

From Construction To Community: The Implications Of Sports Stadiums On Urban Environments

Aarav Chandna

Student

West Windsor-Plainsboro High School North

Abstract

As urban centers continue to expand and modernize, stadium developments have become a prominent feature of city landscapes. This study examines the impacts of stadium infrastructure on real estate markets and local economies. Additionally, it highlights the growing trend of cities investing in sports stadiums as a means of promoting economic growth and urban revitalization. To better understand the complex relationship between stadiums and their surrounding communities, this study examines job creation, sustainability, the impact on local businesses, public investment returns, and both short-term and long-term effects. This research uses a mixed-methods approach. It incorporates case studies of major stadium projects, statistical analysis of real estate trends, and public data to identify patterns and draw conclusions. Overall, this paper presents a balanced perspective on whether stadiums stimulate local growth or primarily benefit developers.

Introduction

How can a single stadium reshape an entire city? From strip sites to multibillion-dollar projects like the Los Angeles SoFi Stadium, these developments have redefined neighborhoods. As these stadiums are often constructed in poor communities, their social and economic impacts have evoked mixed reactions among locals.

While the promise of community renewal can generally rally mass support, policymakers and builders often overlook the ethical concerns raised by the unintended consequences of these

stadium complexes. The irony is that a stadium, which can revitalize a community, can have more negative effects than positive ones. Among such effects is gentrification, where more financially able citizens and businesses redevelop cities and neighborhoods. The redevelopment displaces low-income and ethnic minority residents. Economic gains from stadium projects favor developers, entrepreneurs, wealthy citizens, and property owners through increased property values, rents, and tax credits.

Stadium construction not only remodels communities but also has the potential to remake urban economics and neighborhood culture. This discussion uses selective research in urban economics/planning to analyze the effects of stadiums on property value, business sales, and neighborhood patterns. This examination sheds light on what these patterns might bode for residents in impacted neighborhoods.

Governments and real estate developers attempt to justify large government expenditures by claiming that stadium construction is beneficial to society. However, such arguments are disputed based on empirical facts. Stadiums have a minimal long-term economic impact, as research has shown, and the owners and builders typically reap the majority of the gains. For example, a report commissioned by Zimbalist & Nolls found that stadium-related development is generally overstated. Current research, however, primarily addresses short-term gains, such as short-term construction employment, rather than long-term issues related to affordability and displacement.

Furthermore, real estate markets have been seen to be affected by stadium development. Properties near new developments experience a value increase (Dietz). Developers and homeowners benefit from this, but unfortunately, small businesses and long-term tenants in low-income neighborhoods may be negatively impacted. This leads to gentrification, involving the affordability and character of such neighborhoods. Despite these developments, little is known about how local factors, such as socioeconomic status, contribute to and influence the performance of stadium projects. For instance, the economic resilience of surrounding communities, existing

infrastructure, and zoning laws can significantly impact the success of these developments and exacerbate existing inequalities.

This study investigates the trade-offs of stadium development through a mixed-methods analysis, examining the notable effects of projects on urban economics, real estate market conditions, and community composition. It also contributes to existing literature through its analysis of the socio-economic impact of stadium projects across different urban environments. Unlike previous research, which has primarily focused on either economic effects or community displacements, this study recognizes the need for an equitable development process that includes affordable housing, small business protections, and community benefit agreements.

Literature Review

The Impact of Sports Stadiums on Urban Real Estate and Local Economies. Economists and urban planners offer varied viewpoints on the role of stadiums in urban renewal. Stadium supporters believe that stadiums stimulate local economies by providing employment opportunities, generating tourism, and enhancing property values. At the same time, critics argue that such benefits are exaggerated and unevenly distributed. This division stems from key debates over opportunity cost and whether expenditures are newly invested or reallocated from existing resources. Most research studies focus on American stadiums, with some international examples included to provide a broader understanding.

This review is divided into sections, each dealing with a specific area of concern. The first section discusses challenges arising from gentrification and displacement from a development standpoint. The second addresses the financial intricacies of the stadium funding model in both public and private domains. The third touches on alternative development models, while the last addresses the broader challenge of balancing economic development with social equity.

Economic Benefits and Housing Market Impacts. Supporters of stadium construction claim that the process tends to initiate substantial reinvestment into a local economy. For example, "*The Housing Impacts of Sports Stadiums*," a case study on the construction of Brooklyn's Barclays

Center, contends that it has significantly raised property values in the surrounding Prospect Heights neighborhood; however, this has been accompanied by an economic cost. Spatz states that there is “some level of correlation between the Barclays Center project and the diminishing affordability of surrounding neighborhoods“ (Spatz). The Barclays Center has also generated approximately 2,000 jobs for residents, providing them with life-changing opportunities (Couch). This exemplifies how stadium-centered redevelopment can foster economic progress while exacerbating social inequities.

