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Gentrification occurs when affluent residents displace existing lower-income groups, bringing a significant reinvestment in the built environment. This tie between architectural change and social continuity is managed in most historic cities through regulations that limit the scope of allowed building conservation to issues of material stability. However, this approach has had limited success in Venice, where housing quality is only one factor influencing access to housing by long-term residents. Another, more widespread phenomenon is investment in the housing market by vacationers. The resulting commodification of residential space in vernacular buildings has introduced architectural and contractual changes that threaten the historic qualities that support long-term resident livability.

Current practice in urban conservation is to tie the material preservation of historic cities to broader social and economic stability. Such a link is of particular importance in districts comprised of vernacular dwellings that house long-term residents. In such contexts, conservation of residential structures should occur in conjunction with efforts to stabilize the local population.

A common problem in conservation districts is gentrification, because poorly managed preservation efforts may lead to the displacement of vulnerable segments of the population by more affluent residents. But conservation need not be synonymous with displacement if
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it is focused on basic issues of structural and material stability. An early and successful example of this approach was conducted by Cerrellati and Scannavini in Bologna in the 1970s. Although it was criticized for generalizing the unique physical features of individual buildings through “typological restoration,” its core approach, using vernacular housing conservation to stabilize an existing resident population, continues to be lauded as a model for preservation planning.4

The same housing strategies implemented in Bologna have been attempted in the historic center of Venice, but with only limited success. Unlike Bologna, which was largely free of tourism and outside development pressure at the time the conservation program was initiated, residential markets in Venice have been exposed to widespread speculation from outside tourist interests.5 The increasing predominance of vacation properties and the growing amount tourists will pay for them have inflated residential prices well above what local wages will sustain.4 Under such conditions, efforts to make conservation affordable may translate into only limited gains in terms of population stability. Even when conservation is made accessible through procedural clarity, grants, and tax incentives, heritage simply sells to the highest bidder. With tourists willing to pay several times the actual dollar cost of conservation activities to occupy space in restored buildings, other methods will be necessary to support access to housing by the local population.

These are severe issues that must be addressed by the municipal government. Long-term residents make an irreplaceable contribution to the well-being of an urban environment through their daily investment in its social, political and economic life. This effect is particularly important in historic cities, where patterns of daily life and development have long relied on relatively stable populations. While the physical structure of places rooted in tourist activity may accommodate the volatility and capriciousness of vacationers, cities like Venice are far less able to accommodate either intense short-term occupancy or long periods of abandonment during tourist off-seasons.

The loss of a stable resident population may have many consequences for an intricately constructed historic city like Venice. These may include declines in safety, economic and political stability, and the material quality of the residential fabric itself. Currently, a significant number of Venice’s homes are either closed for a great portion of the year, or are subject to a rapid succession of short-term visitors. Such use patterns fail to provide adequate support for neighborhood grocery stores or other resident-oriented services. Instead, a monoculture of tourist-oriented shops has exacerbated the difficulty of living in the city.

These important issues were discussed at length in Appleyard’s The Conservation of European Cities, and they have been more specifically addressed in relation to Venice by Paolo Ceccarelli.5 In general, they form a basis for the field of Urban Conservation, whose concerns are not exclusively architectural, but have equally to do with the socioeconomic vitality of historic urban communities.

This report contributes to this discussion by explaining how tourist commodification may create a structural problem in the architectural and contractual organization of housing itself. Its first section seeks to explain the decline in Venice’s long-term residential population in relation to changes in both household size and housing capacity. Its second section discusses resulting patterns of housing underutilization and how they are being addressed through government- and non-profit-sponsored conservation programs. In its third section it explores patterns of housing overutilization, and explains how the commodification of residential space for vacation use has changed both the size and contractual disposition of dwelling units in the city. The conclusion addresses the impact of tourist commodification on resident livability, and discusses implications for public policy.

HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND HOUSING CAPACITY

Many authors have cited the drastic decline of Venice’s resident population as a way to explain the dramatic social changes that have occurred in the city over the last half century.4 The city’s population is now only a third of what it was in 1951; while more than 174,800 people lived there just fifty years ago, today the city is home to less than 66,000.7 There is little agreement as to the precise cause of this decline. A multifaceted problem, on the one hand it is linked to changes typical of historic city centers throughout Italy including industrialization, suburbanization, and modernized housing preferences. On the other hand, it derives from changes unique to Venice, such as its geographic location on a lagoon and the transformation of its economy over the past several centuries from mercantile exchange to tourism.

Venice’s population decline is also linked to problems with employment, housing, and even social preference. Thus, even though a large number of people from the metropolitan region travel to the historic center each day to work, their jobs are unlikely to pay a sufficient wage to afford housing there. Even if these same workers would prefer to live in the historic center, it is another question whether they would choose to give up ready access to the mainland automobile culture.

Approaching the issue of population decline from the perspective of households and housing capacity limits discussion to a set of specific questions that can be answered in the scope of this report. What is the specific capacity of the city’s housing stock to accommodate resident households, and how has this changed during the past fifty years? What is being done to improve the condition of vacant and underused housing through conservation? How have the economic changes caused by tourism limited the ability of conservation to improve the housing situation? What policies will be necessary to improve housing capacity and livability for residents in the future?

In relation to the city’s total habitable housing stock, what immediately stands out is how the number of resident
households has declined far less steeply than the total resident population. In comparison to an absolute population decline of 62 percent since 1951, the number of households has dropped only 37 percent. The discrepancy would seem to signal a trend toward smaller family units, resulting in a greater distribution of population among available dwellings. Indeed, in 1951, the average household in Venice was composed of 4.9 members, while today the average household size is 2.0 persons.

Such changes have been shaped both by general social attitudes and local issues directly related to housing occupancy. In social terms, decreased household size reflects a changing expectation for space in Italian cities, a growing standard of living, an aging population, and the propensity for childless or single-child families. However, the effect of these larger trends has been compounded in Venice by a general limitation on housing supply. Indeed, at the time Venice’s population began to decline in the early 1950s, the number of its resident households actually exceeded the number of dwelling units in the city. As a result of such initial overcrowding, the early decades of population decline should actually be characterized as an outward migration from an overcrowded urban center.

Some statistics may help clarify the changing nature of the city’s population decline. In 1951 the coefficient of overcrowding was 1.34 persons per habitable room. But as residents left to seek less crowded conditions elsewhere, that ratio reached 1:1 in 1966. However, by 1969 the motivation to escape an overcrowded city could no longer fully explain the continued exodus. In that year the index of overcrowding in Venice equaled that of other Italian cities (0.81:1) — clearly an important landmark. Nevertheless, the downward demographic trend continued, and in 1984 the number of resident households had declined to where it was actually less than the number of habitable dwelling units. At this point an official surplus of housing came into existence, and under normal circumstances this might have been expected to create a condition of falling prices, which would have encouraged the infiltration of new residents to the city.

Two primary theories were presented to explain the conflicting trends behind Venice’s continued loss of residents following 1984. Either the dwellings were habitable yet unavailable to residents because they were in active use for vacation accommodation, or they were vacant because their owners did not have the resources to maintain them in active use through conservation. During the early years of this trend, however, it was impossible to test these theories because analysis of demographic data provided the primary method for tracking changes in housing use. It was only possible to point out that the number of dwellings continued to exceed an ever-declining number of resident households.

However, by the early 1990s the presence of vacant vs. vacation homes began to be systematically quantified though analysis of utility use. This research involved gathering data on
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**Figure 1.1:** Unadjusted
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**Figure 1.2:** Adjusted for Vacant Dwellings
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**Figure 1.3:** Adjusted for Non-Resident Dwelling Use

*By author based on census data from Il Censimento Generale Della Popolazione, E Delle Abitazioni, ISTAT.*
the amount of gas, water and electricity consumed per household, and tracking whether those who were paying the bills were able to qualify for a reduced resident rate (fig. 2). By 2000, this work revealed that 29.3 percent of utility use was associated with nonresident occupancy, including dwellings occupied intermittently and ones occupied steadily with a non-resident contract. By contrast, long-term residents steadily occupied 61.7 percent of the total housing stock. The remaining 9 percent of dwellings were presumed to be in need of conservation because they had inactive patterns of utility usage.14

