Land Values and External Obsolescence

by Stanley D. Longhofer, PhD

Abstract

External obsolescence is perhaps one of the most challenging aspects of implementing the cost approach in appraisal. Loss due to external obsolescence is driven by factors outside the property, and it can be difficult to distinguish between external obsolescence of the improvements and a reduction in value of the land. In other words, external obsolescence is prone to double counting. The purpose of this article is to provide guidance as to when such value loss is attributable to the land and when it is attributable to the structure. The discussion demonstrates that external obsolescence can only arise when the existing structure is not the site's highest and best use. As a result, external factors that affect the property's value are attributable to the land if the current use is the property's highest and best use and are attributable to external obsolescence of the building otherwise.

Introduction

Estimating the external obsolescence of a structure is a challenging aspect of implementing the cost approach in appraisal. Because external obsolescence is driven by factors outside the property, it is difficult to distinguish between external obsolescence of the improvements and reductions in value of the land. If the appraiser is not careful, it would be easy to inadvertently double count these outside influences, with their effects showing up both in the land value estimate and the estimated value of the improvements.

This article shows that external obsolescence arises only when the existing structure is not the site's highest and best use. As a result, external factors that affect the property's value are attributable to the land when the current use is optimal and to the external obsolescence of the building otherwise. By paying careful attention to the highest and best use of the site, the appraiser can more accurately allocate the impact of external factors to the land and building value estimates.

This has several important implications for practicing appraisers. First, it provides the analyst with a simple and theoretically rigorous test for determining whether external obsolescence should be applied in the cost approach. A key consideration is whether the current use—in terms of both property type and scale—is the property's highest and best use. If the answer is "yes," then no external obsolescence of the structure is present, and any value change due to the external factor is attributable to the land.

Second, this analysis can help validate the magnitude of estimated external obsolescence if it is present. As shown in the discussion that follows, as long as land value is positive, external obsolescence is simply the difference between the value of the land in its optimal use and its value in the current use. When an appraiser uses traditional methods to estimate external obsolescence, the resulting figure can be compared with this benchmark to verify its reasonableness.

Finally, this analysis provides external confirmation of the land value estimate that may have been derived from another source. If the property's current use is its highest and best use and a large estimate of external obsolescence is required in the cost approach, it may imply that the external land value estimate needs to be reevaluated.

Defining and Measuring External Obsolescence

The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, sixth edition, defines *external obsolescence* as "a type of depreciation; a diminution in value caused by negative external influences and generally incurable on the part of the owner, landlord, or

tenant."[1] In his *Appraisal Journal* article, Thomas Williams, MAI, discusses three categories of external obsolescence: locational (e.g., a neighborhood whose properties are transitioning into a new highest and best use), environmental (e.g., properties affected by a noxious nearby use), and economic (e.g., property rent changes in a location due to changing economic conditions such as oversupply).[2] Because each of these external factors may also affect land values, it can be challenging to determine how they actually affect structure values as opposed to the land itself.[3]

The Appraisal of Real Estate, fifteenth edition, suggests two methods for estimating external obsolescence.[4] When sufficient data is available, the appraiser might use paired data analysis to directly compare similar properties with and without external obsolescence. Second, external obsolescence might be estimated by capitalizing the income loss due to the external factor, either through direct capitalization or discounted cash flow analysis.

Some authors have proposed more specific methodologies for estimating external obsolescence due to special influences such as oversupply within a market[5] or market-wide downturns.[6] At the end of the day, however, each of these methods essentially involves estimating the total value loss due to the external factor and then allocating it between the land and the building in a relatively arbitrary way. The purpose of this article is to provide guidance as to when this value loss is attributable to the land and when it is attributable to the structure.

