QUESTION 24 – HOUSING

See State Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 187, F.S.)

GOAL (5); POLICY (3) GOAL (16); POLICY (3)

Α.

1. If the proposed development contains residential development, provide the following information on Table 1 for each phase of the development.

See Table 24-1.

2. What number and percent of lots will be sold without constructed dwelling units? What is the extent of improvements to be made on these lots prior to sale?

All units will be sold as constructed dwelling units. All units will be constructed and ready to be occupied upon closing.

3. What will be the target market for the residential development (break down by number, percent and type the number of dwelling units to be marketed for retirees, families, etc.)What portion will be marketed as second or vacation homes?

The majority of the units are expected to be owner-occupied at the time of closing; however, changing market conditions will dictate the ultimate mix of the units. At this time, it is expected that vacation homes and second homes, together with non-owner occupied homes will comprise about 30% of the total mix of housing units.

The Applicant agrees to pay the City's Affordable Housing Linkage Fee and endorses the City's Linkage fee program as a sound and constructive method to address the affordable housing issue. As such, the Applicant is planning to work with the City to have the Affordable Housing Fees paid by the Applicant redeployed within the development. The fees will be used to offset the cost of market rate housing so that it is affordable to target groups. The City's Linkage Fee Ordinance is attached as Attachment 24-1: Linkage Fee Ordinance. (Page 24-1 Revised September 2009 SIN1)

TABLE 24-1 DWELLING UNITS WITHIN DEVELOPMENT							
HOUSING		NUA	ABER OF DW	ELLING UNITS			
COSTS(1)	Single Family	Single Family Apartment Condo Mobile Other TOTAL					
	Townhouse			Home			
Rental-Occupied	θ	θ	θ	0	0	Ð	
DUs (Gross Rent)							
Range							
Owner Occupied	100	θ	3,650	0	θ	3,750	
DUs (Dollar Value)	\$250,000-		\$250,000-			\$250,000-	
Range	\$600,000		\$600,000			\$600,000	
(Table 24-1 F	(Table 24-1 Revised September 2009 SIN1) (Table 24-1 Revised November 2009 SIN2)						

<u>TABLE 24-1</u> <u>Dwelling Units Within Development</u>								
	<u>N</u>	UMBER OF DV	VELLING UNITS		01	T 1 1		
	TownhomesApartmentCondoMobile HomeOtherTotal							
<u>Rental Dwelling</u> <u>Units (DUs)</u>								
<u>Number of</u> <u>Annual DU's/</u> <u>Monthly Rental</u> <u>Rate Range</u>	<u>7 DU's/\$2,650-</u> <u>\$3,800</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>438 DU's/</u> <u>\$1,250-\$2,100</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>445</u>		
<u>Seasonal</u> DU's/Motnhly <u>Rental Rate</u> <u>Range</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>292 DU's/</u> <u>\$2,300-\$3,300</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>292</u>		
Total Rental Units	7	<u>0</u>	<u>730</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>737</u>		
Owner-Occupied								
<u>Retiree</u> <u>DU's/Price</u> <u>Range</u>	<u>20 DU's/</u> <u>\$250,000-</u> <u>\$600,000</u>	<u>0</u>	726 DU's/ <u>\$250,000-</u> <u>\$600,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>746</u>		
Vacation/Second Homes DU's/Price Range	<u>15</u> DU's/\$250,000- <u>\$600,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>523</u> DU's/\$250,000- \$600,000	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>538</u>		
All Other DU's/Price Range	<u>58</u> DU's/\$250,000- <u>\$600,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,671</u> DU's/\$250,000- <u>\$600,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,729</u>		

Total Owner- Occupied DU's	<u>93</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2,920</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,013</u>
<u>Total All Dwelling</u> <u>Units</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,650</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,750</u>

Table 24-1 Revised November 2009 SIN2)

Rental and cost ranges to be determined at the pre-application conference.

The construction of housing units will occur when there is sufficient demand. Currently, the market does not support the construction of residential product. In addition, very few of the total number of units will be constructed over the fashion retail or office space. In later years, when the market justifies residential construction, residential product will be constructed over neighborhood retail space. (Page 24-2 Revised September 2009 SIN1)

B. Indicate and discuss the availability or projected availability of adequate housing and employment opportunities reasonably accessible to the development site. Housing opportunities should be described in terms of type, tenure, and cost range and location within the following circumscribed areas: adjacent, two miles, five miles, ten miles, and within the local jurisdiction or county. Employment opportunities should be described in terms of two digit SIC code numbers located within the local jurisdiction with estimated distances or transit times to the development site.

Per the pre-application conference, this question is deleted.

C. If displacement or relocation of existing residents will occur due to the proposed development, identify the number of people that will be affected, any special needs of these people, and any provisions for addressing the effects of the relocation or displacement of these people, particularly in regards to their ability to find suitable replacement housing.