In relation to Venice’s capacity to support a stable resident population, the combined demographic and utility data led to some important discoveries. First, despite appearing to be a uniform demographic phenomenon, the overall decline in the city’s population was shown to comprise two very distinct phases. The early decades of the decline relieved overcrowding and placed dwelling densities and household sizes in line with other historic centers in Italy. But since 1984, an apparent housing surplus has done little to slow or reverse a continued population decline because it has been absorbed into two extremes of use.

At one end of the use spectrum, residential properties have clearly been left vacant, a pattern of underutilization that remains linked to problems with building conservation. Indeed, only by addressing problems of structural instability and outdated utilities can such dwellings be returned to active use. However, at the other end of the use spectrum, the data clearly showed a pattern of housing overuse linked to tourist commodification. According to this pattern, the subdivision of dwelling space couples with the segmentation of access into weekly contracts to create an intensification of use that significantly raises the value of dwelling space for tourist occupancy. Such commodification of residential space creates further financial pressure within the entire housing market, based merely on the potential for greater profit by converting long-term resident units to tourist use. When unsupported by increases in local wages, such upward pressure on housing prices has serious implications for resident livability.

CONSERVATION AND HOUSING UNDERUTILIZATION

As mentioned above, housing underutilization remains an important factor behind the continuing decline in Venice’s resident population. Not only do uninhabited dwellings reduce the total number available for long-term residents, but units held off the market also create upward pressure on prices.

In this regard, two government-sponsored conservation programs have sought to stem further population decline. As mentioned above, dwellings in need of conservation were found to comprise about 9 percent of the city’s housing stock. The programs further hope to avoid tourist-market pressures by focusing on units that are either unmarketable or have a limited marketability to nonresident groups. Financed under Italian Law 798/1984, these initiatives address two distinct segments of the “minor” housing stock.15 One program focuses on social housing through the maintenance of publicly owned buildings; the other addresses privately owned ground-floor residential space.16

The conservation of dilapidated and underused government-owned residential buildings provides a direct way to make dwellings available to the most disadvantaged sectors of the city’s population. For example, in partnership with the private foundation Venice in Peril and the British committee of UNESCO, the city has conserved a mostly abandoned seventeenth-century residence in Calle delle Beccarie. The project aimed to transform a structure that had previously provided only precarious shelter for a single household into four highly livable apartments (fig. 3). It thus demonstrated how straightforward conservation can both return underused publicly owned buildings to habitation and provide affordable accommodation for low-income residents.7
As a model, the house on Calle delle Beccarie presents an excellent linkage between livability and conservation goals. However, the potential of such projects is limited because only 4 percent of residential buildings in Venice are owned by a public entity. The purchase of a similar structure on the open market would prove difficult because of the numerous owners involved. In the rare case of a single seller, the cost would surely be prohibitive due to exposure to the vacation market.

The second conservation program, however, is linked to a particular subset of dwellings still available on the open market — ground-floor units exposed to periodic flooding. In Venice such dwellings represent a unique conservation challenge because of the rising frequency of floods and their implications for health and comfort.

Historically, ground-floor space in Venice was not commonly used for habitation because of its high humidity and poor access to light and ventilation. Such space was used most often for storage, office, or retail activity. Nevertheless, ground-floor dwellings do remain as a byproduct of previous periods of overpopulation. Indeed, it has been estimated that there are more than four thousand such ground-floor units in the city, representing 11.5 percent of the total housing stock.

Such dwellings offer the additional benefit of remaining largely free of tourist investment, and 92 percent are currently occupied consistently. Unfortunately, these units are also characterized by a high degree of general degradation, and only 14.2 percent are equipped with the waterproof tub (vasca) needed to prevent inundation during unusually high tides (acqua alta). To the extent that these issues can be resolved through conservation and upgrading, however, the program should have an important impact in terms of stemming the city’s ongoing population decline.

