









:

:

:

*



.(Mansfield et al., 2005)

.

•

.(vaezin, 2007

.(Harirchy, 2006)

...

Dallas

Heshmatol)

.

.

.(Luttik, 2000)

.

Zurich

.(Long & Schaeffer, 2001)

.(Lipton, 2003)

.(Wolf, 2004)

Hedonic

.

%

.



.

.

.(Geoghegan, 2002)

.

.(Morancho,2003)

% /

Jim &) .(Jim & Chen, 2006)

•

(Chen,



منطفه مورد مطالعه





.(Dehghanian et al. 1995)

Heshmatol et al. 2007)

.(Vaezin



 $Y(X) = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, ..., X_J, ..., X_n)$ $X_J = f(X_J)$

Hedonic Pricing Method (HPM)

$(\text{GCP})^2$

:

(

. PCI Geomatica V8.1

.(Sabina, 1996) . ()

. (Gregory, 1982)

.(

)

.

ArcGIS 9/2

Ground Control Point Ortho photo mosaic

			1	Pu
		1	1	Wi ()
		1	1	Sz
		1	1	Ag
		1	1	Nunsr
			1	Nsr
		1		fsr
		1	1	Nbd
		1	1	wal
1	1	1	1	NbdSz
		1	1	Bf60
1	1	1		DP
1	1	/		DG

	())		
1	1		Fs	
1	1		AnC	
1	1		Pr	
1	1		Ntel	
1	1		Asn	
1	1		Ff	
1	1		Te	
1	1		He	()
1	1		As	()
1	1		Ex	
1	1		Re	
1	1		Ele	
			Dc	
1	1		Ар	
			Lu	
1	1		Vpg	



•









VIF: Variance Inflation Factor



















:NBDSZ

.

.

$$\begin{split} PU = & \text{imposed} - & \text{imposed} \\ ASN + & \text{imposed} + & \text{imposed} \\ ASN + & \text{imposed} + & \text{imposed} \\ - & \text{imposed} + & \text{imposed} \\ PU = & \text{imposed} + & \text{imposed} \\ ASN + & \text{imposed} + & \text{imposed} \\ ASN + & \text{imposed} + & \text{imposed} \\ PU = & \text{im$$

:FSR

(

:LOGSZ :ASN

:AS

:LOG DP ()

1	1	Fs	**
1	1	AnC	
1	1	Pr	**
1	/	Asn	**
1	/	Ff	*
1	/	Te	
1	1	Не	()
1	/	As	()
1	/	Vpg	*
1	/	Wi	()
1	/	Sz	
1	/	Ag	
1	/	Nunsr	
1	/	Nsr	**
1	/	fsr	
1	/	Nbd	*
1	/	wal	**
1	1	NbdSz	*
1	1	Bf60	*
1	1	DP	
1	1	DG	
1	1	sbn	

...

1		ska		
1	1	sjo		
1	1	sfr		
1	1	smn		
1	1	shr		
	:	%	**	%



:*

.







$$d_i = \frac{y_i - y_i}{\sqrt{MSE}} = \frac{y_i - y_i}{SEE}$$
(

i :*d*_i

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \vdots y_{i} & \vdots \\ \vdots MSE & \vdots \\ \vdots SEE & () \end{array}$$

/ (

.

(

· · ·

Mean Square of Error



Empirical Cumulative Distribution Function (ECDF)

(B)			t	VIF	
			1		Constant
		1	/ **	1	FSR
	1	/	/ **	1	ASN
	1	1	/ **	1	LOGSZ
	1	/	/ **	1	AS
		1	/ **	1	LOG DP
		1	*	1	NBDSZ
				% :*	*

:*

%

(R2)			F	
/	1	/	1	**
	-		%	: **





/ .

.

•

.(Morancho, 2003)

.

.

...

.

(Geoghegan. 2002) (Kong et al. 2007)

.

.

%

References

- Bae, C, 2003. The Impact of Seoul's Subway Line 5 on Residential Property Values. Journal of Transport policy, 10: 85-94.

- Bihamta, M.R. 2006. Course Leaflet Linear Regression Analysis. University of Tehran, Agriculture and Natural Resources, Department of Horticultural Sciences and Plant Medicine, ???p.

- Choa, S.H.; N.C. Poudyal and R.K. Robertsa. 2008. Spatial Analysis of the Amenity Value of Green Open Space. Journal of Ecological Economics, 66: 403–416.

- Dehghanian, S. a small change and Ali hat Ahari, 1995. Environmental Economics. University of Mashhad Press, Mashhad, 437 p. (in Persian)

- Geoghegan, J. 2002. The Value of Open Spaces in Residential Land Use. Journal of Land Use Policy, 19: 91-98.

- Gregory, J.H. 1982. Satellite Surveying Map Project Theory geodesy. ???, USA, , ???p.

- Harirchy, P. 2006. Effect of Attractive Urban Green Space Bystanhay on Residential Property Prices. Science Campus, Islamic Azad University, 190p. (in Persian)

- Heshmatol vaezin, S. M. 2007. Economic Evaluation of External Savings Renewable Natural Resources, Requirements and Restrictions. Forest and pasture, 76-77: 58-52. (in Persian)

- Heshmatol Vaezin, S.M.; A. Barkaoui and J.L. Peyron. 2007. Estimating the Value of Standing Timber on the Basis of Parcel Characteristics-the case of Beech in Lorraine Prior to the 1999 Storms. French Journal of Forest, LIX (6): 625-638.