Per the pre-application conference, this question is deleted.

ATTACHMENT 24-1 LINKAGE FEE ORDINANCE

DIVISION 5. IMPACT FEES*

*Editor's note: Ord. No. 2006-017, § 1, adopted May 11, 2006, amended the Code by changing the title of Div. 5 from "Affordable Housing Program" to "Impact Fees".

Sec. 13-110. Purpose and intent.

The city commission has determined that the public health, safety and general welfare requires the implementation of an affordable housing program for the following purposes:

(1) To implement the goals, policies and objectives of the city's comprehensive plan.

(2) To provide housing opportunities for workforce and lower income families in order to meet the existing and anticipated housing needs of such persons and to maintain a socio-economic mix in the community.

(3) To satisfy the community's obligation to provide that a fair share of the community's housing production is affordable to workforce and lower income families.

(4) To provide for a range of housing opportunities for those who work in the City and who provide the community with essential services but cannot afford to live in the community.

(5) To provide that developments which create additional affordable housing demand within the city share in the responsibility to provide affordable housing.

(Ord. No. 2006-005, § 2, 3-9-06)

Sec. 13-111. Definitions.

The following definitions shall be incorporated into this ordinance for reference purposes:

Affordable/attainable housing. Housing that is affordable to very low, low, and moderate-income persons by not requiring that more than forty (40) percent of household income be spent on housing costs, as further described by the Nexus Study.

Residential construction. Enclosed building and floor areas used for living and habitation including screened porches, recreation rooms, guest houses, but excluding garages, carports, open balconies, screen pool enclosures, cabanas, attics and storage sheds.

Square footage. Square footage shall be calculated in the same method as defined and utilized within the Florida Building Code for gross floor area.

Non-residential construction. Enclosed building and floor areas used for non-residential purposes, but excluding parking decks or garages, carports or covered parking, attics, external mechanical or storage buildings.

Mixed-use project. Any project that contains a development program of residential and non-residential use within the proposed project boundaries and is submitted as such under a mixed-use zoning classification.

(Ord. No. 2006-005, § 2, 3-9-06)

. .

Page 2 of 3

Sec. 13-112. Affordable housing linkage fee.

In order to implement an affordable housing program, an affordable housing linkage fee is hereby established, to be paid at the time of the issuance of building permits for all non-residential development. The amount of the fee is hereby established per the following table:

TABLE INSET:

Type of use	Linkage fee
Industrial	\$0.37 per square foot
Commercial	\$1.36 per square foot
Office	\$0.15 per square foot
Hotel	\$2.42 per square foot
Limited service hotel	\$0.70 per square foot

(Ord. No. 2006-005, § 2, 3-9-06)

Sec. 13-113. Assessment.

The affordable housing linkage fee shall be assessed for all new non-residential construction, non-residential construction within a mixed-use project, building additions and on the renovation of existing buildings and building space when the building permit value of the renovation or improvement exceeds fifty (50) percent of the replacement cost of the building or building space at the time of the construction.

(Ord. No. 2006-005, § 2, 3-9-06)

Sec. 13-114. Alternatives to payment of affordable housing linkage fee.

As an alternative to payment of the housing linkage fee, a developer of non-residential project or mixed-use project may submit a request to produce affordable housing units, which request can be granted in the form of a developer's agreement approved by the city commission.

(Ord. No. 2006-005, § 2, 3-9-06)

Sec. 13-115. Exemptions.

The following buildings constructed within the city shall be exempt from the affordable housing linkage fee:

(1) Non-residential building construction that constitutes the exempt use of property for education, religious, charitable or governmental use, as defined by F.S. ch. 196, or that is used for such purposes by organizations which qualify for exemption from taxation under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended.

(2) Interpretations or doubts as to the applicability of these exemptions shall be decided by the director of development services. Affected parties may appeal any such decision to the city commission.

(3) If a development is exempt from the fee at initial construction, but later converts to a new non-residential development project, the converted square footage will be deemed

net new non-residential square footage and the housing impact fee paid shall be a condition of the building permit certificate of occupancy.

(Ord. No. 2006-005, § 2, 3-9-06)

Sec. 13-116. Independent impact analysis.

A developer may choose to use an independent impact analysis to compute the impact fee due as a result of a development. The development services director shall have the authority to approve or disapprove the person who prepares the draft independent impact analysis on the basis of the person's professional training and experience in preparing development impact analyses. The developer shall be responsible for the preparation of the independent impact analysis which shall be reviewed by the development services department and forwarded to the planning and zoning board and city commission for review and consideration. The requirement to pay the housing impact fee may be adjusted or waived if the developer demonstrates by substantial, competent evidence, that an insufficient nexus exists between the proposed use and the housing impact fee.

(Ord. No. 2006-005, § 2, 3-9-06)

Sec. 13-117. Trust fund established.

