

International Journal of Scientific Research Updates

Journal homepage: https://orionjournals.com/ijsru/

ISSN: 2783-0160 (Online)



(REVIEW ARTICLE)



Innovative legal frameworks to enhance affordable housing access for marginalized communities in the United States

Oyebimpe Onifade 1,*, Ngozi Samuel Uzougbo 2, Chidinma Favour Chikwe 3 and Ayo Amen Ediae 4

- ¹ Independent Researcher, San Diego, CA, USA.
- ² Independent Researcher; Columbus Ohio, USA.
- ³ Whitman School of Management, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, USA.
- ⁴ International Organization for Migration, Edo State, Nigeria.

International Journal of Scientific Research Updates, 2024, 08(02), 149-156

Publication history: Received on 15 October 2024; revised on 20 November 2024; accepted on 23 November 2024

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.53430/ijsru.2024.8.2.0068

Abstract

Access to affordable housing remains a critical issue in the United States, disproportionately affecting marginalized communities. Current housing policies often fail to address systemic inequities and legal barriers, limiting their effectiveness in ensuring housing accessibility and affordability. This paper explores the current landscape of affordable housing laws, highlighting gaps in federal, state, and local policies. It proposes innovative legal frameworks to address these deficiencies, such as inclusive zoning, community land trusts, and tenant protections. The study also examines barriers to implementation, including stakeholder resistance, political opposition, and financial constraints, and offers strategies to overcome these challenges through collaboration, advocacy, and resource optimization. The paper concludes with actionable recommendations for policy-makers, legal practitioners, and housing advocates to create equitable and sustainable housing systems. By prioritizing inclusive frameworks and addressing systemic barriers, this study aims to contribute to the advancement of affordable housing for marginalized communities.

Keywords: Affordable housing; Marginalized communities; Legal frameworks; Inclusive zoning; Tenant protections; Housing equity

1. Introduction

1.1. Overview of Affordable Housing Challenges

The affordable housing crisis in the United States has deep roots in historical and structural inequities. Post-World War II housing policies, such as redlining and racially restrictive covenants, systematically excluded marginalized groups from homeownership and wealth-building opportunities (Dantzler & Rivera, 2021). These discriminatory practices created lasting disparities in housing access and affordability. These challenges persist in various forms today, such as gentrification, displacement, and exclusionary zoning laws, which often limit affordable housing options in high-opportunity areas (Davies, 2023).

Data underscores the severity of the crisis. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, in 2023, there was a national shortage of approximately 7.3 million affordable and available rental homes for extremely low-income renters (Benfer, 2023). The problem is particularly acute in urban centers, where rental costs continue to rise due to high demand and insufficient supply. Marginalized communities disproportionately bear the brunt of these challenges, with Black and Hispanic households experiencing higher rates of housing cost burdens and homelessness than their white counterparts (Olivet, Dones, & Richard, 2019).

^{*} Corresponding author: Oyebimpe Onifade

The affordable housing crisis is exacerbated by legal barriers that hinder affordable housing development, preservation, and equitable distribution. Exclusionary zoning laws, for instance, restrict multifamily housing in many neighborhoods, perpetuating racial and economic segregation. These laws often prioritize single-family homes, which are less affordable, effectively shutting out lower-income families from high-opportunity areas with better schools, healthcare, and employment prospects (Howell, Mueller, & Wilson, 2019).

Additionally, tenant protections vary widely across states and municipalities, leaving many renters vulnerable to eviction, discrimination, and unsafe living conditions. Marginalized communities often face compounded challenges, as systemic inequities in income, wealth, and access to legal resources make it more difficult to secure and retain housing. Federal housing programs, while critical, are often underfunded and fail to meet the growing demand, further widening the gap between need and availability (Merritt & Farnworth, 2021).

1.2. Objective

In light of these challenges, this paper aims to explore innovative legal frameworks that can improve affordable housing access for marginalized communities. The objective is to identify policies and legal mechanisms that address systemic inequities, promote inclusive development, and prioritize the needs of historically disadvantaged groups. This paper seeks to contribute to the ongoing discourse on housing justice in the United States by analyzing existing laws and proposing new approaches.