Combined, the two government-sponsored programs described here could potentially affect the affordability and livability of 12–15 percent of the city’s housing supply. Their estimated impact might correlate with a return of up to 3,700 residents and the improvement of housing conditions for approximately 4,000 existing resident households.

COMMODIFICATION AND HOUSING OVERUTILIZATION

Housing overuse related to tourist occupancy is the other problem identified as contributing to the continuing decline of Venice’s resident population. The known percentage of dwellings used for time-share or vacation rental is only 8.4 percent of the current housing market. However, the impact of tourist use extends throughout the remaining market because of informal spatial and contractual arrangements that create the potential for lucrative conversion of conventional resident dwellings.

Most residents and conservationists struggle with affordability indexes that are linked to local costs, wages, and income. In this context, the difference in price between a home in need of restoration and one that has been restored is roughly 1:1.7 on a citywide per-square-meter basis. This 70 percent increase in price presents a significant economic hurdle for most long-term residents, and explains why many people believe conservation is the primary obstacle to affordability. It is, however, not the cost of the conservation work itself that drives up this price, but the value placed by tourists on conserved dwellings.

A study by the author of time-share housing for sale to tourists revealed the relatively small effect of conservation on housing prices (fig. 4). Using a preliminary survey of sale prices, unit plans, and unit areas, it showed that a time-share unit’s total sale price per square meter exceeds the value of unrestored dwelling space by an average factor of 13.6. A similar escalation on account of tourist demand is present in the rental market. While many apartments in the city exceed the locally affordable rent by a factor of 1.5 to 2.5, the study showed the rent a landlord may receive by marketing a unit to tourists may be much higher. Indeed, it is likely the majority of rentals will exceed local affordability indexes precisely because landlords know these same units rented on a weekly basis to tourists will bring rents that exceed affordability by a factor of thirteen.

The significantly greater increase in the value of a unit due to tourist commodification is only partially based on the fact that vacationers have greater financial resources than those working in the local tourist economy. Such a direct relationship would really only apply in the case of second homes, which are bought and sold like any other homes and provide no built-in financial-leverage benefit. What makes time-share housing and tourist rentals additionally valuable is that their occupancy may be structured to accommodate short-term use at higher cost — but with a greater perceived value to tourists. Thus, less affluent vacationers can collectively
purchase a time-share right at a fraction of what it would cost to buy a flat outright. Similarly, rents that would be out of reach on a full-time basis are sustainable for a week or a month as a part of an annual vacation budget. This difference in perceived value and access between tourists and long-term residents is the primary factor behind the inflation of housing costs when units are converted to tourist occupancy.

The value of housing to a permanent resident typically combines the amount of space provided with the longevity of the contract available for access to it (fig. 5). In most markets, the housing space will be sufficient to accommodate a full range of resident needs, including cooking, bathing, sleeping, working, and entertaining guests. Payment for this space is usually made in monthly increments (either through a mortgage or according to a lease), and it is envisioned to encapsulate durations of occupation measured in years and decades. In the case of a conventional residence, the layout of dwelling space will remain unaffected.

In the case of tourist use, however, the value of housing is more incremental in terms of time, and it can be more constrained in terms of space, introducing the opportunity for subdivision. Because of the short duration of stay, the needs of tourists for domestic space are more limited and flexible. Tourists still need spaces for sleeping and bathing, but places for cooking, working, and entertaining are less critical. Indeed, over a short duration it is often preferable to eat meals out of the dwelling, and there may be little need to entertain guests at all. The reduced priority of these spaces is reflected by the fact that in many tourist rentals kitchens become kitchenettes, and many living spaces become multi-use areas designed to convert into sleeping spaces at night.

The conversion of a residential unit in Venice’s Dorsoduro neighborhood provides a good example of the implication of these forces over time. The unit was once a three-bedroom, two-bathroom residence similar to many units in the city. While the dwelling was somewhat unconventional in its typology, the principal architectural elements of a partial sala passante with the kitchen at the back, flanked by supporting rooms, were recognizable (fig. 6.1). A decade ago, however, this original plan was subdivided into two smaller apartments for rental in the tourist market. The smaller of the two units can now accommodate up to four visitors at an average monthly rate of 45 Euro per square meter (fig. 6.3). The larger of the two units contains a full separate kitchen and living space; and although owner-occupied in the past, it too is now being rented to vacationers on the short-term market (fig. 6.2).