(a) An affordable housing linkage fee trust fund is hereby established. All fees collected under this section shall be deposited within this fund, and shall be expended only for those purposes budgeted and authorized by the city commission.

(b) The city commission shall use the funds deposited within the affordable housing linkage fee trust fund for the following purposes:

- (1) Construction of affordable housing units.
- (2) Acquisition of land for affordable housing unit construction.

(3) Assistance for first-time home buyers, following guidelines to be adopted and established by the city commission by resolution.

- (4) Preservation of existing affordable housing supply.
- (5) Rental assistance and relocation assistance.
- (6) Reasonable administrative costs and expenses of the program.

The above list is not exhaustive, and the city commission by resolution may add or remove alternative affordable housing programs.

(Ord. No. 2006-005, § 2, 3-9-06)

ATTACHMENT 24-2 AFFORDABLE HOUSING LINKAGE FEE STUDY AND BROWARD COUNTY MEMO

B C PLANNING COUNCIL

PAGE 03/04





Gretchen + I clea

Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department PLANNING AND REDEVELOPMENT DIVISION 115 S. Andrews Avenue, Room 329K . Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301 . 954-357-8634 . FAX 954-357-8655

- DATE: October 5, 2009
- TO: Henry Sniezek, Executive Director **Broward County Planning Council**
- PMR THROUGH: Peter Ross, Deputy Director Environmental Protection and Growth Management
- FROM: Cathy Randazzo, Director Planning and Redevelopment Division
- Broward County Land Use Plan SUBJECT: Review of Proposed Amendment City of Coconut Creek PCT 09-6

The Broward County Planning and Redevelopment Division (PRD) staff has reviewed proposed amendment PCT 09-6. The subject site is located in the City of Coconut Creek on approximately 500 acres. The amendment proposes:

Current Designation: **Regional Activity Center** Residential: 2,700 multi-family units Commercial: 2,500,000 square feet Office: 850,000 square feet Community Facilities: 303,000 square feet Hotel: 1,300 rooms Recreation and Open Space: 5 acres (minimum) Conservation: 14.7 acres **Regional Activity Center** Proposed Designation:

Residential: 6,450 multi-family units Commercial: 3,300,000 square feet Office: 1,094,500 square feet Community Facilities: 303,000 square feet Hotel: 1,300 rooms Recreation and Open Space: 5 acres (minimum) Conservation: 14.7 acres

Broward County Board of County Commissioners Josephus Eggelietion, Jr. • Sue Gunzburger • Kristin D. Jacobs • Ken Keech • Ilehe Liebernen • Stacy Ritter - John E. Rodstrom, Jr. • Diana Wasserman-Rubin • Lois Wexler www.broward.org

Henry Sniezek, Broward County Planning Council Page 2 October 5, 2009

Item B - Affordable Housing

The estimated net effect will be an increase of 3,750 permitted residential units. The proposed amendment is consistent with Policy 1.07.07 of the Broward County Land Use Plan because it will employ the Affordable Housing Linkage Program of Coconut Creek in order to achieve and/or maintain a sufficient supply of affordable housing.

Item 10 - Hurricane Evacuation Analysis

The amendment site is not located in a Hurricane Evacuation Zone.

Item 11 - Redevelopment Analysis

In addition to its review; of PCT 09-6, PRD staff is responsible for reviewing the City's Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) Redevelopment Plan. The amendment site is not located within a CRA.

Item 12 - Intergovernmental Coordination

The proposed amendment is not adjacent or in close proximity to any county-owned facility/property and/or unincorporated area lands.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (954) 357-6674 or crandazzo@broward.org.

CR/ga

cc: File



AFFORDABLE HOUSING LINKAGE FEES



Final Report January 20, 2006

Strategic Planning Group, Inc. 2453 South Third Street Jacksonville Beach, Florida 32250



COCONUT CREEK AFFORDABLE HOUSING LINKAGE FEES

Submitted to:

City of Coconut Creek 4800 Copans Road Coconut Creek, FL 33063

Submitted by:



Strategic Planning Group, Inc. 2453 South Third Street Jacksonville Beach, Florida 32250 Phone: (800) 213-PLAN www.spginc.org