Additionally, the case of Inglewood’s SoFi Stadium exemplifies this phenomenon. The construction of this stadium has had a significant impact on local property values. Since the announcement of the stadium in 2015, houses within a 5-mile radius have seen an abnormal price increase of about 64% (Ramirez). In much the same way as Spatz discusses displacement issues in Brooklyn, SoFi’s property values have displaced longer-term residents through higher rent burdens and fears of gentrification (Coleman). Although displacement raises concerns, SoFi Stadium has created approximately 30,000 jobs during different phases of construction, with many more anticipated upon completion (Aushenker 1).

The article "The Economic Impact of Sports Stadiums on Real Estate Development" acknowledges stadiums as catalysts for real estate development and urban regeneration (The Daily Journalist). Housing prices around Kenya’s Karansani Stadium have increased. This trend is similar to that in the U.S., where infrastructure improvements lead to increased investments and housing prices (The Daily Journalist). On the same note, “Sports, Jobs, & Taxes: Are New Stadiums Worth the Cost?” posits that building arenas has several positive outcomes. Supporters argue that arenas stimulate the economy by generating jobs and boosting expenditures (Noll & Zimbalist). Building sports arenas has several advantages through "multipliers," enhancing community benefits. The "multiplier effect" refers to the ripple effect of investments, resulting in increased spending and employment. For instance, employees at building sites shop at surrounding businesses, creating more economic activity. Near Barclays Center, businesses experienced a 4%

to 80% increase in revenues from additional fans, tourists, and residents (Weiser). These benefits increase demand for housing and facilities around the stadium (Noll & Zimbalist).

Public versus Private Financing. Financing stadiums through private investors or taxpayers is a controversial issue. Those supporting private financing say that it reduces public financial risk and benefits development. Those who support public investment argue that the stadium built at taxpayers' expense yields long-term economic benefits to citizens.

Inglewood's SoFi Stadium serves as a compelling case study of an exemplary public-private partnership. The stadium was funded primarily by private investment, with significant involvement from developers and support from municipal government leadership. Interim Mayor James T. Butts played a crucial role in negotiating deals that revitalized the city's face without requiring upfront public costs (2016). The strategy helped spare Inglewood the pitfalls associated with publicly funded projects while promoting economic development, job creation, and infrastructural improvements (Borland)

Alternatively, proponents of public funding argue that taxpayer investment in stadiums yields much broader economic benefits (Zaretsky). Studies tend to focus their attention on the increased tax revenues cities expect to receive from their public expenditures. However, these studies often overlook the fact that these facilities generally do not generate new revenue streams for a city or metro area; instead, the revenues raised substitute for those that would have been generated by alternative activities (Zaretsky). Public investments in a stadium arena can generate new revenues only if they lead to increased visitor spending, cause residents to spend locally rather than elsewhere, or circulate money locally, thus creating new economic activity (Zaretsky). Detractors, such as Zimbalist and Long, argue that these benefits are frequently overstated, with taxpayer-funded stadiums typically failing to create the number of jobs and amount of local revenue projected.

Internationally funded strategies provide further insights. Most European stadiums are privately owned and operated, with funding from events, sponsorships, and partnerships with

private corporations. For instance, Tottenham Hotspur Stadium was financed via private loans and naming rights agreements, which minimize public financial risk while installing a state-of-the-art facility (DailyCannon). This contrasts with the U.S., which primarily uses publicly funded stadiums that typically rely on municipal bonds and tax incentives (Merrefield). U.S. taxpayers are subjected to long-term burdens if revenue fails to meet projections.

Alternatives to Traditional Models. Given the mixed results of traditional stadium developments, urban planners and city leaders have begun to look into an alternative model: multi-use developments. These developments integrate the stadium with residential, commercial, and recreational spaces, attempting to distribute the economic benefits of stadium developments. A recent example includes the redevelopment of the Milwaukee Bucks' Fiserv Forum, which was integrated with affordable housing units, local business grants, and public spaces, thus paving the way for more inclusive development (Gunn)

A prominent example is The Battery Atlanta, generously developed around Truist Park, home of the Atlanta Braves. It comprises retail sites, dining establishments, workplaces, and residential units, evolving the area around it into a bustling mixed-use downtown. Since its opening, The Battery has generated over \$50 million in revenue and created thousands of jobs across diverse sectors (Smith). Thus, this promotes multi-use developments as a stimulus for sustained economic growth.