Perhaps the most practically relevant and theoretically satisfying treatment of external obsolescence can be found in *In Defense of the Cost Approach: A Journey into Commercial Depreciation*.[7] In this excellent book, Nelson Bowes, MAI, provides straightforward techniques for estimating external obsolescence and clearly demonstrates that it is inappropriate to simply allocate the impact of external factors based on a land-to-cost or other arbitrary ratio. All of the book's examples, however, are developed assuming an accurate external land value estimate. The present analysis therefore augments this book by providing a benchmark for validating that the external land value estimate is reasonable given the parcel's highest and best use.

At the heart of the analysis is the residual theory of land values, wherein the value of a parcel is the difference between its market value and fair compensation to the other factors of production. A direct implication of this theory is that the outside factors that might cause obsolescence affect land values first, with structure values being affected only as a byproduct.

Indeed, the urban economic theory that underlies much of appraisal practice is built on the primacy of land values. Thus, to understand external obsolescence, we must first understand how these outside factors affect land values.

Land Values and Highest and Best Use

Appraisers and others involved in real estate generally are quite familiar with the dictum that a parcel's land value is determined by its value under its highest and best use as though vacant, regardless of its current use. An important implication of this idea, however, is less well understood. If the building or structure present on the parcel maximizes the land's value—that is, if the current use is the parcel's highest and best use—then any loss in value due to external factors is attributable to the land, not the building. In other words, external obsolescence of the structure arises if and only if that building is *wrong* for the site.

1. Appraisal Institute, *The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal*, 6th ed. (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2015), s.v. "external obsolescence."

2. Thomas P. Williams, "Categorizing External Obsolescence," *The Appraisal Journal* (April 1996): 148–154.

3. Throughout this article, the term "external factors" is used to refer to anything outside the property that might affect the property's value, either by affecting the value of the land or the value of the structure. In contrast, "external obsolescence" refers *only* to situations where the external factor affects the value of the structure. Thus, some but not all external factors may result in external obsolescence.

4. Appraisal Institute, *The Appraisal of Real Estate*, 15th ed. (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2020), 591–597.

5. MacKenzie S. Bottum, "Estimating Economic Obsolescence in Supply-Saturated Office Markets," *The Appraisal Journal* (October 1988): 451–455. See also MacKenzie S. Bottum and Scott D. Evans, "Supply-Saturation-Induced External Obsolescence: Two Techniques for Quantifying Value Loss," *The Appraisal Journal* (October 1993): 545–552.

6. Mark Galleshaw, "Market-Wide External Obsolescence," *The Appraisal Journal* (October 1991): 519–525.

7. E. Nelson Bowes, *In Defense of the Cost Approach: A Journey into Commercial Depreciation* (Chicago: Appraisal Institute, 2011), e-book.

Exhibit 1 Case Study Example: Vacant Parcel with Office and Retail Potential Uses

	Potential Uses		Scenario 1 Retail rents fall, no change in highest and best use		Scenario 2 Retail rents fall, change in highest and best use	
	Office	Retail	Office	Retail	Office	Retail
Net operating income (*NOI*)	$360,000	$280,000	$360,000	$252,000	$360,000	$224,000
Capitalization rate (*R*)	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%
Market value ($V_O = NOI / R$)	$4,500,000	$3,500,000	$4,500,000	$3,150,000	$4,500,000	$2,800,000
– Construction cost (*C*)	$2,500,000	$1,000,000	$2,500,000	$1,000,000	$2,500,000	$1,000,000
= Land value in use if vacant ($V_{L\,use}$)	$2,000,000	$2,500,000	$2,000,000	$2,150,000	$2,000,000	$1,800,000
Total value (V_O)		$3,500,000		$3,150,000		$2,800,000
– Land value in highest and best use (V_L)		$2,500,000		$2,150,000		$2,000,000
= Building value ($V_B = V_O – V_L$)		$1,000,000		$1,000,000		$800,000
External obsolescence ($EO = V_{L\,office} – V_{L\,retail}$)						**$200,000**

To see this, consider a vacant parcel of land with two potential uses that are legally permissible, physically possible, and financially feasible: office and retail. The details of these uses are summarized in the first column of Exhibit 1. If the property is developed as an office building, its annual net operating income (NOI) would be $360,000. Assuming a market capitalization rate of 8%, the office's total market value would be $4.5 million ($360,000 ÷ 0.08). If it costs $2.5 million to build the office building (and assuming it would be built without any physical deterioration or functional obsolescence), this implies that the land is worth $2 million if it is developed as an office building (the $4.5 million overall value less the $2.5 million in construction costs).