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1	1
Winter Park	1 •••••	1
San Diego	1	1
The Methodology	1	1
The Relationship Between Job Growth and Population Growth	2	2
The Relationship Between Construction and Job Growth		2
Microeconomic Analysis of Coconut Creek	2	2
Population	3	3
Employment	2	4
Housing	5	5
Land Area Changes	(5
Vacant and Developable Land	7	7
MicroEconomic Jobs Housing Analysis	9	9
Analysis Approach and Framework	<u>9</u>	9
Analysis Steps	1(0
Step 1 – Estimate of Total Employees	1(C
Step 2 – Adjustment for Changing Industries	11	1
Step 3 – Industry Distribution of Employees	11	1
Step 4 – Adjustment from Employees to Employee Households	13	3
Step 5 – Estimates of Employee Households Meeting the Lower Income Definitions	14	4
Step 6 – Estimates of Households that meet HUD Income Criteria (Affordability Mo	odel)
-	18	8
Summary by Income Level	21	1
Adjustment for Commute Relationship	22	2
Summary by Square Foot Building Area	23	3
Total Housing Linkage Costs	23	3
Income and Household size Assumptions	24	4
Current Housing Costs	25	5
Housing Affordability Gap	26	5
Rental Housing Affordability Gap	26	5
Ownership Housing Affordability Gap	26	5
total linkage costs	28	8
Government Assisted Housing Programs	31	1
Federally Funded Programs	31	1
Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME)	31	1
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	31	1
Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Program	31	1
Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program	32	2
HOPE VI	32	2
State Funded Programs	32	2
State Housing Initiated Partnership (SHIP)	32	2
State Apartment Incentive Loan (SAIL) Program	33	3
Florida Homeownership Loan Program (HLP)	33	3
Predevelopment Loan Program (PLP)	33	3



Florida Affordable Housing Guarantee Program	. 33
Multifamily Mortgage Revenue Bond Program	. 34
Single-Family Mortgage Revenue Bond (MRB) Program	. 34

List of Tables

Table 1. Coconut Creek Population Projections	3
Table 2. Demographic Characteristics - Coconut Creek and Broward County	4
Table 3. Employment Characteristics of Coconut Creek and Broward County	5
Table 4. Housing Occupancy – Coconut Creek and Broward County	6
Table 6. Vacant and Developable Land Inventory (Acres) City of Coconut Creek	7
Table 7. Vacant Residential Land Inventory – City of Coconut Creek	8
Table 8. Single-Family Existing Home Sales, Fort Lauderdale MSA, 1993 through 2004	8
Table 9. Affordable Housing Opportunities, City of Coconut Creek	9
Table 10. Estimate of Total New Employees in Prototype Building, 100,000 Sq. Ft	. 11
Table 11. Estimate of Employees after Adjustment	. 11
Table 12. Industrial Distribution of Employees by Land Use Category	. 13
Table 13a. Adjustment from Employee to Employee Households - Industrial	. 14
Table 13b. Adjustment from Employee to Employee Households - Commercial	. 14
Table 13b. Adjustment from Employee to Employee Households - Commercial	. 15
Table 13c. Adjustment from Employee to Employee Households – Office	. 16
Table 13d. Adjustment from Employee to Employee Households – Hotel	. 17
Table 14a. Affordability Analysis of Workers Households Industrial Land Use	. 18
Table 14b. Affordability Analysis of Workers Households - Commercial Land Use	. 19
Table 14c. Affordability Analysis of Workers Households - Office Land Use	. 20
Table 14d. Affordability Analysis of Workers Households - Hotel Land Use	. 21
Table 15. Worker Households by Affordability Level	. 22
Table 16. Worker Households Adjusted for Commute Factor	. 23
Table 17. Housing Demand Impact by Land-Use Type on a Per Square Foot Basis	. 23
Table 18: 2005 HUD Income Limits for Various Household Sizes	. 24
Table 19. Affordable Rents Based on 40% Occupancy Costs	. 25
Table 20. Market Rents	. 26
Table 21. Affordability Gap – Apartment Units (2-bedrooms)	. 26
Table 22. Supportable Housing Prices (1-bedroom to 3-bedroom)	. 27
Table 23. Affordability Gap – Ownership Units (2-bedrooms)	. 28
Table 24. Estimated Linkage Fee Before and After Commute Adjustment (Rental 2-bedroom)) 28
Table 25. Estimated Linkage Fee Summary Based on Affordable Ownership Units (2 bedroe	om)
	. 29
Table 26. Total Linkage Costs per Square Foot by Land Use	. 29
Table 27. Projected Commercial Development – Estimated Potential Revenues	. 30
Table 28. Proposed Linkage Costs per Square Foot by Land Use	. 30
Table 29. Proposed Commercial Development – Estimated Potential Revenues	. 31



COCONUT CREEK AFFORDABLE HOUSING LINKAGE FEES

INTRODUCTION

This linkage analysis and discussion focuses on the relationships among development, growth, employment, income and demand for housing. The analysis yields a connection between new construction of office, industrial, commercial, and hotel buildings and the need for additional affordable housing; a connection that is quantified both in terms of number of units and in terms of subsidy assistance to make units affordable.

The first housing linkage programs were adopted in the cities of San Francisco, California, and Boston, Massachusetts in the mid 1980's. In Florida, only the City of Winter Park has actually enacted linkage fee legislation. However, Lee County, Florida has recently completed a study addressing linkage fees as part of its assessment of affordable housing issues.