Innovative legal frameworks must go beyond traditional approaches to address the multifaceted nature of the housing crisis. These frameworks could include reforms to zoning laws, expanding community land trusts, and implementing stronger tenant protections. They must also incorporate strategies to address underlying inequities, such as disparities in income, wealth, and access to resources.

1.3. Scope

This paper focuses on the intersection of legal innovation and housing accessibility for marginalized communities. While the affordable housing crisis affects millions of Americans, marginalized groups face unique and disproportionate barriers that require targeted solutions. The analysis will emphasize legal strategies that prioritize equity and inclusion, ensuring that the benefits of affordable housing initiatives reach those who need them most.

Moreover, the paper will examine how these legal frameworks can be tailored to address the specific needs of different marginalized populations. For instance, immigrants may require housing policies that consider their unique legal and economic circumstances, while Native American communities may benefit from initiatives that address the historical and ongoing impacts of land dispossession.

The scope also includes exploring the role of stakeholders, including policymakers, legal practitioners, housing advocates, and community organizations, in driving change. Collaborative efforts among these groups are essential for successfully implementing and enforcing innovative legal frameworks. By highlighting best practices and potential challenges, this paper aims to provide a roadmap for creating a more equitable and accessible housing landscape.

2. Current Landscape of Affordable Housing Laws

2.1. Review of Existing Federal, State, and Local Housing Policies

At the federal level, affordable housing policies are largely driven by programs established under the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (Schwartz, 2021). These include the Housing Choice Voucher Program (commonly known as Section 8), which subsidizes rents for low-income families, and public housing programs that provide government-owned affordable housing units. Federal tax credits, such as the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), incentivize private developers to construct or rehabilitate affordable housing units. Despite these efforts, the demand for affordable housing far exceeds supply, with long waitlists for Section 8 vouchers and insufficient funding for public housing maintenance and expansion (Ellen, 2020).

State governments also play a crucial role in shaping affordable housing policies. Many states have enacted programs to supplement federal initiatives, including state-level housing trust funds and tax credits. However, the effectiveness of these programs varies widely depending on political priorities and fiscal capacity. For instance, states like California and New York have made substantial investments in affordable housing, while others lag behind, leaving gaps in support for low-income families (Haberle & Tegeler, 2018).

Local governments, particularly municipalities, are instrumental in implementing zoning and land-use policies that directly impact housing development. Some cities have adopted progressive measures such as inclusionary zoning, which requires developers to include affordable units in new projects. Others have implemented rent control or rent stabilization policies to limit rent increases and protect tenants. Nevertheless, local policies can also contribute to housing inequities, particularly through exclusionary zoning laws that restrict multifamily housing development, often in affluent areas (Monroy et al., 2020).

2.2. Analysis of Gaps and Limitations in Addressing Marginalized Communities' Needs

Despite these policies, marginalized communities often face significant barriers to accessing affordable housing due to systemic inequities and policy shortcomings. One major limitation is the insufficient funding and scale of federal programs. For example, HUD's budget constraints mean that only about one in four households eligible for federal housing assistance actually receives it. This leaves millions of low-income families without the support they need to secure stable housing (Dawkins & Jeon, 2018).

Additionally, exclusionary zoning laws at the local level perpetuate segregation by limiting affordable housing developments in high-opportunity neighborhoods. These laws disproportionately affect marginalized groups, particularly Black and Hispanic families, who are often relegated to lower-opportunity areas with fewer resources and opportunities for upward mobility (Hagins, 2022). Another challenge is the lack of uniform tenant protections across states and municipalities. In some jurisdictions, renters face weak or nonexistent protections against eviction, discrimination, and unsafe living conditions. Marginalized communities, including undocumented immigrants and individuals with criminal records, are particularly vulnerable to exploitation by unscrupulous landlords (Gilman & Green, 2018).

The LIHTC program, while instrumental in increasing the stock of affordable housing, has been criticized for failing to prioritize deeply affordable units for extremely low-income households. Many LIHTC-funded projects are targeted at moderate-income renters, leaving the poorest families without adequate housing options. Moreover, the program's reliance on private developers has led to concerns about the long-term affordability of these units, as affordability requirements often expire after a set period (Wijburg, 2024).

