Economics Letters 154 (2017) 13–16

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Economics Letters

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ecolet

The risks of nuclear disaster and its impact on housing prices☆

Michihito Ando [a,b,*], Matz Dahlberg [c], Gustav Engström [d]

[a] National Institute of Population and Social Security Research, Japan
[b] Hibiya Kokusai Building 6th Floor 2-2-3 Uchisaiwai-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-0011, Japan
[c] Institute for Housing and Urban Research and Department of Economics, Uppsala University, Sweden
[d] The Beijer Institute of Ecological Economics, at the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, Stockholm, Sweden

HIGHLIGHTS

- We explore the potential effect of the Fukushima disaster on housing prices in Sweden.
- We use data set on housing sales transactions in vicinity of nuclear power plants in Sweden.
- We do not find any disproportionate effect from the Fukushima disaster on housing prices.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 27 September 2016
Received in revised form
20 December 2016
Accepted 8 February 2017
Available online 9 February 2017

JEL classification:
Q51
Q53
R21

Keywords:
Fukushima
Nuclear accident
Housing price
Difference-in-differences

ABSTRACT

Using a data set on housing sales transactions we explore the potential effect of the Fukushima disaster on housing prices in Sweden. In contrast to most earlier findings in other countries we do not find any disproportionate effect from the Fukushima disaster on housing prices in vicinity of nuclear power plants in Sweden.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we use data on individual real estate transactions from the Swedish housing market in order to study whether the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster on March 11, 2011, affected housing prices in the vicinity of nuclear power plants.

The Fukushima accident was big news all over the world, and previous research provides evidence that the Fukushima incident has indeed had an impact on public opinion polls as well as a significant reduction in reported well-being in various countries (Holmberg, 2012; Goebel et al., 2015). The immediate response in most countries was a reduced public support for existing and future proposed plants: The reduced support for nuclear energy was largest in Japan and its surrounding Asian neighbors. Outside Asia, Germany was one of the countries where public opinions were most negatively affected, while the effect on public opinion in the USA and the UK was negligible (Holmberg, 2012). According to public polls conducted in Sweden, the support for nuclear power dropped immediately after the Fukushima accident by 17% and 20%, respectively, compared to earlier polls done in 2008 and 2010 (Holmberg, 2012). An interesting question is thus whether this increase in the awareness of the risks of nuclear disaster has also capitalized onto the housing markets.

Several recent studies have provided quasi-experimental evidence that this may in fact be the case in many countries,

☆ A research grant from Handelsbankens Forskningsstiftelser (P2013-0081:1) is gratefully acknowledged. Engström also acknowledges research support from the Ragnar Söderberg foundation and the Erling–Persson foundation.

* Corresponding author at: National Institute of Population and Social Security Research, Japan.
E-mail addresses: andou-michihito@ipss.go.jp (M. Ando), matz.dahlberg@ibf.uu.se (M. Dahlberg), gustav.engstrom@beijer.kva.se (G. Engström).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2017.02.017
0165-1765/

e.g. Bauer et al. (2014) for Germany, Boes et al. (2015) for Switzerland, and Zhu et al. (2016) for China,[1] while Fink and Stratmann (2015) do not find such an effect in the US. They all exploit the Fukushima nuclear accident as an exogenous shock to local housing or land markets and adopt difference-in-differences (DID) approaches to estimate the impact of the accident on housing or land prices near nuclear plants.

Due to explicit quasi-experimental frameworks, these studies may not suffer from serious endogeneity problems, but other problems still exists. Bauer et al. (2014) and Fink and Stratmann (2015) rely on data attained from public internet platforms where the data source is either approximate or proxies underlying transactions.[2] Using sources such as these thus reduces the precision of estimated values of marginal willingness to pay and may in a worst case scenario lead to biases due to measurement error. The study by Boes et al. (2015) uses data from the rental market also attained from a public internet platform.[3] Apart from being sensitive to divergences between the actual "final" negotiated rent and the announced rent, the rental market may also suffer from more government price manipulation in form of subsidies than ownership housing.[4] Finally, Zhu et al. (2016) examine land markets in China with micro-level transaction data, but they do not directly investigate housing markets. In addition, local governments are the only legitimate sellers in urban land markets in China. Hence the findings of Zhu et al. (2016) may not easily generalize to housing transactions in other countries.

Our study is, to our knowledge, the first to use individual level housing sales transactions to assess the effect of the Fukushima accident on property values in the vicinity of nuclear power plants. We use a DID method and find that the accident did not have a disproportionate effect on property prices in the vicinity of plants; the obtained point estimates are tightly and robustly estimated zeros.

