, and civic space on 1.23 acres. Developed by APAH, it emerged from a partnership with the Arlington Presbyterian Church (APC), which sold its land at a below-market price, driven by a mission to provide perpetually affordable housing. Most units are affordable to households earning 60% or less of AMI, with some as low as 40% AMI, guaranteed for 30-60 years. This project exemplifies how a shared mission can lead to innovative solutions for acquiring below-market-priced land in high-cost urban areas.

Amazon's Housing Equity Fund. Beyond specific projects, Amazon's Housing Equity Fund represents a significant private commitment of $3.6 billion to create or preserve over 35,000 affordable homes across its hometown regions, including Arlington/DC, Puget Sound, and Nashville. As of September 2022, the fund had committed over $1.4 billion, contributing to the creation and preservation of more than 10,000 affordable homes, thereby increasing Arlington's dedicated affordable housing stock by 22% through two preservation investments. The fund also supports homeownership initiatives for households earning up to 120% AMI, including through community land trusts, which aim to maintain long-term affordability.

The dual nature of PPPs, presenting both opportunity and an ideological battleground, is evident in these examples. While Amazon's involvement provides crucial capital and has significantly impacted Arlington's affordable housing stock, the focus often remains on units affordable to moderate-income households (60-120% AMI) rather than the "deeply affordable" 30% AMI segment most at risk of displacement. This suggests that while private corporate funds are a positive catalyst, they may naturally gravitate towards less risky, higher-AMI projects. This highlights a potential gap in PPPs for achieving deep affordability without substantial direct public subsidies.

The "free dirt" concept, where developers advocate for more height and density to make affordable units more economically viable, and for the county to cover infrastructure costs, further illustrates that private developers operate on economic incentives. To truly scale affordable housing through PPPs, policies must either reduce development costs through zoning reform and infrastructure support or increase financial returns for developers through subsidies, or a combination of both.

Direct Government Subsidies and Programs

Federal Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program (Section 8). The Federal Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program, commonly known as Section 8, is a cornerstone of federal rental assistance, primarily administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and implemented by local and state public housing agencies. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2023). Under this program, voucher holders receive a subsidy that can be used at any privately owned rental unit that meets program guidelines and has a willing landlord. The program offers both tenant-based vouchers, which provide mobility and choice by moving with the household, and project-based vouchers (PBVs), which are attached to specific units to ensure ongoing affordability.

The benefits of HCVs are significant: they provide crucial stability and prevent homelessness, contribute to improved long-term outcomes for children, reduce rent burdens and overcrowding, and generally increase housing stability for recipients. The program effectively leverages the private market for housing provision while limiting the government's role to partial financing and setting minimum quality standards. Critically, at least 75% of newly enrolled households must be extremely low-income, with incomes not exceeding 30% of AMI or the federal poverty level (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2023), ensuring that the program targets the most vulnerable populations.

However, the HCV program faces substantial challenges. Demand for vouchers far outstrips supply, leading to waiting lists that can stretch for many years. Nationally, fewer than one in four qualified households receive any form of federal rental assistance, with a typical applicant waiting about two years. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2023). Even for those who receive a voucher, finding a landlord willing to accept it within the allotted search time is difficult, with only 57% succeeding in 2022, a decline from previous years." (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2023). This difficulty stems from administrative burdens, such as HUD's required housing inspections, and outright discrimination by landlords. Tightening rental housing markets further exacerbates these challenges. Moreover, voucher recipients often find themselves concentrated in lower-income neighborhoods, partly due to payment standards that make units in higher-opportunity areas unaffordable. The program also faces proposed Congressional cutbacks and tighter eligibility requirements, including potential time limits and work requirements, which could severely reduce its ability to stabilize families with minor children. This efficacy versus scale dilemma of vouchers means that while highly effective for recipients, the program is far from a universal solution, perpetually leaving a vast number of eligible families unhoused or severely cost-burdened without a corresponding increase in affordable housing supply.

Local Housing Grants and Emergency Rent Assistance. Arlington's local Housing Grant program currently serves approximately 1,400 households annually." (Arlington County, 2023). This program assists explicitly very low-income households, prioritizing those with members aged 65 or older, those who are permanently and totally disabled, or working families with children. Eligible households contribute a portion of their monthly income towards rent, with the remaining amount subsidized by the County's grant. In response to the economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, Arlington County swiftly expanded its emergency rental assistance, enabling hundreds of families to maintain housing despite severe financial hardships.

Developer Perspectives on County Assistance and Policy Suggestions.