Alternatively, the owner could develop the site as a retail building. A breakdown of land and building values where retail is the highest and best use is depicted in Exhibit 2. This use would generate annual NOI of $280,000, and assuming the same 8% market cap rate, the property's total

market value as a retail building would be $3.5 million ($280,000 ÷ 0.08). Assuming the retail improvements would cost $1 million to build, the land's value in a retail use would be $2.5 million ($3.5 million – $1 million). Because a retail use brings the highest total economic return to the land's owner, the parcel's highest and best use is retail. Indeed, if these two uses were proposed by different developers, the land would be sold to the retail developer because of their willingness to pay more for the parcel.

Suppose that the owner develops the land for retail as described above and then factors external to the property change. The question that needs to be addressed is when such factors would be captured in the land value estimate and when an adjustment for external obsolescence should be applied to the estimated value of the structure.

For example, suppose a change in retail demand at this location causes rents (and hence NOI) to fall by 10%.[8] This scenario is depicted as Scenario 1 in Exhibit 1, which shows that the prop-

8. In this example, it is assumed that the external factor affecting the parcel is a change in market demand. All of the analysis would remain the same if the change in rents (property value) were due to a different external factor such as a change in traffic patterns, environmental concerns, or another externality.

**Exhibit 2** Case Study Example: Land and Building Value with Retail as Highest and Best Use

Notes: $V_{O \, use}$ is the overall value of property in the given use (office or retail); $V_{L \, use}$ is value of land in that use; $V_{B \, use}$ is value of building in that use; and C_{use} is construction cost new of building in that use. Retail is the highest and best use of this parcel because the value of land under this use ($V_{L \, retail} = V_{O \, retail} - V_{B \, retail}$) is higher than its value in an office use.

erty is now worth $3.15 million ($252,000 ÷ 0.08). In other words, market conditions have caused the property's value to drop by $350,000.

In this case, *all* of the lost value is attributable to the land. To see this, note that the cost of constructing the retail building has not changed (it is still $1 million), so if the land were vacant it would be worth $2.15 million to a retail developer ($3.15 million − $1 million). This is still more than what the land is worth as an office (assuming that has not changed), so the property's highest and best use remains retail. Since the land's value is, by definition, its value under its highest and best use as though vacant, the land

value is $2.15 million, or $350,000 less than it was before rents fell, as shown in Exhibit 3. Thus, the entire value loss is attributable to the land, and the "external factors" affecting the property do not result in any external obsolescence to the building.

This will be true as long as retail remains the property's highest and best use. Suppose, however, that retail rents fall even more dramatically, so that the property's annual NOI falls to $224,000; this is shown through Scenario 2 in Exhibit 1 and illustrated in Exhibit 4. In this case, the property's total value falls to $2.8 million ($224,000 ÷ 0.08), making the land worth

Exhibit 3 Case Study Example: Falling Retail Rents, No Change in Highest and Best Use

Notes: $V_{O\ use}$ is overall value of property in the given use (office or retail); $V_{L\ use}$ is value of land in that use; $V_{B\ use}$ is value of building in that use; and C_{use} is construction cost new of building in that use. When rents decline for retail use, the property's overall market value in this use falls as well. Nevertheless, because the highest and best use of parcel remains retail, all of value loss is attributable to land value.

$1.8 million ($2.8 million – $1 million) in a retail use if the property were vacant. This is now lower than what the land would be worth in an office use (still $2 million). As a result, the parcel's highest and best use is now "office," meaning that the land value is $2 million, its value under the parcel's highest and best use as though vacant. The remaining value loss of $200,000 is attributable to the building in the form of external obsolescence (denoted in Exhibit 4 as *EO*).