WINTER PARK

In 1990, the City of Winter Park enable legislation creating an affordability housing trust fund and establishing an affordability housing fee on all new residential and nonresidential construction in the amount of \$0.15 per square foot of building area. Since 1990, the fee has increased to \$0.50 per square foot. This fee is assessed on all new buildings, additions, and renovations. The City of Winter Park exempts affordable housing projects, residential units containing a set-aside program, and nonresidential construction for civic, educational, charitable, and religious purposes. Also not included are nursing homes and assisted living facilities with the exclusion of retirement homes.

SAN DIEGO

Other notable linkage fee legislation includes the City of San Diego, which assesses different linkage fees for office, hotel and retail, manufacturing, research and development, and warehouse land uses. Residential hotels are exempted from the program, which generates approximately \$33 million in total revenues.

THE METHODOLOGY

The commercial development analysis links new commercial buildings and other workplaces with new employees in the city. These workers demand additional housing in proximity to their jobs, a portion of which needs to be affordable to the workers in lower income households.

While a macroeconomic analysis has been conducted to review the past and projected relationships involving construction, employment, and housing in Coconut Creek, there is also a microeconomic analysis which demonstrates the linkages associated with individual buildings of different land-use types. The microanalysis serves as the basis for quantifying the linkage or quantifying the fee amount.



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB GROWTH AND POPULATION GROWTH

The social issue driving this analysis has been the growth in lower- to moderate-income households. New population growth in most regions of the country occurs primarily as a result of job growth. Over the long term, the vast majority of growth in the State of Florida is job-driven. The arrival of new population creates a secondary demand for jobs in retail and service-related establishments. Growth in Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, and the entire South Florida region is predominantly new-employment driven. While the region had initially grown as a haven for retirement, these retirees required goods and services. New job growth is based on the foundation of existing residents. Most people coming to the region would not come if they could not expect to find employment. Those born in the local area would not stay without jobs. Simply stated, if a region of the country does not maintain job growth, there is an outmigration to regions where job growth is occurring.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSTRUCTION AND JOB GROWTH

Many factors underlie the reasons for growth in employment in a given region; these factors are complex, interrelated, and often associated with forces at a national level. One of the factors is the delivery of new workspace buildings. The commercial development linkage argument does not make the case that the construction of new buildings is solely responsible for growth. However, especially in South Florida, new construction is uniquely important, first, as one of a number of parallel factors contributing to growth, and second, as a unique and essential condition precedent to growth.

As to the first, construction itself encourages growth. When the state economy is growing, the most rapidly growing areas in the state are those where new construction is vigorous as a vital industry. In regions such as South Florida where multiple forces of growth exist, the political and regulatory environment join forces with the development industry to attract growth by providing new work spaces, particularly those of a speculative nature. The development industry frequently serves as a proactive force inducing growth to occur or be attracted to specific geographic areas or locations.

Second, workplace buildings bear a special relationship to growth, different from other parallel causes, in that buildings are a *condition precedent* to growth. Job growth does not occur in modern service economies without buildings to house new workers. Unlike other factors that are responsible for growth, buildings play the additional unique role that growth cannot occur without them. Conversely, it is well established that the inability to construct new workplace buildings will constrain job growth.

MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF COCONUT CREEK

Incorporated in 1967, Coconut Creek is located in the north central portion of Broward County immediately south of Palm Beach County and west of the Florida Turnpike. Coconut Creek is recognized as well-planned community of approximately 49,000 residents. Housing consists of primarily single-family homes, condominiums and townhouses within professionally landscaped communities.



Currently, the City of Coconut Creek is leading a plan to develop a mixed-use, pedestrianfriendly downtown with both residences and shops in the area. The new development, to be named Creek Commons, will be located northwest of the intersection of Sample and Lyons Roads. It is envisioned to accommodate the development of up to an additional 2,700 dwelling units within the City.

POPULATION

Between the 1990 Census and the 2000 Census, Coconut Creek's population increased by more than 16,000 residents. The City's adopted Comprehensive Plan relied on population projections produced by the Shimberg Center in 1999, for the period 2000 through 2010, using BEBR medium-range County projections for the target years. The adopted plan indicates that population within the City is expected to increase by another 6,232 residents between 2000 and 2005, and by 8,309 residents between 2005 and 2010. This represents average annual increases of 2.9% between 2000 and 2005, increasing slightly to 3.3% between 2005 and 2010 (Table 1).

Year Population		Increase	Increase (%)
1990	27,485		
2000	43,566	16,081	58.5
2005	49,798	6,232	14.3
2010	58,107	8,309	16.7
Annual Average	e Population Grow	th (%)	
1990 to 2000	5.9		
2000 to 2005	2.9		
2005 to 2010	3.3		
Source: City of Co			

Table 1.	Coconut	Creek	Population	Projections
----------	---------	-------	------------	-------------

Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005

The 2000 Census indicated that 4.1 % of the City's housing units were for seasonal, recreational or occasional use. This correlates with the 1990 estimates of a seasonal population of 4% of the permanent population. The City's seasonal population appears to be relatively stable and is not expected to change significantly during the planning period.