Multi-family developers offer specific suggestions for how Arlington County can further support affordable housing development, often aligning with the concept of direct government assistance or regulatory exchange. They propose that the County expedite land-use approval processes for projects that meet certain Committed Affordable Unit (CAF) standards or contributions. They also suggest that the County cover costs for underground utilities or co-located parking garages near multi-family buildings, arguing that this would free up developer resources specifically for affordable units.

Developers also advocate for decoupling affordable housing negotiations from other community benefits negotiations, asserting that affordable housing is often "shortchanged" in favor of amenities like arts parks or public landscaping. They call for the County to provide more "backbone" and support against neighborhood pushback on increased height and density, which they view as essential for making affordable units economically viable. Lastly, developers suggest raising the CAF eligibility standard from 60% AMI to 80% or even 100% AMI. This, they argue, would allow more "workforce" clients—such as teachers, firefighters, police, and nurses—to access Arlington's committed affordable units, addressing the "workforce housing" gap. This tension between "deep affordability" (30% AMI) and "workforce housing" (80-100% AMI) highlights a fundamental policy choice. While federal and local grants prioritize the most vulnerable, developers often gravitate towards higher AMI targets due to economic feasibility, creating a potential gap for the deeply vulnerable.

The interplay of zoning, subsidies, and developer behavior is clear: direct government action, whether through financial subsidies or regulatory incentives, is crucial to bridge the gap between market viability and affordability targets. This reinforces that zoning reform alone may not be enough; it needs to be coupled with financial support and a clear, consistent policy framework that prioritizes affordable housing over other community amenities in negotiations.

Solutions

Addressing Arlington's affordable housing crisis requires a comprehensive strategy that balances zoning reform, innovative public-private partnerships, expanded subsidies, and broader social equity initiatives. The following recommendations outline a multi-pronged approach designed to increase the supply of affordable units, reduce bureaucratic barriers, and strengthen public trust through transparency and community engagement. They also emphasize prioritizing deeply affordable housing, enhancing federal and local subsidy programs, and integrating supportive services with housing policy. Together, these strategies aim to confront both the structural and economic drivers of the crisis while ensuring that Arlington's housing future is equitable, sustainable, and inclusive.

Policy Recommendations for Zoning Reform

Addressing Arlington's complex affordable housing challenge requires a comprehensive, multi-pronged strategy that tackles both supply-side limitations and demand-side pressures, while also confronting the historical and economic underpinnings of the crisis. The following recommendations build upon current efforts and aim to foster a more equitable and sustainable housing future.

To truly unlock the potential of zoning reform, Arlington must move beyond incremental changes:

Expand EHO Scope and Scale: The current annual permit cap for Expanded Housing Options (EHO) of 58 units results in a projected conversion of only approximately 20 lots per year, which is insufficient to address the crisis's magnitude, affecting over 24,000 individuals living below 30% AMI. It is recommended that Arlington significantly increase this annual permit cap and explore allowing more than six units per lot in appropriate areas, particularly near high-capacity transit corridors. This would amplify the impact of challenging exclusionary zoning and substantially increase the housing supply.

Streamline Approval Processes for Affordable Units: Bureaucratic hurdles and delays add significant costs to development. Implementing expedited land-use approval processes specifically for projects that meet or exceed Committed Affordable Unit (CAF) standards, as suggested by multi-family developers, can reduce these costs, making affordable units more economically viable for developers.

Address Community Opposition Proactively: The success of zoning reform hinges on public acceptance. Arlington should develop robust public education campaigns to counter misinformation about EHO impacts on neighborhood character, property values, and infrastructure. Simultaneously, proactive investment in critical infrastructure, such as schools, stormwater management, and public transit, is essential to alleviate legitimate concerns about strain on existing resources. This dual approach, combining transparent communication with tangible improvements, can help mitigate the deeply entrenched resistance to density.

Strategies to Enhance and Optimize Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs)

While PPPs are proving valuable, their effectiveness can be amplified by strategic adjustments:

Prioritize Affordability in PPP Structures: While workforce housing is essential, the most vulnerable populations, including immigrant communities, low-income seniors, and homeless individuals, operate at the deepest economic margin. It is crucial to structure PPPs, especially those involving significant public investment or regulatory concessions, to prioritize units affordable to households at 30% AMI and below, rather than primarily focusing on 60-120% AMI. This may necessitate additional layers of public subsidy to bridge the financial gap for the lowest income brackets.

Increase Public Financial Contributions to PPPs: The County should increase direct financial contributions to PPPs, such as covering infrastructure costs (e.g., underground utilities, co-located parking garages) for affordable housing developments, as suggested by developers. These "soft subsidies" can significantly reduce developer costs and risks, making it more feasible to build deeply affordable units and attract private partners.