2.3. Trends and Patterns in Housing Affordability and Accessibility

Recent trends in housing affordability and accessibility reveal a growing crisis exacerbated by economic and demographic shifts. The rising cost of housing and stagnant wages have pushed an increasing number of households into housing cost burdens, defined as spending more than 30% of income on housing (Petach, 2022). According to a 2023 report by the Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University, nearly 40 million American households are cost-burdened, with renters disproportionately affected (Mehdipanah, 2023).

Gentrification and displacement represent another troubling trend. The influx of higher-income residents in many urban areas has led to rising rents and property values, displacing long-standing, low-income communities. This dynamic disproportionately impacts marginalized groups, who are often forced to relocate to areas with fewer resources and longer commutes (Schuerman, 2019).

On a positive note, there has been increasing momentum toward adopting more inclusive housing policies in some cities and states. For instance, states like Oregon and California have implemented statewide bans on single-family zoning, allowing for the development of duplexes, triplexes, and other multifamily housing types in traditionally exclusionary areas. Similarly, growing interest in community land trusts and shared equity housing models offers promising alternatives for ensuring long-term affordability and preventing displacement (Nwosu & Ilori, 2024; Ochuba, Adewunmi, & Olutimehin, 2024; Osundare & Ige, 2024). The COVID-19 pandemic also brought renewed attention to the importance of housing stability. Temporary eviction moratoriums and emergency rental assistance programs provided critical relief to millions of renters, highlighting the potential for bold policy interventions. However, the expiration of these measures has left many families vulnerable, underscoring the need for more sustainable solutions (Versey, 2021).

3. Innovative Legal Frameworks: A Theoretical Perspective

3.1. Proposals for New Legal Frameworks or Enhancement of Existing Ones

A critical starting point for innovation is the reform of existing zoning laws. Exclusionary zoning restricts land use to single-family homes in many areas and has long been a barrier to affordable housing development. Legal frameworks should be revised to encourage higher-density developments, such as duplexes, triplexes, and apartment buildings,

particularly in high-opportunity neighborhoods. Statewide policies, like those recently enacted in Oregon and California, serve as potential models, demonstrating the feasibility of eliminating single-family zoning while balancing community concerns.

Another proposal involves expanding the use of inclusionary zoning, which requires developers to incorporate affordable housing units in new residential projects. This approach has proven effective in cities like New York and San Francisco but needs broader adoption and stricter enforcement to ensure it meets affordability targets. Enhancing inclusionary zoning laws to provide greater incentives or penalties for noncompliance can further increase the stock of affordable units.

In addition to zoning reforms, a robust legal framework should prioritize tenant protections. This includes strengthening anti-eviction laws, ensuring rent stabilization, and preventing discriminatory practices. Universal "just cause" eviction laws, which require landlords to provide legitimate reasons for eviction, are vital to this approach. Legal frameworks should also establish mechanisms for rapid resolution of tenant-landlord disputes, reducing the likelihood of displacement and homelessness.

Finally, innovative legal frameworks must address the funding and resource gaps that plague affordable housing programs. Proposals could include increasing federal and state investments in housing trust funds and creating public-private partnerships to finance affordable housing projects. Legal mechanisms should also promote equitable allocation of these resources, targeting areas and populations with the greatest need.

3.2. Integration of Inclusive Zoning, Land Trusts, and Tenant Protections

Inclusive zoning, land trusts, and tenant protections represent three pillars of a comprehensive legal framework to enhance affordable housing access. Inclusive zoning ensures that affordable units are distributed throughout urban and suburban areas, fostering socioeconomic diversity and providing marginalized groups with access to better schools, healthcare, and job opportunities. Municipalities can create mixed-income communities and mitigate segregation by integrating mandatory affordable housing quotas into zoning laws (Lawson & Ruonavaara, 2019).

Community land trusts (CLTs) offer a promising solution to the challenge of long-term affordability. Under this model, nonprofit organizations acquire and manage land for affordable housing development, separating ownership of the land from the housing units. This approach reduces housing costs and prevents speculative market pressures from driving up prices. Legal frameworks should facilitate the expansion of CLTs through tax incentives, grants, and streamlined processes for acquiring public or underutilized land (Lowe, Prochaska, & Keating, 2022).

