

Private vs Public? Golf Course's Effect on Real Estate Value

Earth and Environmental Science and Asian Studies Departments, Furman University, Greenville, SC 29613

Abstract

The valuation of various green space and other outdoor amenities is continuously explored in both environmental studies and economic literature. A golf course is considered within that category of recreational outdoor spaces and thus can be valued using the same methodology. The goal of this research is to asses the effect of proximity to a golf course on the final selling price of homes. By identifying this relationship, one can draw a monetary value of the golf course. Finally, this research also looks to find the difference in value between a private golf course and a public golf course and asses its significance. Using 2015 final home selling prices around two local courses (Paris Mountain Country Club and Pebble Creek Country Club) and Geographic Information Systems to determine proximity, It is concluded home value is inversely related to distance from a golf course. In that, as a house increases its distance from the edge of a course, the value of that house declines. Any specific interpretation cannot be made however, because of lack of observations and statistically insignificant results.

Methodology

Below shows a flowchart of the exact methodology used to complete this analysis. Much of the data collection and manipulation happened within the GIS program, but once the distance values were calculated and exported, the model was run using the statistical program, STATA. The tables to the left show the results of the model from STATA.



Model

Below is the regression model used to find the relationship between the distance variable (distance in feet each house is from the edge of the golf course) and the final selling price. It is using the ordinary least squares estimation technique (OLS) and thus it could be compared to a line of best fit. The betas shown below indicate the coefficient associated with each variable and the corresponding relationship with final selling price. Because OLS is used, each beta can be interpreted in the following way: for every one foot increase in the distance from the golf course, the final selling price of the home changes by " β 1" amount. Housing controls and census controls are other variables that affect the final selling price of a given home. They must be included in the model as well to ensure the validity of the distance variable. So, the interpretation of the β 1 includes the assumption that all other control variables are considered constant. The housing controls include, number of bathrooms, number of bedrooms, garage capacity, total finished square feet and days on market. The census controls include, average family size, average household size, and percent black, all as averages of the particular census tract the house is located in. The epsilon is the stochastic error term or the variable that catches all relationships not included in the model.

soldprice= β 0+ β 1Distance+ β nHousingControls+ β n2CensusControls+ ϵ

Public Results: Paris Mountain

Without Census Controls			
	(1)		
VARIABLES	SoldPrice		
Distance	-8.407		
	(9.384)		
Number of Bathrooms	13,507		
	(20,745)		
Days on Market	-76.65		
	(156.9)		
Number of Bedrooms	-17,250		
	(12,673)		
Garage Capacity	32,843		
	(19,759)		
TotalFinishedSqft	79.78***		
	(16.55)		
Constant	-16,023		
	(78,374)		
Observations	38		
Adjusted R-squared	0.631		
R-squared	0.690		

Nithout Census Controls			With Census Con	
	(1)		VARIABLES	
	SoldPrice			
			Distance	
stance -1.594	-1.594			
	(4.614)		NUMBBR	
umber of Bathrooms -4.635				
			NumbOfBedrooms	
	(13,082)			
lysOnMarket	-48.68		GarageCapacity	
	(56.26)			
mber of Bedrooms	-5,382			
	(1 001)		TotalFinishedSqft	
araga Capacity	(4,034)			
rage Capacity	10,702		DaysOnMarket	
	(5,952)			
Total Finished Soft 95.93***		PCTBlack		
	(19.17)		AvaHouseSize	
onstant	-996.5		Avgriouseoize	
	(29,178)		AvgFamSize	
oservations	149			
usted R-squared	0.661		Constant	
aguarad	0.075			
squareo	0.675			
			Observations	
			Adjusted P-squared	
	"On" Coi	rse vs "Off' Course	Aujusieu N-squareu	
			R-Squared	

	(1)
VARIABLES	SoldPrice
On Course	7,066
	(17,395)
Number of Bathrooms	-4,872
	(12,829)
Days on Market	-51.15
	(55.42)
Number of Bedrooms	-5,264
	(4,220)
Garage Capacity	18,527***
	(5,838)
Total Finished Sqft	95.79***
	(19.90)
Constant	-3,181
	(27,188)
Observations	149
Adjusted R-squared	0.662
P. cauarod	0 675

Sold Price vs Distance (Pebble Creek)



Kyle Courtney

With Census Controls				
	(1)			
VARIABLES	SoldPrice			
Distance	-4.299			
	(12.18)			
Number of Bathrooms	6,858			
	(17,607)			
Days on Market	-121.7			
,	(168.2)			
Number of Bedrooms	-17,960			
	(12.250)			
Garage Capacity	29,242*			
	(15,609)			
Total Finished Sqft	86.56***			
	(18.87)			
Percent Black	-3.901e+06			
	(2.806e+06)			
Average Household Size	931,316			
	(584,853)			
Average Family Size	567,381			
	(403,075)			
Constant	-3.670e+06			
	(2.320e+06)			
Observations	38			
Adjusted R-squared	0 669			

0.749

Robust standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Private Results: Pebble Creek

model. For every foot of distance a house is away from the golf course, the value of the home drops by the red amount of dollars.

Red numbers represent negative coefficients

associated with the distance variable (β 1) of the

The green value represents a different interpretation. If a home is on Pebble Creek Golf Club (within a 100 feet), then the value of that home increases by the green amount of dollars.



Distance (ft)



Conclusion

After preliminary results, proximity to a golf course will increase the value of a home as it is located closer to the edge. However, due to lack of available house prices, the interpretation of the coefficient is unreliable and not statistically significant. When looking specifically at Pebble Creek, the effect of being on the course (within 100 feet of course edge) vs off the course shows the same relationship found with general proximity. Again, the number of observations limits the interpretation of the coefficient but the direction of the relationship remains the same. This analysis shows that people value property closer to golf courses due to either preference of green areas, community amenities, enjoyment of golf or a combination of many reasons. In order to correctly valuate each course, many more data points of recent home sales would be needed. A analysis could also be done using estimated value of homes that are located within the two mile buffer, not specifically sales price.

References and Data Sources

Major Listing Service Greenville Country GIS **United States Census**

Owesu-Edusei, K, Espey, M. (2003). *Does Proximity to a Golf Course Matter?* South Carolina Agriculture and Forestry Research. Clemson University Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics.

Kong, F., Yin, H., & Nakagoshi, N. (2007) Using GIS and landscape metrics in the hedonic price modeling of the amenity value of urban green space: A case study in Jinan City, China. Landscape and Urban Planning, 79 (3-4), 240.

Acknowledgements: Dr. Suresh Muthukrishnan, Dr. Mohammed Taha, Jacob Milchuck