These two scenarios demonstrate a simple but important fact: a building only suffers from external obsolescence when the property is not in its highest and best use. As long as the current use is the highest and best use, any external factors that change the property's value will affect the land value, not the structure value.

**External Obsolescence
and Development Scale**
On the surface, it might seem that external obsolescence rarely occurs given that many if not most appraisal assignments involve parcels that are already in their highest and best uses. It is important to note, however, that if market conditions change such that the property is no longer developed to the right *scale*, this too can be a

Exhibit 4 Case Study Example: Falling Retail Rents, Change in Highest and Best Use

Notes: $V_{O\ use}$ is overall value of property in the given use (office or retail); V_L is value of land; V_B is value of building; C_{use} is construction cost new of building in that use; and *EO* is building's external obsolescence. If retail rents fall enough that retail is no longer the property's highest and best use, additional value loss accrues to the building in the form of external obsolescence.

form of suboptimal use. That is, if the current structure is not the same size as one that would be built now if the property were vacant, external obsolescence will occur as well.[9]

To see this, consider the residential example shown as the "Baseline Scenario" in Exhibit 5. In that example, the subject property is an older, 1,000-square-foot, single-family home. The home's effective age is 30 years out of an economic life of 50 years. Based on its condition

and age, the house would rent for $1.10 per square foot per month. Assuming a gross rent multiplier (GRM) of 100, the property's market value using the income approach is $110,000 ($1.10 psf × 1,000 sf × 100).

Suppose that the cost of new construction is $150 per square foot. In this case, the existing house would cost $150,000 to construct new. Using the age-life method, the property's physical deterioration is estimated to be $90,000

---

9. Some might argue that the incorrect size of a building should be categorized as functional obsolescence. If the missize is entirely internal to the property, this would be correct. In most instances, however, problems of scale arise because market conditions change the optimal floor-area ratio for a site. These changes in market conditions are external to the site and therefore their impact should be categorized as external obsolescence.

Exhibit 5 Highest and Best Use (HBU) and Development Scale

| | Baseline Scenario | | Market Rents Rise | |
	Current Structure	HBU as Vacant	Current Structure	HBU as Vacant
Building size	1,000 sf	1,500 sf	1,000 sf	1,500 sf
Effective age	30 years	0 years	30 years	0 years
Economic life	50 years	50 years	50 years	50 years
Rent (psf)	$1.10 psf	$2.00 psf	$1.50 psf	$2.40 psf
Monthly rent	$1,100	$3,000	$1,500	$3,600
Gross rent multiplier (GRM)	100	100	100	100
Total value (V_O = Rent × GRM)	$110,000	$300,000	$150,000	$360,000
Construction costs	$150 psf	$150 psf	$150 psf	$150 psf
Construction cost new (sf × cost psf)	$150,000	$225,000	$150,000	$225,000
− Physical deterioration	$90,000	$0	$90,000	$0
= Remaining physical value (*RPV*)	$60,000	$225,000	$60,000	$225,000
Land value under current use ($V_{Lc} = V_O - RPV$)	$50,000	$75,000	$90,000	$135,000
External obsolescence ($V_L - V_{Lc}$)	$25,000		$45,000	
Remaining physical value (*RPV*)	$60,000	$225,000	$60,000	$225,000
− External obsolescence (*EO*)	$25,000	$0	$45,000	$0
= Structure value (V_B)	$35,000	$225,000	$15,000	$225,000
+ Land value (V_L)	$75,000	$75,000	$135,000	$135,000
= Total value (V_O)	$110,000	$300,000	$150,000	$360,000

Notes: V_O denotes the overall value of the property, V_B the value of the structure, V_L the value of the land (under its highest and best use), V_{Lc} the value of the land under the current use, and *RPV* the remaining physical value of the structure (construction cost new less physical deterioration).