From the point of view of a long-term resident family, a subdivision such as this takes what might suffice as a primary residence and partitions it into two largely inadequate

**Figure 4.** Housing cost charts. By author based on sources noted.

**Figure 5.** Housing subdivision diagram. Drawing by author.

### For Sale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Sale</th>
<th>Euro/M²</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Housing Description</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>20.515</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>Time-share</td>
<td>Price per week of ownership for a 36 square meter unit was quoted in person, 27 million x 52/36 = 39 million al mq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>2.582</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>&quot;Restored&quot;</td>
<td>Assessorato alle Polifunzionali Abitative, Osservatorio Quarto Rapporlo (Venice: Comune di Venezia, June 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>&quot;Used&quot;</td>
<td>(Residential) 5-6 milioni al mq, &quot;Usati&quot; 4 milioni al mq, &quot;da Restaurare&quot; 4-2.8 e 3 milioni al mq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>&quot;In need of Restoration&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For Rent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Rent</th>
<th>Euro/M/Mo.</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Housing Description</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Combined Weekly Rental</td>
<td>Price of 1997 Euro per week for 92.6 sq. M reflects average of <a href="http://www.banslayweb.com">www.banslayweb.com</a>: 1997 Euro 92.6 sq.m. = 69 Euro/mq/ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Central Zones</td>
<td>Osservatorio Casa, Secondo Rapporto: Monitor E Apparatiamenti Tematici (Venice: Comune di Venezia, June 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Peripheral Zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Affordable Rent</td>
<td>Giuseppe Santato, Polifunzionali Abitative A Venezia Dall Emergenza Ai Social Housing (Venice: Comune di Venezia, June 1999)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This process in some cases is taken beyond the point of informal subdivision, to the formalized sale of the units as two separate condominiums. The full extent of such informal subdivision is difficult to track from a public-policy perspective. And while most such activity is illegal, it is hard to prohibit since it is largely undetectable from the public realm. But the government has contributed to the permanence of such activity by pardoning it once it takes place. This would explain how, without additional construction, the number of residential units in the city has grown by more than 4,000, while the average unit size has decreased. In 1951 the average dwelling had 4.2 rooms; today the average number of rooms per dwelling is 3.6.

There are two great benefits from such subdivision activity: greater profit for the dwelling owners, and increased value and flexibility for tourists. As can be seen in the case of the subdivided spaces in the Dorsoduro dwelling, vacationers find they can economize on the amount of space they rent by using common areas as secondary sleeping spaces. Thus, while each of the apartments could potentially accommodate only one to two resident adults, as tourist flats they can accommodate up to four. Furthermore, because the smaller units are usable by a greater number of people, they yield greater rental profit for their owners. Smaller units are actually also more profitable than larger ones, as dwellings of less than 60 square meters exceed larger vacation homes in price on a per-meter basis by a factor of 1.5. Indeed, the most profitable units marketed for tourist rental on the three major websites included in this study had an average area of 51.5 square meters, while the least profitable averaged 120 square meters.

Declining overall dwelling-unit size has significant negative implications for resident livability. It is also problematic from a population-stabilization perspective because it discourages residence by growing families with children. A study of first-time homebuyers participating in a housing subsidy program conducted by the Municipality of Venice has revealed...