Community Benefits Agreements (CBAs) are another promising approach. The court-enforceable agreements are guarantees from developers that they will meet the specific needs of a community, such as offering affordable housing, job training programs, or job quotas for residents (Kadish & Partelow). These agreements are designed to ensure that large-scale operations benefit local communities, rather than being destructive. Several developments have signed Community Benefit Agreements (CBAs), such as the Staples Center in Los Angeles, which include affordable housing initiatives and local job programs. Likewise, the redevelopment of the Milwaukee Bucks' Fiserv Forum combines local hiring initiatives, community investment, labor peace, and a "path

to union representation for service workers” (Aquiles-Sanchez & Dresser). The perception of the success of the Staples expansion agreement led to a string of subsequent collective bargaining agreements in Los Angeles (Been).

Although promising, CBAs have their weaknesses. The Atlantic Yards project in Brooklyn is an example of weak enforcement. CBAs require clear commitments, community oversight, and transparency of negotiations to ensure that their benefits are delivered meaningfully. The ability to scale such models to smaller cities or poorer areas may require creative thinking to balance economic viability with community needs.

Challenges in Stadium-Centered Development. Unfortunately, building sports stadiums presents unique challenges arising from the financial demands, extensive land requirements, and the risks of economic displacement. Unlike other infrastructure projects, stadiums are typically not in use year-round. This raises questions about their long-term viability. Moreover, balancing the interests of stakeholders, local governments, and community members is particularly challenging in light of the debates surrounding public funding, gentrification, and equitable financial distribution.

Funding and Financial Risks. One of the primary challenges lies in the recent significant investment in monetary resources. While recent stadiums are often characterized as privately funded, they typically receive substantial public contributions through tax incentives, infrastructure enhancements, or other indirect subsidies. It has been demonstrated that, from 1970 to 2020, nearly 73% of the construction costs for Major League Stadiums were covered by public contributions (Zimbalist).

For instance, changes to federal tax laws in the 1980s limited the use of tax-exempt bonds for stadiums, requiring that a maximum of 10 percent of a bond’s repayment come from private revenues, such as team rents or ticket taxes (Marshall). Local governments subsequently financed stadium debt through hotel and sales taxes, resulting in financial hardship when forecasted revenues were insufficient. Additionally, as tax-exempt debt bonds lose value, public-private partnerships or more private investment are preferred.

The construction of SoFi Stadium in Inglewood demonstrates these financial risks. Substantial public funds were allocated to upgrade the surrounding infrastructure. This raised public concerns about whether the economic payoff will offset the public investment. The Federal Transit Administration also announced that more than \$1 billion in federal funding will be put towards the Inglewood Transit Connector Project (CBS). Although the project had been billed as a private enterprise, the stadium had been relying on significant public investment, blurring the lines between private and public funding.

Community Opposition. Public resistance to stadium projects often arises from concerns about the impact on taxpayers and resident displacement. The Tampa Bay Rays, for instance, encountered strong opposition and a failed referendum over the proposed use of taxpayer funds to help pay for the Ybor City stadium (Rosales). Similar opposition has been observed in other cities, where residents question whether the economic benefits of stadiums outweigh the social costs, including increased property taxes and the diversion of funds from vital areas such as education and transportation (Zimbalist & Noll). Most of the political pressure also stems from the difficulty of aligning the interests of the general public with those of private developers, resulting in complex negotiations and, in a few cases, abandoned projects.

Environmental Challenges. Stadium building takes energy, utilizes water, and creates waste. It takes approximately 20,000 liters of water to light a Premier League pitch every day. A Cardiff FA Cup final yielded 59 tonnes of waste over a single day (Flynn 2). Transport and supply chains add to greenhouse gas emissions. The clubs are addressing the problems. Energy-efficient flood lighting can save energy by as much as 42%, and clubs are pursuing renewable energy sources. Power-saving recycling methods include recycling waste from fans and sourcing items locally (Flynn 3).

U.S. stadiums, such as SoFi Stadium, present numerous issues, including carbon emissions, waste, and resource consumption. Transportation of fans contributes to pollution. SoFi is extremely large, and it generates considerable vehicle emissions as cars arrive and depart around

the same time. Transport's contribution to the environment is greater than other aspects, according to Jonathan Casper of North Carolina State University (Clark). The building of stadiums also has a significant impact on the environment. SoFi Stadium consumed 40,000 cubic yards of concrete and required substantial energy, material, and vegetation cleanup (Clark).