According to the 1990 Census, the average number of persons per household in Coconut Creek was 2.02 compared with the county-wide average of 2.35. The 2000 Census indicated that this average had increased to 2.16 persons per household in the City, while the County's average increased to 2.45 persons per household.

The comparison of data provided in Table 2 also suggests a slightly older population in the City with an average 41.3 years of age versus 37.8 years of age in the County. The median household income level of the City is also slightly higher than that of the County (\$43,980 versus \$41,691). These numbers, coupled with the increase in persons per household, suggest that there are an increasing number of families entering the City that had been predominately retirement-oriented in its earlier development cycle. As an integration of families into the community continues, the City will begin to mirror the population demographic characteristics of the County.



City of Coconut Creek and Broward County						
2000 Census Coconut Creek Broward Co.						
Total Population	43,566	1,623,018				
Number of Households	20,093	654,445				
Average Person per Household	2.16	2.45				
Median Age	41.3	37.8				

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics – Coconut Creek and Broward County

Source: 2000 Census; Strategic Planning Group, Inc, 2005

EMPLOYMENT

Growth in employment is a key element in the growth of population. New population growth in most U.S. regions occurs primarily as a result of job growth. Over the long term, the vast majority of growth in Florida and its sub-regions is job driven. The arrival of new population creates a secondary demand for jobs in retail outlets and services. Over the years, the growth of the retirement and tourist-related markets in Florida has created a secondary demand for retail and services for those employed in these related industries.

As the need for goods and services increases with the increase in population, the increase in the percentage of the available population for employment increases. Approximately 56.5% of the age-appropriate workforce residing in the City of Coconut Creek is employed, which is just slightly less than that of the County at 59.2%.

Table 3 reflects the employment characteristics of Coconut Creek and Broward County. As a predominately bedroom community, one of many in Broward County, the City employs only about one in ten of it residents (9.1%), compared to 19.4% for the County, reflecting the County's status as a bedroom community to Miami-Dade County. This status is changing as Broward County and its municipalities are gaining more employers and the growth of goods and services to those residing in the County.



2000 Census	Coconu	t Creek	Browar	d Co.
Population 16 years and over	35,916		1,281,478	
As a percent of total population	82.4%		79.0%	
Employment	20,283		758,939	
Employment as a %	56.5%		59.2%	
Work in place of residence	9.1%		19.4%	
Industry		%		%
Agriculture	66	0.3	2,373	0.3
Construction	1,482	7.7	56,496	7.7
Manufacturing	1,308	6.8	50,521	6.9
Wholesale Trade	962	5	34,578	4.7
Retail Trade	3,067	15.7	106,804	14.6
Transportation	848	4.4	42,891	5.9
FIRE	1,962	10.1	69,046	9.5
Professional & Mgmt	2,860	15	88,604	12.1
Education & Healthcare	3,182	16.4	134,872	19
Arts & Entertainment	1,558	8.1	69,535	9.5
Other Services	1,011	5.2	41,307	5.7
Public Administration	1,036	5.4	33,988	4.6
Source: 2000 Census; Strategic Plannin	ng Group, Ind	e, 2005		

Table 3. Employment Characteristics of Coconut Creek and Broward County

It should be also noted that even if housing were available and affordable, it is unlikely that 100% of the people would live and work in the same city. The choice of where one lives depends on many factors (schools, style of housing, types of amenities, and local services, etc.), as well as on where one works.

The composition of the workforce, between the City and the County, in term of the industry in which they work is very much the same. The three leading industry groups are Education and Healthcare (16.4% for the City versus 18.5% for the County), Retail Trade (15.7% versus 14.6) and Professionals and Management Services (15.0% versus 12.1%).

HOUSING

The 2000 Census identified 22,182 housing units in Coconut Creek of which 20,093 units were occupied. The City had a 9.4% vacancy of which 4.1% were determined to be seasonal or recreational units. This compares to the County's 741,043 units, where 11.7% were vacant, of which 6.3% were considered to be seasonal or recreational units, representing a somewhat less stabile housing environment than Coconut Creek.

This can also be seen in the housing tenure comparison between the City and County. Coconut Creek has over 75% ownership compared to Broward County's 69.5%. The City has a higher density of housing than that of the County when looking at types of housing units. Most of Coconut Creek's units are in dwellings of five or more units, which is almost twice the number of single-family units (52.4% to 28.4%), whereas, this ratio is about the same in the County (40.2 versus 40.9%) (Table 4).