2. Data and empirical strategy

2.1. Data

We use a data set consisting of approximately 80% of all individual transactions of apartments and houses in Sweden covering the period 2010–2012. Each transaction typically contains information on the list price and the final sales price, size/area, number of rooms, plot size, number of floors, construction year, rents as well as geographical coordinates and address information. As a quality control of the data we also geocoded the address to avoid any potential data insertion errors. In addition, we know the exact dates when the objects came on the market and when they were sold. This is important for being able to determine whether an object is considered as treated or not (i.e., whether it was sold before or after March 11, 2011).

To our knowledge, we are the first to study the effect of the Fukushima nuclear disaster using directly reported housing sale transactions. In comparison to earlier studies, the analysis undertaken here is thus less prone to biases as a result of poor data quality. Also, prices on the Swedish housing markets are unregulated in the sense that demand is not skewed due to price regulations or subsidies.

While Table 1 shows some descriptive statistics for our sample categorized by housing type and distance from nuclear plants, Fig. 1 shows price trends for the same categories. The pattern observed in both graphs in Fig. 1 indicates that the important assumption in a DID-framework of common time trends appears to be valid; the price trends seem to be fairly before March 2011 irrespective of housing type and distance to nuclear power plant.[5] Fig. 2 shows the area from which we select the observations that are to be investigated.

2.2. Empirical strategy

To examine the effects of the Fukushima disaster on housing prices in Sweden, we adopt a DID approach using a distance from a nuclear plant as an indicator of treatment intensity. We thus compare housing prices close to and further away from the power plants before and after the Fukushima disaster on March 11, 2011.

The model specification is a semi-log hedonic price function that takes the following form:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha Dist_i + \sum_{\tau \neq 0} \beta_\tau Dist_i \times 1[t = \tau] + \gamma 1[t = \tau] + \mathbf{X}'_{it}\boldsymbol{\theta} + \sigma_s + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where Y_{it} is the log of the selling price, $Dist_i$ is the continuous distance (in meters) from each house i to the closest nuclear power plant, $1[t = \tau]$ is a dummy variable that takes the value of one if $t = \tau$ and zero otherwise (t is measured either by quarter or by month), $\mathbf{X}'_{it}$ contains the control variables listed in Table 1, and σ_s is the spatial fixed effect that is meant to capture some area-specific common shocks in area s. In order to remove confounding idyosyncratic spatial shocks but to leave out sufficient within-area variation caused by the Fukushima accident if it exists, we use congregation-level spatial fixed effect for σ_s in our analysis. In addition, since the analysis for houses contains both permanent houses and vacation houses, we also add an indicator variable for permanent houses to the control variables.

The coefficients of interest are the time varying coefficients β_τ of the interaction term, $Dist_i \times 1[t = \tau]$; before March 11, 2011, β_τ can be seen as placebo-estimates and after March 11, 2011, β_τ can be seen as effects of the Fukushima accident. We estimate Eq. (1) using fixed-effect regressions where the standard errors are clustered by area s.[6]

[1] Boes et al. (2015) find that the Fukushima accident led to a 2.3% price discount on apartment rents in the vicinity of nuclear power plants in Switzerland. Bauer et al. (2014) find a price discount of up to 5% on real estate located near nuclear plants in Germany. Zhu et al. (2016) find that land prices near nuclear plants decreased by around 18% one month after the accident but that this initial impact decays over time.

[2] Bauer et al. (2014) rely on data from the website ImmobilienScout24 which only records asking as opposed to transaction prices. Fink and Stratmann (2015) uses approximate values from the Zillow website (US), including not only house sale prices but also assessment values.

[3] They use data from the Homegate, the largest online advertising platform for rental apartments in Switzerland.

[4] In Switzerland, housing subsidies are granted by the federal government as well as various cantons and municipalities in the rental market (Schneider and Wagner, 2015).

[5] In the empirical analysis, the common trend assumption will be further examined, through the placebo results, in which pre-accident common trends are checked conditional on the covariates.

[6] We have also estimated some variants of Eq. (1) by dropping spatial fixed effects σ_s or replacing spatial fixed effects σ_s with municipality-level fixed effects. We have also estimated a model with a time-invariant coefficient β instead of β_τ in Eq. (1), as well as DID-models using discrete cut-offs at different distances from the nuclear power plants (i.e. discretely splitting the group into "treated" and "untreated", allowing for group-specific time trends). These different specifications do not yield any meaningful differences in our estimation results. All these additional estimation results are available from authors upon request. Regarding the specifications with discrete cut-offs, it shall be noted that, first, there is no natural cut-off in the Swedish case in the sense that there is no public statement from the government in Sweden on what distance from a nuclear power plant that would constitute a risk zone (as in Boes et al., 2015), and, second, for apartments within very small distances from the nuclear power plants, we get a small treatment sample size.