Tenant protections are essential for safeguarding the rights and stability of renters, particularly in a market where marginalized groups often face discrimination and exploitation. Comprehensive legal frameworks should include rent control policies to limit annual increases, ensuring housing remains affordable for existing tenants. Additionally, laws prohibiting housing discrimination based on race, ethnicity, gender, or immigration status must be rigorously enforced to address systemic inequities (Ayano, 2020).

3.3. Potential Impacts of Innovative Policies on Marginalized Groups

Implementing innovative legal frameworks has the potential to improve housing outcomes for marginalized groups significantly. By reforming zoning laws and promoting inclusive development, these policies can dismantle patterns of segregation and provide marginalized communities with access to high-opportunity neighborhoods. For example, eliminating single-family zoning could increase the supply of affordable housing in suburban areas traditionally closed off to low-income families, offering them better access to quality education and healthcare.

Community land trusts, in particular, have shown promise in stabilizing neighborhoods and empowering marginalized groups. By granting residents a stake in the land, CLTs can foster community ownership and resilience, reducing the risk of displacement due to gentrification. This model also promotes wealth-building among low-income families, as homeowners can retain property equity while ensuring future generations' affordability (Hackett, Saegert, Dozier, & Marinova, 2019).

Strengthening tenant protections can have profound impacts on housing security for marginalized renters. Anti-eviction laws and rent stabilization policies can prevent sudden displacement, allowing families to maintain stability and avoid the cascading effects of homelessness. These protections are especially critical for groups disproportionately affected by housing insecurity, such as single mothers, undocumented immigrants, and individuals with disabilities (Ewim, Komolafe, Ejike, Agu, & Okeke, 2024; Komolafe, Agu, Ejike, Ewim, & Okeke, 2024; Latilo, Uzougbo, Ugwu, Oduro, & Aziza,

2024). Moreover, the broader adoption of innovative policies can stimulate economic growth and community revitalization. Affordable housing developments create jobs, generate tax revenue, and contribute to local economies. By integrating marginalized groups into thriving neighborhoods, these frameworks can also reduce disparities in health, education, and employment outcomes, fostering a more equitable society (Leigh, 2024).

4. Barriers to Implementation and Mitigation Strategies

4.1. Challenges in Adopting and Enforcing Innovative Frameworks

The adoption of innovative housing frameworks often encounters resistance from various stakeholders, including property owners, developers, and local governments. One of the primary challenges is the entrenched opposition to zoning reforms. Many communities, particularly those with high property values, resist changes that could increase density or introduce affordable housing units. This phenomenon, often referred to as the "Not In My Backyard" (NIMBY) syndrome, reflects fears that such developments may lower property values, increase congestion, or alter the character of neighborhoods (Been, 2018).

Political hurdles also pose a significant challenge. Affordable housing reforms frequently become entangled in partisan debates, with disagreements over the role of government in housing markets and the allocation of resources. Political leaders may sometimes be reluctant to support reforms due to pressure from influential interest groups, such as real estate associations or wealthy constituents (Marble & Nall, 2021).

Financial constraints further complicate the implementation of innovative frameworks. Developing affordable housing requires substantial investment, which may be difficult to secure in the face of competing priorities for public funding. Limited federal, state, and local budgets often result in underfunded programs, leaving gaps in affordable housing supply and maintenance (Bakare, Aziza, Uzougbo, & Oduro, 2024; Ebeh, Okwandu, Abdulwaheed, & Iwuanyanwu, 2024).

Another barrier is the lack of administrative capacity and expertise required to enforce new policies effectively. Municipalities with limited resources may struggle to monitor compliance with zoning changes, tenant protections, or other housing regulations, undermining the intended impact of these reforms (Cinar, Trott, & Simms, 2019).

4.2. Stakeholder Resistance, Political Hurdles, and Financial Constraints

Stakeholder resistance is a significant obstacle to the success of affordable housing initiatives. Landlords, developers, and homeowners often view these policies as threats to their financial interests. For example, landlords may oppose rent control measures, arguing that they limit profitability and discourage investment in property maintenance. Similarly, developers may resist inclusionary zoning requirements, perceiving them as added costs that reduce overall project viability (Agyemang & Morrison, 2018).