Formalize and Decouple Affordable Housing Negotiations: To ensure affordable housing is not "shortchanged" in development agreements, Arlington should establish a clear policy that formally decouples affordable housing contributions from other community benefits negotiations. This ensures that affordable housing remains a primary objective, preventing it from being traded off against other amenities like arts parks or public landscaping.

Recommendations for Strengthening Direct Government Subsidies and Support Programs

Advocate for Increased Federal HCV Funding and Reforms: The Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program is highly effective for those who receive assistance, but its impact is severely limited by insufficient funding and administrative barriers. Arlington County should actively lobby federal authorities for increased funding for the HCV program and advocate for reforms to reduce administrative burdens on landlords and address discrimination, thereby improving program accessibility and expanding its reach.

Expand Local Housing Grant Programs: Arlington's local Housing Grant program currently serves approximately 1,400 households annually. To address the broader unmet need, particularly for the "working poor" who may not fit existing eligibility categories, it is recommended to significantly increase funding for this program and explore expanding its eligibility criteria. Local subsidies are crucial for filling gaps left by federal programs and providing immediate relief.

Enhance Awareness of Existing Programs

Even effective programs are useless if eligible residents are unaware of them. Targeted outreach campaigns are needed to ensure that vulnerable populations, particularly low-income seniors, are informed about and can easily access existing county assistance programs, such as senior tax breaks. Improving access to existing resources can alleviate immediate financial burdens and prevent unnecessary displacement.

Approaches Addressing Economic Disparities and Social Equity

Promote Living Wage Initiatives: Addressing the fundamental gap between low wages and high living costs is paramount. Arlington should support and incentivize businesses to pay living wages that align with the county's cost of living, particularly for essential service workers. Directly increasing income significantly improves housing affordability for residents.

Invest in Supportive Services: Housing insecurity is often intertwined with other challenges. Increased investment in comprehensive supportive services for vulnerable populations, including legal aid for tenants, credit counseling, and navigation assistance for complex housing programs, is vital, especially for immigrant communities and individuals experiencing homelessness. Holistic support can improve housing stability and overall well-being.

Integrate Housing Policy with Broader Planning: The housing crisis cannot be solved in isolation. Housing policy must be deeply integrated with transportation, education, and economic development planning to create a cohesive and equitable urban environment where residents can afford to live near their jobs, schools, and essential services. This comprehensive approach ensures that housing solutions contribute to, and are supported by, all aspects of community life.

Conclusion

Arlington County's affordable housing challenge is a complex, multi-faceted crisis, deeply intertwined with its celebrated economic success and the legacy of its land-use patterns.

The profound human cost, affecting diverse populations from immigrant families and low-income seniors to individuals experiencing homelessness, threatens the very fabric of the community, eroding social cohesion and economic viability. While Arlington has initiated crucial policy responses, including progressive zoning reforms like Expanded Housing Options, innovative Public-Private Partnerships, and essential direct government subsidies, the scale and scope of these efforts must be significantly expanded to match the magnitude of the problem.

The path forward demands a bold, multi-pronged approach. It requires not only an acceleration of zoning reforms to genuinely increase housing supply across all income levels, but also a strategic optimization of Public-Private Partnerships to prioritize deep affordability for the most vulnerable. Simultaneously, strengthening direct government subsidies and support programs is indispensable for those whose market-based solutions cannot serve. Ultimately, the challenge ahead requires solutions with thought-out and strategic city planning. Knocking over all zoning laws could have drastic impacts on neighborhood communities and setting up a lot of people in one area quickly, without the supporting infrastructure like public transportation or space to take on extra children in public schools, could lead to a severe problem. However, just because the solutions could be very difficult to address and execute correctly, it doesn't mean they aren't necessary.

Fundamentally, Arlington must commit to addressing the underlying economic disparities by promoting living wages and investing in holistic supportive services. This comprehensive strategy, coupled with sustained political will and genuine community collaboration, is essential to ensure that Arlington's prosperity is not merely a facade but a shared reality for all its residents, fostering a truly vibrant, diverse, and equitable community for generations to come.