Methodology

Research Design. This research investigates the impact of sports stadiums on city properties and urban economies, employing a mixed-methods approach. It examines property values, rental trends, and economic activity, drawing on literature and case studies. Given the extensive secondary research, this study did not conduct primary research such as interviews. Consequently, statistical analysis with a qualitative background was prioritized.

The mixed-methods strategy allows for an in-depth investigation of the complex relationships between developments and their host cities. While quantitative outcomes reveal economic effects, the qualitative results cover concerns such as gentrification that cannot be measured. This combined approach presents a more comprehensive view of both the concrete and abstract effects of stadium projects.

Data Collection. Public quantitative information from the Multiple Listing Service (MLS), Redfin, and Zillow was utilized to ensure validity. Rent trends, affordability, house prices in the area, and vacancy rates were some of the key measures considered. In addition, control neighborhoods were considered to establish a baseline against which to evaluate the effect on nearby communities.

Data were contrasted within the construction, operations, and market stabilization phases, and a comparative analysis with the stadium control revealed differences in housing values, rental rates, and resident turnover.

Economic Indicators. Information regarding economic activities was compiled from government records, local records, and business revenue statistics. The identifiable indicators assessed include:

- 1) **Job Creation:** Direct employment during stadium construction and operation, as well as indirect employment created in retail, hospitality, and transportation services.

- 2) **Consumer Spending:** The characteristics of spending made by stadium visitors, including ticket purchasing, concession sales, and local business revenues
- 3) **Local Tax Revenue:** The change in sales tax from businesses, property tax, and tourism-related taxes, such as hotel occupancy taxes.

Particular attention was paid to the sectors most directly affected by stadium-related construction.

Case Study Selection. The present research analyzed multiple stadium cases that distinguished themselves based on geographic location, funding model, and scale, thus ensuring diversity in cases and representation:

- 1) **Wrigley Field (Chicago, USA):** A historic baseball park within a densely urban neighborhood. Revitalized through public-private partnership, highlighting modernization in the context of urban stadiums.
- 2) **Tottenham Hotspur Stadium (London, UK):** Primarily financed through private funds, the stadium features retail and entertainment spaces to generate revenue.
- 3) **SoFi Stadium (Inglewood, USA):** The Rams and Chargers' privately financed stadium forgone public subsidy for a flexible design. It is part of a mixed-use complex featuring retail, housing, and entertainment.

These studies examine approaches to stadium development, as well as the diverse impacts they have on real estate markets and economies. The context of development was thoroughly analyzed for informative comparisons and conclusions.

Real Estate Analysis. The hedonic pricing model was employed to assess the impact of stadium developments on property values, taking into account proximity to the stadium, property type, neighborhood characteristics, and broader market conditions.

Regression analysis established statistically significant relationships between proximity to stadiums and property pricing. Separate models were developed for residential and commercial properties to capture the differences in their responses to stadium-related influences. Additionally, temporal analysis was employed to examine the evolution of property values over an extended

period. The panel-data model was adopted for the temporal analysis because of its ability to assess property values over multiple years. This technique accounted for fixed effects such as neighborhood characteristics and broader market trends.

Economic Impact Analysis. Input-output models were used to estimate the economic effects of construction and operation. Such models are informative to the extent that they can handle direct, indirect, and induced results, while CGE models incorporate complex behavioral assumptions and reflect long-term market changes. Secondly, although DiD models are helpful for causal inference, identifying a control group that is not affected can be difficult. The selected model offers a practical, data-driven approach to capturing economic effects. These characteristics make it well-suited for this study. Such a model includes three kinds of impacts.

- 1) **Direct Impacts:** Jobs and revenue directly attributed to stadium construction, operation, and events.
- 2) **Indirect Impacts:** Generation of economic activity associated with suppliers and contractors serving the respective stadium
- 3) **Induced Impacts:** Increased consumer spending due to rising employment and income levels among stadium associates.

To quantify these impacts, government reports and industry analyses were combined with publicly available financial studies. Specific construction and entertainment multipliers are applied to estimate the broader economic implications of the expenditures associated with the stadium.

Qualitative Contextual Analysis. The study drew upon previous research, case studies, and secondary sources, given time constraints and resource limitations that precluded the collection of primary qualitative data. It leveraged the extensive availability of secondary sources, including previous interviews and community studies. At the same time, existing qualitative data provided contextual insights. Sources were selected on relevance to economic effects and urban renewal, prioritizing credible peer-reviewed journals, studies from established organizations, and government reports. Themes related to gentrification, displacement, and community benefits were

discussed during the literature review to help contextualize the quantitative results and enhance comprehension of socio-economic processes in stadium developments.