[$150,000 × (30 ÷ 50)], while the property's remaining physical value is $60,000. Assuming no functional obsolescence, what remains to be estimated in order to apply the cost approach is (1) the value of the land and (2) any external obsolescence of the building.

The land value is determined by the parcel's highest and best use as though vacant. Suppose that because of changes in market conditions from when the property was first developed, that if this were a vacant lot today its optimal structure would be a 1,500-square-foot house that would rent for $2.00 per square foot per month.[10] This structure would cost $225,000 to build ($150 psf × 1,500 sf) and, recalling that the gross rent multiplier is 100, the property's market value would be $300,000 ($2.00 psf × 1,500 sf × 100). Given this, the implied value of the land under its highest and best use as though vacant—and hence the land's correct value—would be $75,000.

From this it is straightforward to determine the structure's external obsolescence. The remaining physical value of the existing building is its $150,000 construction cost less the physical dete-

10. An astute reader will wonder how this relates to the rent on the existing structure. For internal consistency, here it is assumed that the existing structure's rent is the highest and best use (HBU) rent reduced to account for the property's effective age. Specifically, Current Rent = HBU Rent × [1 − (Effective Age ÷ Economic Life) × (Cost New of HBU ÷ Value of HBU)] = $2.00 psf × [1 − (30 ÷ 50) × ($225,000 ÷ $300,000)] = $1.10 psf.

rioration of $90,000, or $60,000.[11] Subtracting this from the total market value of the parcel shows that the land's value under the current use is $110,000 – $60,000 = $50,000. But as shown above the actual land value is $75,000—its value under the highest and best use as though vacant. The difference, $25,000, is therefore attributable to the structure in the form of external obsolescence. Once again, the external obsolescence exists only because the current use is different from the property's highest and best use. In this example, however, the suboptimal use is due to the *size* of the structure, not its intended purpose.

It is worth noting that when the suboptimality of the existing structure is due to the wrong scale of the building, a rise in market rents can actually serve to *increase* the structure's external obsolescence. To see this, consider what happens in the example above if market rents for a new structure increase by 20% to $2.40 per square foot; this situation is depicted by the "Market Rents Rise" scenario in Exhibit 5. In this case, the optimal structure (highest and best use as vacant) will be worth $360,000 ($2.40 psf × 1,500 sf × 100). The increase in rents has no impact on construction costs, so the entire value increase is attributable to the land, increasing the parcel's land value to $135,000.[12]

Of course, the parcel is not vacant; it has an existing structure. The increase in rent causes the market value of the property in its existing use to rise to $150,000 ($1.50 psf × 1,000 sf × 100).[13] Given the remaining physical value of the structure (which remains unchanged at $60,000), the value of the land under its current use would be $90,000. Nevertheless, the land's actual value is $135,000, its value under its highest and best use as though vacant. The difference between these two values, $135,000 – $90,000 = $45,000, is the structure's external obsolescence, or its value loss due to having the "wrong" structure on the site.

It may seem unusual to have external obsolescence increase when market rents rise. This hap-

pens because the existing structure is not the structure that would be built if the land were vacant. As market rents increase, the "penalty" or value loss from having the wrong structure on the site increases as well. Because this value loss has nothing to do with the land, it is rightly attributed to the structure in the form of external obsolescence.

This phenomenon is directly related to teardowns. If rents continued to rise, land value would rise as well and external obsolescence would increase until the structure value became negative. Eventually, the structure's external obsolescence would become sufficiently large that it would pay the owner to tear it down and replace it with a new, correctly sized structure (in this case, one that is 1,500 square feet).[14]

Practical Implications and Conclusions

The purpose of this article has been to highlight the underlying source of external obsolescence. A structure suffers from external obsolescence if and only if the current use is not the property's highest and best use, whether this is based on the functional use or the scale of the building within a given use.