Political hurdles often arise due to conflicting priorities and the influence of interest groups. Elected officials may prioritize short-term economic gains or appease influential stakeholders over long-term housing equity. For example, opposition from real estate lobbyists can stifle efforts to reform exclusionary zoning laws or increase funding for affordable housing programs. Political polarization further exacerbates these challenges, making building consensus on comprehensive housing reforms difficult.

Financial constraints are perhaps the most pervasive barrier, affecting all aspects of affordable housing development. Insufficient funding for housing programs limits the construction of new units, the rehabilitation of existing stock, and the provision of rental assistance to low-income families. Private sector reluctance to invest in affordable housing compounds this issue, as developers often favor market-rate projects with higher returns (Adabre et al., 2020).

4.3. Strategies for Overcoming Barriers, Including Collaboration and Advocacy

Overcoming these barriers requires a multifaceted approach that leverages collaboration, advocacy, and innovative funding mechanisms. Collaborative efforts between government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and the private sector are essential for addressing stakeholder resistance. By involving diverse stakeholders in the planning and implementation of housing policies, governments can build broader support for reforms. For example, public-private partnerships (PPPs) can incentivize developers to include affordable units in their projects by offering tax credits, grants, or reduced permitting fees (Adekugbe & Ibeh, 2024).

Advocacy and public education are critical tools for countering NIMBYism and building community support for affordable housing. Educating the public about the benefits of inclusive zoning and affordable housing developments can help dispel myths about their negative impacts. Community engagement initiatives, such as town hall meetings and focus groups, can allow residents to voice their concerns and contribute to the planning process, fostering a sense of ownership and cooperation.

To address political hurdles, housing advocates must work to build bipartisan coalitions that prioritize housing equity as a nonpartisan issue. Demonstrating the economic and social benefits of affordable housing—such as job creation, reduced homelessness, and improved public health—can help gain support from policymakers across the political spectrum. Engaging influential stakeholders, such as business leaders and philanthropic organizations, can also amplify advocacy efforts and increase the likelihood of policy adoption (Aminu, Akinsanya, Oyedokun, & Tosin, 2024; Aziza, 2020).

Financial constraints can be mitigated through innovative funding strategies and resource optimization. Governments can establish dedicated housing trust funds at the state and local levels, supported by revenue from real estate transfer taxes, developer impact fees, or general funds. Additionally, leveraging federal resources, such as Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), can attract private investment in affordable housing projects. Alternative financing mechanisms, such as social impact bonds or community investment funds, offer further capital-raising opportunities (Fisher, 2022).

Strengthening administrative capacity is another crucial strategy for overcoming barriers to enforcement. Municipalities can invest in training programs for staff, improve data collection and analysis capabilities, and adopt digital tools to streamline compliance monitoring and enforcement. Partnerships with academic institutions and nonprofit organizations can also provide technical assistance and policy expertise to support local governments (Trinh, Hu, & Pham Phu, 2021).

5. Conclusion

Access to affordable housing continues to be a critical challenge in the United States, particularly for marginalized communities disproportionately affected by systemic inequities. Existing housing policies, while extensive, often fail to address the unique needs of low-income populations, racial minorities, and other disadvantaged groups. Legal barriers and structural inequalities perpetuate housing instability, making it imperative to explore innovative frameworks that can offer equitable solutions. Inclusive zoning policies, community land trusts, and robust tenant protections have emerged as promising approaches to expand access, mitigate displacement, and promote long-term affordability. However, the implementation of these frameworks faces significant hurdles, including political opposition, stakeholder resistance, and financial constraints.

To address these challenges, policy-makers must adopt forward-thinking strategies that prioritize inclusivity and adaptability. Strengthening zoning reforms through incentives, establishing dedicated funding mechanisms such as housing trust funds, and implementing data-driven evaluation systems are essential steps in this process. Legal practitioners also play a crucial role by advocating for tenant rights, pursuing litigation to combat discriminatory practices, and supporting community-led housing initiatives. Additionally, housing advocates can drive change by building grassroots coalitions, raising public awareness, and fostering collaboration between diverse stakeholders. These efforts, when combined, have the potential to dismantle systemic barriers and create a more equitable housing landscape.