	Coconut Creek	Broward County
Housing Occupancy		
Total Housing Units	22,182	741,043
Occupied Units	20,093	654,445
Vacancy (%)	9.4%	11.7%
Seasonal Units (%)	4.1%	6.3%
Housing Tenure		
Owner Occupied (%)	75.5%	69.5%
Renter Occupied (%)	24.5%	30.5%
Type of Units (% of Total)		
Single Family	28.4%	40.9%
Townhouses	6.8%	7.7%
2 units	0.5%	2.7%
3 to 4 units	5.0%	4.5%
5 or more units	52.4%	40.2%
Mobile homes	6.8%	3.6%
Source: 2000 Census; Staretgic Plannin	g Group, Inc., 2005	

Table 4. Housing Occupancy – Coconut Creek and Broward County

Since the 2000 census, building permit activity would suggest a change in the demand for types of housing units. As shown in Table 5 and in comparison to the types of housing units identified in the 2000 Census, there has been an increased level of permit activity for single family and townhouses, representing a demand change in the composure of the housing stock to less density uses (Table 5). For example, while the 2000 Census identifies 28.4% of the housing units being single-family, detached units current building permit activity suggests that 37.5% of all permits being issued are for single-family units. This also holds true for townhouses; 20% of permit activity versus only 6.8% of the 2000 Census housing stock. The only decease has been in the higher densities of multifamily units, which may be explained by the decreasing amounts of developable vacant land available for higher density, multifamily development.

Table 5. Building Permit Activity – City of Coconut Creek, 2000 Census thru Oct. 17.	, 2005
--	--------

	Units	%	Total Value	Avg. Unit Value			
Single Family	800	37.5%	\$94,273,282	\$117,841			
Townhouses	426	20.0%	\$36,325,969	\$85,272			
Mult-Family	908	42.5%	\$43,125,120	\$47,495			
Total	2,134						
Source: City of Coconut Creek: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005							

LAND AREA CHANGES

The total land area within the incorporated limits of Coconut Creek in 2004, as presented in the adopted comprehensive plan, was 7,480 acres. There were several annexations that had been under review since 2002, which became effective in 2004, and were not reflected in the adopted plan. The City has annexed an additional 44 acres, increasing the City's acreage to 7,524. These were all voluntary annexations of unincorporated pockets in the northern section of the City.



This area is characterized primarily by vacant, single-family, estate lots allowing for one dwelling unit per acre. In addition to these annexations, there is one large section and several smaller pockets of unincorporated Broward County north of the City's boundary which are expected to be incorporated into Coconut Creek over the next five years.

VACANT AND DEVELOPABLE LAND

The City's 2005 EAR states that, in 2003, there were approximately 786 acres of land within the city limits either vacant or undeveloped. Of this, approximately 239 acres were in interim agricultural use. Since that time, approximately 121 acres have been developed, and 19 of 44 acres annexed into the City are now developed. Therefore, a total of 140 acres are developed, leaving the current vacant undeveloped land inventory at 690 acres.

Recently, Broward County has identified several vacant properties for preservation. Many of these properties were acquired through the County Preservation Fund or were already owned by the County and are located along the Hillsboro Boulevard corridor in the northern section of the City. Several of these properties were platted with development entitlements and will not be dedicated as perpetual open space. These areas, included in the 2004 Comprehensive Plan as vacant developable land, have become undevelopable as a result of the County's actions. A total of 120 acres of the 690 acres of vacant land will be dedicated as preservation by Broward County, leaving a total of 570 acres of vacant, developable land. Table 6 shows the inventory of vacant land, vacant land which has been dedicated as preservation, and the remaining portion of developable land.

			Vacant
	Vacant	Preservation	Developable
Land Use Category	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)
Residential	130	58	72
Commercial	137	30	107
Office	97	22	75
Employment Center	9	0	9
Community Facility	10	10	0
Industrial	307	0	307
Total Vacant Land	690	120	570
Source: City of Coconut Cree	k Develop	ment Services De	partment, 2005

 Table 6. Vacant and Developable Land Inventory (Acres) City of Coconut Creek

Most of the vacant, developable land is designated non-residential on the Future Land Use Map. Almost all of the land south of Sample Road has been developed or is located with the County's parks and preservation areas. Vacant developable parcels are also found in the northwest sector of the City north of the Sawgrass Expressway, with a majority of the land designated as Office Park or Commercial use.

Vacant residential land is scattered throughout the City and consists of relatively small pockets of land. The vacant, developable, residential land area is summarized by Future Land Use density in Table 7. There has been a decrease in all density levels as a result of development or preservation, except with the Estate classification where there was an increase due to voluntary annexations as previously discussed.