This idea can be applied in a wide variety of situations where allocating the impact of external factors between land and structure values might otherwise be difficult. For example, in many cases externalities can have opposite impacts on two different potential uses. Consider a single-family home on an arterial street. As traffic on the street increases, it may lower the value of the parcel as a single-family home but increase its value for a retail or office use. Such a change will simultaneously increase the value of the land (assuming the office or retail use is now the highest and best use) but decrease the value of the existing single-family structure. The techniques outlined here can help an appraiser estimate these effects more accurately and transparently.

---

11. For simplicity, it is assumed that the structure has no functional obsolescence. If it did, this would be subtracted here as well.

12. Notice that the parcel's land value rises by more than 20%. This is because the overall value increase is magnified into its land value because of the property's "land leverage"; see Raphael W. Bostic, Stanley D. Longhofer, and Christian Redfearn, "Land Leverage: Decomposing Home Price Dynamics," *Real Estate Economics* (Summer 2007), 183–208.

13. Once again, the new rent of the property is related to its highest and best use rent as outlined in footnote 10.

14. It is worth noting that in cases like this, external obsolescence could exceed the remaining physical value of the structure so that the total structure value is negative. Suppose in the example that the cost of tearing down the existing structure is $15,000. In this case, the structure value could never fall below –$15,000; if it did, the property owner would simply tear down the existing structure and rebuild the optimal one.

Alternatively, consider how the imposition of rent controls might affect the value of an apartment property. To the extent that the rent controls do not change the property's highest and best use, the entire loss in value from this change in the legal environment will be attributable to the land value. If, on the other hand, the parcel's highest and best use changes, at least part of the value loss will be attributable to the structure in the form of external obsolescence.

Finally, suppose that a parcel is affected by a nearby environmental catastrophe. As long as the land still has some positive value after this event, the external obsolescence of the structure will simply be the difference between the land values in the highest and best use and the current use. If, however, the land becomes worthless because of the catastrophe, all remaining value loss will accrue to the structure in the form of external obsolescence.

To restate this article's central thesis, external obsolescence arises when and only when the existing structure is not the site's highest and best use. This simple fact can help practicing appraisers in three ways. First, it allows an appraiser to quickly and simply determine whether external factors are affecting the structure value and,

hence, whether an estimate of external obsolescence will be needed. If the current use is the property's highest and best use in both type and scale, no external obsolescence can be present. All external factors will be captured in the estimated value of the land.

Second, if external obsolescence is present, this analysis provides a reference point for the magnitude of the estimated external obsolescence. In theory, as long as land value is positive in all potential uses, external obsolescence must be equal to the difference between the value of the land in its optimal use and its value under the current use. When an appraiser uses traditional methods to estimate external obsolescence, the resulting figure can be compared to this benchmark to help validate the reasonableness of the estimate.

Finally, the ideas here can help the appraiser determine whether the independent land value estimate derived by other means is internally consistent. If the property's current use is its highest and best use and the appraiser cannot reconcile the cost approach without applying significant external obsolescence to the structure, this raises the question of whether the land value estimate is correct, since all external influences in this instance must be attributable the land.

About the Author

Stanley D. Longhofer, PhD, is a full professor and holds the Stephen L. Clark Chair of Real Estate and Finance in the W. Frank Barton School of Business at Wichita State University. He is also the founding director of the WSU Center for Real Estate, through which he provides research and educational services to real estate professionals in the Central Plains region, and is the author of the Center's annual Kansas Housing Markets Forecast series. He holds a BBA in economics from Wichita State University and MS and PhD degrees in economics from the University of Illinois.
Contact: stan.longhofer@wichita.edu

Additional Resources

Suggested by the Y. T. and Louise Lee Lum Library

Appraisal Institute
- **Education**
  - *General Appraiser Site Valuation and Cost Approach*
  - *Residential Site Valuation and Cost Approach*

- **Lum Library, Knowledge Base [Login required]**
  - Information files—Land and site
  - Information files—Value

- **Publications**
  - *The Appraisal of Real Estate*, fifteenth edition
  - *In Defense of the Cost Approach*