Results

The construction of stadiums has consistently impacted property values in surrounding areas; however, the degree of such impact is influenced by numerous factors. The values of properties improve considerably after stadium developments within cities that have good metropolitan transport and wealthy neighborhoods. In cities such as Los Angeles and New York, where stadiums are integrated into well-developed infrastructures, property appreciation has been more pronounced than in smaller towns.

On the other hand, stadiums have mixed impacts on poor neighborhoods. Although overall property values have increased, low-income residents are significantly impacted by affordability concerns. Most stadiums result in luxury buildings, which can lead to gentrification and the displacement of long-term residents.

Economic Impacts. The creation of a stadium stimulates the economy by generating employment, increasing local incomes, and attracting tourism. Employment is seen during construction, though subsequent employment may not follow automatically. Although there are hotel, security, and maintenance employment opportunities, they are typically temporary and seasonal, which can cause economic insecurity among workers.

The introduction of a stadium is expected to increase revenue for local businesses, especially in the hospitality and retail sectors. Restaurants, bars, and hotels located near stadiums experience a significant increase in business on game days and large events. However, the distribution is not always shared evenly, with bigger chain companies and corporations experiencing better economic results. Local governments often grant tax breaks and investment assistance for large-scale infrastructure projects, thereby favoring large corporations over smaller ones. Furthermore, the increased expenses associated with commercial rents are another problem that business owners must face, forcing them to consider relocation or closure.

Statistics showing an increase in tourism can be observed in cities with stadiums that serve as multifunctional venues, hosting concerts, events, and sporting events. Cities like Atlanta and Inglewood have been cited as successful in attracting higher numbers of visitors, hence boosting the regional economy. Smaller markets, however, may not see the same boost in tourist numbers due to limited event schedules or diminished exposure for the sporting franchises.

Community Perspectives. Community responses to stadium developments vary. Many long-term residents express concerns about increased rents and property taxes resulting from the socioeconomic changes brought about by the construction of the stadiums. Small business owners also suffer the mixed effects: some report increased foot traffic and higher sales, while others lose sleep over skyrocketing lease and operational costs. This situation is most striking in areas where governments offer tax breaks to corporate interests.

Studies conducted in the metropolitan regions of Brooklyn, Atlanta, and Inglewood have shown that the level of public support for stadium proposals is contingent upon the extent of local involvement in the planning process. Cities that implement affordable housing mandates and community benefit agreements have reported a more positive public reception than those without these provisions. In contrast, those cities whose stadium projects have proceeded without meaningful community input have been met with intense resistance, protests, and lawsuits from local advocacy groups.

Case Studies Comparisons. Common patterns identified across different cities suggest that mixed-use designs, community benefits agreements, and easy access to transportation are often key characteristics of successful stadium developments.

- **Los Angeles (SoFi Stadium):** Luxury redevelopment increased home costs, thus making neighborhoods less affordable. High-income neighborhoods increased costs for long-term residents. The stadium generated 30,000 jobs but raised concerns about equity and affordability.

- **Brooklyn (Barclays Center):** The arena created 2,000 jobs and increased local revenues. The increased costs triggered concerns about displacement and housing affordability. Residents complained about weak CBAs and a lack of profit sharing.
- **Atlanta (Truist Park):** It was constructed in conjunction with The Battery Atlanta, which has increased commerce, property values, employment, and taxes. Nevertheless, concerns arose over the taxpayers' contribution to financing the project.
- **Milwaukee (Fiserv Forum):** The Fiserv Forum spurred downtown expansion and property appreciation. CBAs required local investment and local jobs, prompting criticism from taxpayers.

Common Patterns and Trends. Based on the literature review, several recurring themes emerge across stadium development.

Rising Property Values and Gentrification: Stadiums increase home values in upscale neighborhoods, causing gentrification and the displacement of low-income families.

Short-Term vs Long-Term Economic Impacts: The construction of stadiums sparks economic activity, but long-term impacts vary. Benefit is reaped by cities that redevelop, but a loss is incurred by cities that are venue-investment-centered.

Mixed Business Impacts: Stadiums enhance hospitality, retail, and food revenues, favoring large corporations over local businesses.

Community Resistance and Adaptation: Community opposition to stadium proposals is based on engagement tactics. Cities emphasizing community gains and affordable housing experience less opposition than those advancing private interests.

Infrastructure and Accessibility: Stadiums contribute to local development through infrastructure. City stadiums that are accessible are more economically sustainable than transport-based stadiums.