Moving forward, it is essential for all stakeholders—policy-makers, legal professionals, and housing advocates—to work collaboratively to address housing inequities. A multi-faceted approach that incorporates innovative legal frameworks and prioritizes the voices of marginalized communities can create sustainable and inclusive housing solutions. Ensuring access to affordable housing is not just a matter of policy but a moral obligation to uphold the principles of equity and social justice. By fostering a commitment to these values, the United States can move closer to a future where every individual has the opportunity to live with security, dignity, and stability.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

References

- [1] Adabre, M. A., Chan, A. P., Darko, A., Osei-Kyei, R., Abidoye, R., & Adjei-Kumi, T. (2020). Critical barriers to sustainability attainment in affordable housing: International construction professionals' perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *253*, 119995.
- [2] Adekugbe, A. P., & Ibeh, C. V. (2024). Innovating service delivery for underserved communities: leveraging data analytics and program management in the US context. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences*, 6(4), 472-487.
- [3] Agyemang, F. S., & Morrison, N. (2018). Recognising the barriers to securing affordable housing through the land use planning system in Sub-Saharan Africa: A perspective from Ghana. *Urban Studies*, *55*(12), 2640-2659.
- [4] Aminu, M., Akinsanya, A., Oyedokun, O., & Tosin, O. (2024). A Review of Advanced Cyber Threat Detection Techniques in Critical Infrastructure: Evolution, Current State, and Future Directions.
- [5] Ayano, M. F. (2020). Tenants without rights: Situating the experiences of new immigrants in the US low-income housing market. *Geo. J. on Poverty L. & Pol'y, 28,* 159.
- [6] Aziza, R. (2020). Developing Securities Markets in Sub-Saharan Africa: Does it Matter? Available at SSRN 3664380.
- [7] Bakare, O. A., Aziza, O. R., Uzougbo, N. S., & Oduro, P. (2024). A human resources and legal risk management framework for labour disputes in the petroleum industry.
- [8] Been, V. (2018). City NIMBYs. Journal of Land Use & Environmental Law, 33(2), 217-250.
- [9] Benfer, E. A. (2023). Housing Is Health: Prioritizing Health Justice and Equity in the US Eviction System. *Yale J. Health Pol'y L. & Ethics, 22*, 49.
- [10] Cinar, E., Trott, P., & Simms, C. (2019). A systematic review of barriers to public sector innovation process. *Public management review*, *21*(2), 264-290.
- [11] Dantzler, P. A., & Rivera, J. D. (2021). Constructing Identities of Deservedness: Public Housing and Post-WWII Economic Planning Efforts. *Law & Ineq.*, *39*, 443.
- [12] Davies, L. (2023). From crisis to crisis: Understanding changes to Victorian rental housing policy from the Global Financial Crisis to COVID-19. RMIT University,
- [13] Dawkins, C., & Jeon, J. S. (2018). Housing cost burden in the housing choice voucher program: The impact of HUD program rules. *Cityscape*, *20*(1), 39-62.
- [14] Ebeh, C., Okwandu, A., Abdulwaheed, S., & Iwuanyanwu, O. (2024). Sustainable project management practices: Tools, techniques, and case studies. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Development, 20*(8), 374-381.
- [15] Ellen, I. G. (2020). What do we know about housing choice vouchers? *Regional Science and Urban Economics, 80,* 103380.
- [16] Ewim, C., Komolafe, M., Ejike, O., Agu, E., & Okeke, I. (2024). A policy model for standardizing Nigeria's tax systems through international collaboration. *Finance & Accounting Research Journal P-ISSN*, 1694-1712.
- [17] Fisher, R. C. (2022). State and local public finance: Routledge.
- [18] Gilman, M., & Green, R. (2018). The surveillance gap: The harms of extreme privacy and data marginalization. *NYU Rev. L. & Soc. Change, 42*, 253.
- [19] Haberle, M., & Tegeler, P. (2018). Coordinated action on school and housing integration: The role of state government. *U. Rich. L. Rev., 53,* 949.
- [20] Hackett, K. A., Saegert, S., Dozier, D., & Marinova, M. (2019). Community land trusts: releasing possible selves through stable affordable housing. *Housing Studies*, *34*(1), 24-48.
- [21] Hagins, G. (2022). Separate and Still Unequal: How Neighborhood Zoning Laws Keep US Schools Segregated. JL & Educ., 51, 1.
- [22] Howell, K. L., Mueller, E. J., & Wilson, B. B. (2019). One size fits none: Local context and planning for the preservation of affordable housing. *Housing Policy Debate*, *29*(1), 148-165.