- Jim, C.Y. and W.Y. Chen. 2009. Value of Scenic Views: Hedonic Assessment of Private Housing in Hong Kong. Journal of Landscape and Urban Planning, 91: 226–234.

- Jim, C.Y. and W.Y. Chen. 2007. Consumption Preferences and Environmental Externalities: A Hedonic Analysis of the Housing Market in Guangzhou. Geoforum, 38: 414–431.

- Jim, C.Y. and W.Y. Chen. 2006. Impacts of Urban Environmental Elements on Residential Housing Prices in Guangzhou (China). Journal of Landscape and Urban Planning, 78: 422–434

- Kong, F.; H. Yin and N. Nakagoshi. 2007. Using GIS and Landscape Metrics in the Hedonic Price Modeling of the Amenity Value of Urban Green Space: A Case Study in Jinan City, China. Journal of Landscape and Urban Planning, 79: 240-252.

- Lipton, S.S. 2003. The Value of Public Space, How High Quality Parks and Public Spaces, Create Economic Social and Environmental Value. Chairman, CABE, Department of Landscape, University of Sheffield London, 20p.

- Long, E. and P.V. Schaeffer. 2001. A Comment on the Market Value of a Room with View. Landscape and Urban Planning, Vol.55 (2): 113-120.

- Luttik, L. 2000. The Value of Trees, Water and Open Spaces Reflected by House Prices. Landscape and Urban Planning, vol.48: 161-167.

- Mansfield, C.; K. Subhrendu; McDow W. Pattanayak; R. McDonald and P. Halpi. 2005. Shades of Green: Measuring the Value of Urban Forests in the Housing Market. Journal of Forest Economics, 11:177–

199.

- Morancho, A.B. 2003. A Hedonic Valuation of Urban Green Areas. Journal of Landscape and Urban Planning, 66: 35–41.

- Poudyal, N.C.; D.G. Hodgesa and C.D. Merrett. 2009. A Hedonic Analysis of the Demand for and Benefits of Urban Recreation Parks. Journal of Land Use Policy, 26: 975–983.

- Sabina, F.F.1996. Remote Sensing Principal and Interpretation. 3thd, W.H.Freeman & Company, New York, p.

- Sander, H.; S. Polasky and R.G. Haight. 2010. The Value of Urban Tree Cover: A Hedonic Property Price Model in Ramsey and Dakota Counties. Minnesota, USA, Journal of Ecological Economics, 69: 1646–1656.

- Sander, H. and S. Polasky. 2009. The Value of Views and Open Space: Estimates from a Hedonic Pricing Model for Ramsey County, Minnesota, USA, Journal of Land Use Policy, 26: 837–845.

- Shoaebi, p. 2007. Change of Tariff Protection on Imports of Timber Country of Northern Forests. MSc. Thesis of Forestry and Forest Economics, Faculty of Natural Resources, University of Tehran, Karaj, 98p. (in Persian)

- Tyrvbinen. L. 1997. The Amenity Value of the Urban Forest: An Application of the Hedonic Pricing Method. Journal of Landscape and Urban Planning, 37:211-222.

- Wolf, k.I. 2004. Public Value of Nature Economics of Urban Trees, Parks and Open Space. University of Washington, college of forest resources, 65:80-92.

...

Implicit pricing of urban green space using Hedonic Pricing: (Case study: karaj, Jahanshahr region)

M. Shaaban^{*1}, S. M. Heshmatol Vaezin², M. Makhdoum³, M. Zobeiri³ and J. Feghhi⁴

¹ M.Sc. Graduated of forestry, Faculty of Natural Resources, University of Tehran, Karaj, I.R. Iran

² Assistant prof., Faculty of Natural Resources, University of Tehran, Karaj, I.R. Iran

³ Professor, Faculty of Natural Resources, University of Tehran, Karaj, I.R. Iran

⁴ Associate prof., Faculty of Natural Resources, University of Tehran, Karaj, I.R. Iran

(Received: 10 January 2010, Accepted: 13 March 2011)

Abstract

Environmental characteristics, including the quality of green spaces, constitute one of the determinants of buildings (house & apartment) transaction prices. In this research, impact of urban green space on building's transaction prices (Rials/m2) in Karaj region, District 1 (Jahanshahr), was analyzed. Therefore, a questionnaire concerning building characteristics and transaction prices was developed. The questionnaires were then filled out for all estate agencies in the Jahanshahr region, using all sold building data in 2007. Spatial data and characteristics of green spaces, e.g. percentage of canopy cover, distance to park were measured using aerial photographs and photomap of the study site, as well as Geographic Information System (GIS) software; PCI Geomatica V8.1 and Arc GIS 9/2. Hedonic Pricing Method (HPM), the multivariable regression analysis and stepwise method were then used to estimate a model relating building transaction price to building and green spaces characteristics. Based on the coefficient of determination, the model explained 67 percent of transaction price variability. It is found that green spaces of Jahanshahr parks had a positive and significant impact on transaction price. The result showed that one kilometer distance from the park represented 24 percent decrease in building transaction price. In this study, the impact of building characteristics including apartment floor number, elevator, building size or area, southern facing and the bedroom's number per unit of area on transaction price were found to be significant (p=5%). Apartment floor number and elevator had the highest positive and negative effects on transaction price, respectively. The impact of other green space characteristics, e.g. view to park and garden as well as the percentage of canopy cover were appeared positive but insignificant (p=5%).

Keywords: Hedonic Pricing Method (HPM), Urban green spaces, Distance to park, Building Transaction price, Canopy cover percentage