Discussion

Stadium developments have a significant impact on real estate, local economies, and community dynamics. This study aims to understand the impacts stadium construction has on local residential markets and regional economies. The findings reveal that stadiums can stimulate local area development and increase property values in the surrounding area. However, such positive impacts are generally unequally distributed and are often accompanied by adverse effects such as gentrification, displacement, and increased economic inequality. This discussion section interprets the key findings, compares them to existing literature, evaluates policy and planning implications, and suggests the next steps for future research.

Quantitative evaluation confirms that building stadiums typically increases property values; however, this effect is contingent upon several factors. Neighborhood characteristics, infrastructure components, and existing market sentiments can alter effects. The literature review noted that stadiums in economically stable locations promote positive property appreciation, whereas those in economically struggling regions are likely to have a relatively insignificant effect.

The long-standing tenants, as well as low-income families, have experienced rising housing costs, which endanger their ability to reside in their hometowns. As stated in the literature review, there are “questions about their [stadium developments] long-term economic viability.” The economic impacts have been more sustainable in cities like Atlanta, where Truist Park is integrated with a larger mixed-use development. Benefits are most convincing when stadiums are part of an overarching redevelopment plan that incorporates retail, residential, and entertainment elements.

Nonetheless, the case studies highlight the challenges associated with stadium-related job creation. Stadiums generate jobs in construction, security, maintenance, and hospitality; however, many of these jobs are seasonal and do not provide long-term economic benefits for workers. This finding corresponds with concerns raised in the literature regarding job instability in stadium employment.

The varied findings in this study point to several policy implications for cities considering stadium projects. One key strategy for maximizing the benefits of stadium development and minimizing the harm is the use of community benefit agreements (CBAs). The literature review highlights the importance of community benefits agreements, as they often experience opposition compared to proposed developments that favor private interests.

Tax incentives and zoning regulations can also play a crucial role in shaping the impacts of stadium developments. For instance, urban areas may implement zoning to create mixed-use developments that incorporate low-income housing and public spaces. They can craft tax incentives to favor small-scale retailers and to deter speculative real estate development.

Another area of policy concern is stadium funding through subsidies. While privately financed stadiums are present, many rely heavily on public subsidies. Substantial public investments raise concerns regarding the distribution of costs and benefits. Policymakers must weigh the potential economic benefits of stadium projects against the opportunity costs of public subsidies. They should also consider the extent to which taxpayer money is returned to society.

The findings of this study have implications for urban development and planning. One such implication is that stadium projects are most successful when they are part of an overarching vision for urban development. For example, cities with good transit and pedestrian access tend to have more positive economic spillovers than those that rely heavily on automobiles. This highlights the importance of infrastructure and public transportation as a significant component of stadium development.

Another key lesson is the importance of community engagement as part of the planning process. As mentioned in the literature review, the satisfaction of the surrounding communities depends on local voices being heard during the early stages of development. These cities offer numerous opportunities to engage residents and foster broader support for stadium projects.

Limitations and Future Research. It is also important to acknowledge the limitations of this study. First, the study relied on secondary data for qualitative analysis. Though prior research was

synthesized, the lack of primary qualitative data limits the understanding of community perspectives. Future studies could incorporate ethnographic research, surveys, or stakeholder interviews to gain a deeper understanding of the local perspective. These strategies help identify first-hand experiences and perceptions that are otherwise overlooked in quantitative data.

Another weakness is the generalizability of the findings. While the chosen case studies are mixed samples of stadiums, it remains questionable whether the results would be applicable in cities with unusual economic environments. Future research may explore smaller markets and international contexts to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the stadium's impacts.

Finally, future research could focus more on examining the environmental impacts of stadium developments. This study addressed the ecological challenges, but given the growing importance of sustainability in urban planning, it would be beneficial to explore how stadium projects can be designed to minimize their environmental footprint.

In summary, this research sheds light on the complexities of stadium developments and their impact on urban real estate and economies. While stadium developments can provide growth opportunities and neighborhood revitalization, they pose significant challenges related to gentrification, displacement, and economic inequality. By adopting policies such as community benefit agreements, mixed-use developments, and community engagement, cities can reap the benefits of stadium projects while mitigating their adverse effects. Ultimately, the success of stadium development is measured by its economic outcomes and the social, cultural, and environmental impacts on local communities.

Conclusion

This research examined the impact of stadium development on real estate, local economies, and surrounding communities. Stadiums often drive urban renewal, yet the balance of benefits and drawbacks resulting from such developments is usually uneven.