- [23] Komolafe, M., Agu, E., Ejike, O., Ewim, C., & Okeke, I. (2024). A financial inclusion model for Nigeria: Standardizing advisory services to reach the unbanked. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences P-ISSN*, 2706-9176.
- [24] Latilo, A., Uzougbo, N. S., Ugwu, M. C., Oduro, P., & Aziza, O. R. (2024). Management of complex international commercial arbitrations: Insights and strategies.
- [25] Lawson, J. M., & Ruonavaara, H. (2019). Land policy for affordable and inclusive housing: An international review: Smartland.
- [26] Leigh, N. G. (2024). Planning local economic development: Theory and practice: SAGE publications.
- [27] Lowe, J. S., Prochaska, N., & Keating, W. D. (2022). Bringing permanent affordable housing and community control to scale: The potential of Community Land Trust and land bank collaboration. *Cities*, *126*, 103718.
- [28] Marble, W., & Nall, C. (2021). Where self-interest trumps ideology: liberal homeowners and local opposition to housing development. *The Journal of Politics*, *83*(4), 1747-1763.
- [29] Mehdipanah, R. (2023). Without affordable, accessible, and adequate housing, health has no foundation. *The Milbank Quarterly, 101* (Suppl 1), 419.
- [30] Merritt, B., & Farnworth, M. D. (2021). State landlord–tenant policy and eviction rates in majority-minority neighborhoods. *Housing Policy Debate*, *31*(3-5), 562-581.
- [31] Monroy, A. M., Gars, J., Matsumoto, T., Crook, J., Ahrend, R., & Schumann, A. (2020). Housing policies for sustainable and inclusive cities: How national governments can deliver affordable housing and compact urban development.
- [32] Nwosu, N. T., & Ilori, O. (2024). Behavioral finance and financial inclusion: A conceptual review and framework development. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 22*(3), 204-212.
- [33] Ochuba, N. A., Adewunmi, A., & Olutimehin, D. O. (2024). The role of AI in financial market development: enhancing efficiency and accessibility in emerging economies. *Finance & Accounting Research Journal*, 6(3), 421-436.
- [34] Olivet, J., Dones, M., & Richard, M. (2019). The intersection of homelessness, racism, and mental illness. *Racism and Psychiatry: Contemporary Issues and Interventions*, 55-69.
- [35] Osundare, O. S., & Ige, A. B. (2024). Developing a robust security framework for inter-bank data transfer systems in the financial service sector. *International Journal of Scholarly Research in Science and Technology*, *5*(1).
- [36] Petach, L. (2022). Income stagnation and housing affordability in the United States. *Review of Social Economy*, 80(3), 359-386.
- [37] Schuerman, M. L. (2019). *Newcomers: gentrification and its discontents*: University of Chicago Press.
- [38] Schwartz, A. F. (2021). Housing policy in the United States: Routledge.
- [39] Trinh, L. T. K., Hu, A. H., & Pham Phu, S. T. (2021). Situation, challenges, and solutions of policy implementation on municipal waste management in Vietnam toward sustainability. *Sustainability*, 13(6), 3517.
- [40] Versey, H. S. (2021). The impending eviction cliff: housing insecurity during COVID-19. In (Vol. 111, pp. 1423-1427): American Public Health Association.
- [41] Wijburg, G. (2024). Tax-incentivized housing production and the affordability crisis: International lessons from the low-income housing tax credit program in the United States. *Housing Studies*, *39*(7), 1632-1657.