---

**Figure 6.1** Original Dwelling

**Figure 6.2** Larger Subdivision

**Figure 6.3** Smaller Subdivision

**Figure 7** Three phases of spatial subdivision. Drawing by author.

---
some of these problems. It showed that additional funds were helpful when it came to finding a home that was in a better state of conservation than the housing the buyers left. But the program was less able to provide assistance when it came to finding accommodation of comparable size. The largest group of buyers moved from dwellings of between 75 and 100 square meters to ones of 50 to 75 square meters, and the most frequently voiced complaint was the need for more space.28

Subdivision of dwellings is also not the only way that tourist occupancy affects housing options. While economic segmentation may increase convenience of access to housing for tourists, it makes access more difficult for long-term residents (fig. 8). Such economic segmentation may take place in a wide variety of dwelling types and sizes, and generally involves rapid turnover in occupancy by a series of short-term users. Such a pattern of occupancy is perfect for tourists, who may be glad to purchase or rent housing at inflated prices by the week. But long-term residents can generally only pay for housing on a monthly basis, at prices that must be sustainable for years, or even decades.

Evidence of this shift is most clearly demonstrated in a tourist flat at S. Francesco del Giglio. This 36-sq.m. time-share flat is part of a larger time-share community located in a cluster of “minor” dwellings behind Palazzo del Giglio. In its current configuration, the condo is much too small to accommodate more than a single person or a couple in stable residence (fig. 9). However, this same space may be used by up to four people for weekly periods. By adding up the weekly time-share sales prices for an entire year (approximately 14,000 Euro per share) one arrives at a total value for the property of 738,500 Euro. This equates to a total purchase price per square meter of nearly 20,515 Euro. This price is more than thirteen times greater than the cost of other homes in the city.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESIDENT LIVABILITY

This examination of resident livability in the historic city of Venice is rooted in a study of the capacity and compatibility of vernacular housing to accommodate continued long-term dwelling patterns. From this perspective, the social problems conventionally associated with population decline can be understood as involving a basic incompatibility between the structure of long-term resident households and the impact of unregulated change within the city’s housing markets. It is this evolving crisis that has caused the number of Venetian residents to continue to decline, despite the technical existence of a housing surplus since 1984.

Efforts to reverse this trend today remain focused on issues of affordable conservation, without establishing needed limits to the further expansion of tourist occupancy within the broader housing market. This approach has provided some important improvements by increasing the number of dwelling units available to low-income residents, and by improving the conditions of some dwelling units occupied by long-term residents. However, the potential overall impact of these conservation initiatives is limited because this work affects only the small percentage of housing that is unmarketable (publicly owned), or that has limited marketability to tourists (ground-floor dwellings). Furthermore, there is little sense in expanding conservation strategies to cover a greater portion of the city’s marketable housing because of the inflationary effect of tourist occupancy.

When subject to tourist commodification, the escalation of housing prices far beyond actual conservation costs involves structural changes to the housing itself. These may generally be described as taking two forms: a reduction in dwelling unit sizes, and a shortening of periods of occupancy. The resulting intensification of housing use has effectively removed much of the city’s dwelling space from the market available to meet the needs of long-term residents. The accompanying tables provide a tool that economists, conservationists, and policy-makers can use to understand how tourism forces may modify housing in both informal and official ways that ultimately limit long-term resident access (fig. 10).

Such trends are difficult to counter. No matter how rigorous the inspection mechanism, the informal market through which much of this housing is produced and marketed remains difficult to monitor and control. However, preventing these properties from obtaining formal legitimacy does hold the door open for a program of future buyouts. Once a home is subdivided, a buyout requires the purchase of two properties from two owners to reconsolidate the pieces into a single dwelling. Time-share conversion is even
more difficult to reverse, because a single dwelling might have to be repurchased from 52 co-owners.

It will ultimately be up to municipal governments in tourist centers like Venice to evaluate if enough political will exists to restrict tourist-oriented conversions so that long-term residents can compete for housing on a level playing field with tourists. There certainly is value to encouraging long-term residents to remain in Venice. This value is supported by the ever-increasing number of people who now commute into the historic center to work, and by the existing political will evident in the program to subsidize first-time homebuyers.

But subsidies alone cannot address all the housing imbalances created by the tourist industry. Access to housing for vacation use should be monitored more intensively, and greater disincentives for permanent subdivision should be explored. Such policies should further be targeted toward curbing the conversion of large, historically habitable resident dwellings to time-share and mini-apartment units. However, any formal program must also recognize the limited ability to stop informal subdivision and subletting unless effective monitoring is perceived as part of the common good.
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