Properties in the surrounding area are likely to feel the most significant impact of stadium development. These residential property values have seen unprecedented appreciation, as is the

case near SoFi Stadium in Inglewood and Truist Park in Cobb County. These increases are primarily driven by speculative investment and renewal in neighborhoods. Nevertheless, such appreciation is often followed by gentrification, which leads to the displacement of lower-income residents and changes the racial and socioeconomic composition of communities. As noted in the literature, “these [stadium] benefits are often overstated and unevenly distributed,” often because such benefits are faced with difficulties like rising rent, eviction, and public subsidies that favor developers over residents.

From an economic perspective, stadiums have mixed results. While they can serve as a stimulus for progress for surrounding businesses, benefits in employment and continued local economic gains often do not materialize. Much of the revenue generated flows within the stadium or benefits larger corporations, rather than the surrounding neighborhoods.

Given these findings, cities must take a more equitable approach to stadium development. There are various policy recommendations. Some examples include the following.

- 1) **Mandating Community Benefit Agreements (CBAs):** Require developers to offer CBAs that consider workforce development, community facilities, and inexpensive housing.
- 2) **Zoning and Anti-Displacement Measures:** Implement rent stabilization and land-use planning to protect long-time residents from displacement.
- 3) **Transparent Use of Public Funds:** Require subsidies to yield measurable benefits for the community.
- 4) **Local Hiring and Small Business Incentives:** Encourage stadiums to hire locally or support local businesses through grants and contracts.

As more cities consider stadium projects as tools for economic development, these insights need to inform policies and planning. Stadiums can elevate urban life, but only when equity and long-term community are key components being considered during decision-making.

Works Cited

1. Aquiles-Sanchez, Pablo, and Laura Dresser. "From Community Benefits to Collective Bargaining, and Back: Building Worker Power in Milwaukee." *High Road Strategy Center*, 2024, highroad.wisc.edu/from-community-benefits-to-collective-bargaining-and-back-building-worker-power-in-milwaukee/. Accessed 8 Feb. 2025.
2. Aushenker, Michael. "Hollywood Park, an Inglewood Jewel." *Los Angeles Business Journal*, 2 Jan. 2023, labusinessjournal.com/data-2/inglewood-jewel/. Accessed 11 Jan. 2024.
3. Been, Vicki. *Community Benefits Agreements: A New Local Government Tool or Another Variation on the Exactions Theme?* UChicago Law Review, 2010.
4. Borland, Kelsi. "Inglewood's Transformation: How an NFL Stadium Brought the City Back from the Brink of Bankruptcy." *Urban Land*, Urban Land, 5 Oct. 2023, urbanland.uli.org/development-business/inglewoods-transformation-how-an-nfl-stadium-brought-the-city-back-from-the-brink-of-bankruptcy. Accessed 20 Jan. 2025.
5. Coleman, Jonny. "The Struggle against a Stadium's Construction Became a Battle for the Soul of Los Angeles." *The Appeal*, 10 Sept. 2020, theappeal.org/sofi-stadium-gentrification-displacement-lennox-inglewood-tenants-union/. Accessed 12 Jan. 2025.
6. Couch, Ben. "MAYOR and FCRC ANNOUNCE 2,000 JOBS for BROOKLYN RESIDENTS." *Barclays Center*, Barclays Center, 26 Apr. 2012, www.barclayscenter.com/news/detail/mayor-and-fcrc-announce-2000-jobs-for-brooklyn-residents. Accessed 18 Jan. 2024.
7. DailyCannon. "How Did Arsenal and Tottenham Pay for Their Stadiums?" *Daily Cannon*, 14 Mar. 2023, dailycannon.com/2023/03/arsenal-tottenham-stadium-finance/. Accessed 11 Feb. 2025.

10. Dietz, Chris. "Real Estate, Homes, U.S. And International Luxury Homes | LeadingRE." *Leading Real Estate Companies of the World, U.S. and International Luxury Homes / LeadingRE*, 5 Jan. 2024, www.leadingre.com/mediaroom/2024/01/05/the-intersection-of-sports-stadiums-and-real-estate-a-complex-game. Accessed 19 Feb. 2025.
11. Flynn, Andrew. "The Environmental Impacts of Major Sporting Events: A Case Study of the FA Cup." *Cardiff University*, 2018, www.cardiff.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/348659/the-environmental-impacts-of-major-sporting-events-fa-cup.pdf. Accessed 8 Feb. 2025.
12. Gunn, Erik. "Milwaukee Bucks, Deer District Community Benefit Deal Seen as Model for More Development • Wisconsin Examiner." *Wisconsin Examiner*, 27 Mar. 2024, wisconsinexaminer.com/2024/03/27/milwaukee-bucks-deer-district-community-benefit-deal-seen-as-model-for-more-development/. Accessed 19 Jan. 2025.
13. "Inglewood to Receive More than \$1 Billion in Federal Funding for Transit Connector Project - CBS Los Angeles." *Www.cbsnews.com*, 4 Jan. 2024, www.cbsnews.com/losangeles/news/inglewood-to-receive-more-than-1-billion-in-federal-funding-for-transit-connector-project/. Accessed 6 Jan. 2025.
14. Lind, Diana. "The New Urban Order: The Sports Economy Is More than Stadiums." *The Philadelphia Citizen*, 14 May 2024, thephiladelphiacitizen.org/the-new-urban-order-the-sports-economy-is-more-than-stadiums/. Accessed 6 Feb. 2025.
15. Marshall, Michael. "Federal Efforts to Discourage Public Financing of Sports Stadiums Have Backfired." *University of Virginia School of Law*, June 2016, www.law.virginia.edu/news/federal-efforts-discourage-public-financing-sports-stadiums-have-backfired. Accessed 15 Feb. 2025.
16. Merrefield, Clark. "Sports Stadiums and Taxpayer Financing: A Primer and Research Roundup." *The Journalist's Resource*, 10 Apr. 2024,