References

Amazon. (2022, January). *Amazon Housing Equity Fund*. https://www.housingonline.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Housing-Equity-Fund-Overview-Nashville-Presentation_C.Buell_.pdf

Amazon. (n.d.). *Amazon's Housing Equity Fund*. https://www.aboutamazon.com/impact/community/housing-equity

Arlington Community Foundation. (2022). *2022 poverty information in Arlington*. https://www.arlcf.org/news-events/2022-poverty-information-in-arlington/

Arlington Community Foundation. (n.d.). *Shared prosperity*. Arlington Community Foundation. https://www.arlcf.org/sharedprosperity/

Arlington County. (2022). *2022 Affordable Housing Master Plan*. https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/housing/documents/affordable-housing/2022-ahmp-if-final.pdf

Arlington County. (2022, October 31). *Memorandum*. https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/commissions/documents/zoco/lrpc-zoco-mmhs-2022-10-31.pdf

Arlington County. (2023). *County Board adopts expanded housing options*. https://www.arlingtonva.us/About-Arlington/Newsroom/Articles/2023/County-Board-Adopts-Expanded-Housing-Options

Arlington County. (n.d.). *Arlington County affordable housing study: Qualitative research results*. https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/Housing/Documents/Housing-Study-Qualitative-Research-Results.pdf

Arlington County. (n.d.). *Building a common understanding*. https://arlingtonva.konveio.com/system/files/pdf/replaced_KonveioBoards_0.pdf

Arlington County. (n.d.). *HUD PRO Grant Barcroft full application (DRAFT)*. https://www.arlingtonva.us/files/sharedassets/public/v/1/housing/documents/affordable-housing/hud-pro-grant_barcroft_full-application.pdf

Bean, Kinney & Korman. (n.d.). *Zoning laws in focus: Understanding the Arlington County missing middle housing policy dispute*. https://www.beankinney.com/zoning-laws-in-focus-understanding-the-arlington-county-missing-middle-housing-policy-dispute/

Davidson, N. M., & Malloy, R. P. (Eds.). (2009). Affordable housing and public-private partnerships (law, ... http://ndl.ethernet.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/13229/1/147.pdf

George Mason University. (2019, November). *Gilliam Place case study*. https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/housing/sites/housing/files/assets/documents/housing%20challenge/gmu_gilliam%20place%20case%20study_nov%202019%20(002).pdf

Gilliam Place. (n.d.). *Apartments in Arlington, VA*. https://www.gilliamplace.com/

Greater Greater Washington. (n.d.). *Arlington continues to study missing middle housing, and a familiar debate emerges*. https://ggwash.org/view/83054/arlington-continues-to-study-missing-middle-housing-and-a-familiar-debate-emerges

Hall, D. (2014, January). Why Public-Private Partnerships Don't Work - The many advantages of the public alternative. https://pop-umbrella.s3.amazonaws.com/sites/default/files/documents/research/rapport_eng_56pages_a4_lr_0.pdf

HousingForward Virginia. (n.d.). *Zoning 101*. https://housingforwardva.org/resources/zoning/101-toolkit/2/

McGuireWoods. (2021). *Zoning and segregation in Virginia: Part 1*. https://media.mcguirewoods.com/publications/2021/Zoning-And-Segregation-In-Virginia-Study-Part1.pdf

National Housing Conference. (2017, March). *The impacts of affordable housing on education: A research summary*. https://nhc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/The-Impacts-of-Affordable-Housing-on-Education-1.pdf

National Housing Conference. (2017, March). *The impacts of affordable housing on health: A research summary*.

https://nhc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/The-Impacts-of-Affordable-Housing-on-Health-A-Research-Summary.pdf

National Housing Trust. (n.d.). *Amazon Homeownership Initiative Pilot*. https://nationalhousingtrust.org/our-work/lending/amazon-homeownership-initiative-pilot

National Housing Trust. (n.d.). *Amazon Homeownership Initiative: FAQs*. https://nationalhousingtrust.org/amazon-homeownership-initiative-faqs

New York University. (2025, June). *Federal housing choice vouchers can make the difference between....* https://www.nyu.edu/about/news-publications/news/2025/june/federal-housing-choice-vouchers-can-make-the-difference-between-.html

Single-family zoning. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved August 19, 2025, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Single-family_zoning

The Housing Partnership. (2023, June 5). *Arlington County adopts missing middle housing proposal*. https://www.housingpartnership.net/files/FINAL_Missing-Middle-Case-Study_060523.pdf

The Land Lawyers. (n.d.). *Arlington County Board approves missing middle amendments*. https://thelandlawyers.com/arlington-county-board-approves-missing-middle-expanded-housing-option-amendments/

Local Housing Solutions. (n.d.). *Federal programs for affordable housing*. https://www.localhousingsolutions.org/fund/federal-programs-for-affordable-housing/

Virginia Housing. (2022, March 21). *New, affordable housing coming to Arlington*. https://www.virginiahousing.com/news/22-0321-new-affordable-housing-coming-to-arlington