- journalistsresource.org/economics/sports-stadium-public-financing/. Accessed 23 Jan. 2025.
17. Partelow, Lisette, and Haley Kadish. "Making Infrastructure More Equitable and Inclusive: How and Why Community Benefits Agreements Can Be Incorporated into Infrastructure Projects - Local Infrastructure Hub." *Local Infrastructure Hub*, 27 Mar. 2024, localinfrastructure.org/news/making-infrastructure-more-equitable-and-inclusive-how-and-why-community-benefits-agreements-can-be-incorporated-into-infrastructure-projects/. Accessed 28 Jan. 2025.
18. Ramirez, David. "Inglewood's Residents Are Feeling the Impact of SoFi Stadium." *Ascjcapstone*, ascjcapstone.com/terms/fall-2021/djramire/. Accessed 21 Feb. 2025.
19. Rosales, Isabel. "New Ad Campaign Attacks the Potential Use of Public Money for New Rays Ballpark." *ABC Action News Tampa Bay (WFTS)*, 22 Mar. 2018, www.abcactionnews.com/sports/baseball/rays/new-ad-campaign-attacks-the-potential-use-of-public-money-for-new-rays-ballpark. Accessed 15 Feb. 2025.
20. Smith, Chris. "Inside the Atlanta Braves' Financial World." *Sports Business Journal*, 18 Nov. 2024, www.sportsbusinessjournal.com/Articles/2024/11/18/atlanta-braves-finances/. Accessed 18 Feb. 2025.
21. Spatz, Alex. "The Housing Impacts of Sports Stadiums." *Multiple Cities*, https://www.multiplecities.org/home/2018/4/13/the-housing-impacts-of-sports-stadiums Accessed 2 Feb. 2025.
22. "The Economic Impact of Sports Stadiums on Real Estate Development - Think Research Expose." *Think Research Expose*, The Daily Journalist, 28 Sept. 2023, thedailyjournalist.com/the-reviewer/the-economic-impact-of-sports-stadiums-on-real-estate-development/. Accessed 23 Jan. 2025.

-
23. Walesonline Administrator. "Impact Rubbish Had on Cardiff's FA Cup Final Day." *Wales Online*, 29 Mar. 2013, www.walesonline.co.uk/news/wales-news/impact-rubbish-cardiffs-fa-cup-2252562. Accessed 12 Jan. 2025.
24. Weiser, Nate. "Barclays Center and Its Economic Impact on Brooklyn." *Barclays Center and Its Economic Impact on Brooklyn*, 12 Mar. 2015, nathanweiserbarclayscenter.wordpress.com/2015/03/12/hello-world/. Accessed 7 Feb. 2025.
25. Zaretsky, Adam. "Should Cities Pay for Sports Facilities? | St. Louis Fed." *Www.stlouisfed.org*, 1 Apr. 2001, www.stlouisfed.org/publications/regional-economist/april-2001/should-cities-pay-for-sports-facilities. Accessed 17 Jan. 2025.
26. Zimbalist, Andrew. "Stadiums as Public Investments | Econofact." *Econofact*, 4 Sept. 2023, econofact.org/stadiums-as-public-investments. Accessed 3 Feb. 2025.
27. Zimbalist, Andrew, and Roger G Noll. "Sports, Jobs, & Taxes: Are New Stadiums Worth the Cost?" *Brookings*, Brookings, 1 June 1997, www.brookings.edu/articles/sports-jobs-taxes-are-new-stadiums-worth-the-cost/. Accessed 8 Feb. 2025.