			Total
Residential Land Use		Density	Potential
Classification	Acreage	DU/AC	Units
Estate 1.0	37.9	1	37.9
Low 3.0	4.8	3	14.4
Low 5.0	26.1	5	130.5
Low 6.0	0	6	0
Low Med 8.0	2	8	16
Low Med 10	1.2	10	12
Irregular	0	Varies	0
Total	72		194.8
Source: City of Coconut Cre	ek Developme	nt Services Depa	artment, 2005

Table 7. Vacant Residential Land Inventory – City of Coconut Creek

The area in the northwest quadrant of Sample and Lyons Roads represents the City's largest assemblage of vacant and undeveloped land, totally 290 acres. The majority of this land area is classified as Industrial on the City's Land Use Map. However, this parcel has been identified as having the potential for establishing the City's Town Center through the development of a master-planned, mixed-use development. The proposed vision for the Regional Activity Center includes the addition of up to 2,700 dwelling units to the City's existing housing stock. Currently, the City is undertaking a land use amendment in order to create this Regional Activity Center, and this has been identified as one of the local issues addressed in the City's 2005 EAR. Table 8 reflects the median sales prices for single family homes in the Fort Lauderdale MSA between 1993 and 2004. Since 2000, the median home price has escalated from \$148,500 to \$279,500 in 2004, representing an 88% increase.

		Median	
		Sales	
Year	Sales	Price	%Chg
1993	12,623	\$102,800	-
1994	13,291	\$103,300	0.5%
1995	12,597	\$105,900	2.5%
1996	12,494	\$112,300	6.0%
1997	10,683	\$123,800	10.2%
1998	11,179	\$129,800	4.9%
1999	12,898	\$136,300	5.0%
2000	13,591	\$148,500	9.0%
2001	13,158	\$170,600	14.9%
2002	14,465	\$197,400	15.7%
2003	15,163	\$228,600	15.8%
2004	14,266	\$279,500	22.3%
Source: Fl	orida Associ	ation of Realton	rs. MLS Data

Table 8. Single-Family Existing Home Sales, Fort Lauderdale MSA, 1993 through 2004

In its 2005 EAR, the City of Coconut Creek addressed the importance of providing for and maintaining housing opportunities within the City that meet the standards of both quality and



affordability. While not considered a community with an abundance of governmentally subsidized housing, the area has continuously managed to provide affordable housing opportunities independent of government-subsidized housing programs (Table 9).

				Type of
Project Name	Sale/Rent	Units	Avg Cost	Assistance
Township	Sale	4,904	\$166,786	Subsidized
Wynmoor	Sale	5,260	\$130,500	Age Restricted
Banyan Bay	Rental	416	\$820	Subsidized
Fisherman's Landing	Rental	268	\$902	Subsidized
Hillsboro Bay Club	Rental	366	\$1,000	Subsidized
Banyan Point	Rental	300	NA	Subsidized

Table 9. Affordable Housing Opportunities, City of Coconut Creek

Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005

The Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse indicates that there are 21,459 housing units in the City of Coconut Creek, of which 16,159 units or 75.3%, are owner-occupied and 5,300 units or 24.7%, are renter-occupied. Of the owner-occupied units, 28% pay more than 30% of their income for housing costs, 44.1% of the rental units pay more than 30%. In the City's 2005 EAR, the combined figure is approximately 705 of all housing units within the City have housing costs of less than 30% of their income. Based on the Adequate Housing Uniform Standard Rule, housing is considered to be affordable if housing costs do not exceed 30% of the household income for very low, low and moderate-income households. However, the City has determined that the trend of housing costs as a percentage on income is increasing over time, so the SPG model is using a standard of 40% of household income for housing costs.

As addressed in the 2005 EAR, the Housing Element of the City's 2004 Comprehensive Land Use Plan contains language for the City to continue to provide for additional housing options and not just rely on the existing housing stock to accommodate future population growth. The City evaluated the residential growth in the Plan and determined that the existing inventory of vacant residential land represents very limited opportunity for expanding the housing stock. Objective IV-1 calls for the City to encourage the private sector to develop new dwelling units with range in size and cost to meet housing needs of the existing and projected population growth. In addition, Policy IV-1.6 specifically identifies that any future land use change, for what has been identified as the MainStreet area, should provide for a range of housing types in a mixed-use environment consistent with regional Activity Center land-use provisions.

MICROECONOMIC JOBS HOUSING ANALYSIS

This section presents a summary of the analysis of the linkage between four types of workplace buildings and the estimated number of worker households in the income categories that will, on average, be employed within those buildings.

ANALYSIS APPROACH AND FRAMEWORK

The microanalysis is used to examine the employment associated with the development of 100,000 square foot building modules. Then, through a series of linkage steps, the number of employees is converted to households and housing units by affordability level. The findings are



expressed in terms of numbers of households related to building area. In the final step, the numbers of households are converted back to the per-square-foot level.

The building types or land-use activities addressed in the analysis include industrial, commercial (including retail and other services), office and hotel. The three income categories addressed in the analysis, as defined by HUD, are Very Low Income (under 50% of median income), Low Income (50% to 80% of median income), and Moderate Income (80% to 120% of median income).

ANALYSIS STEPS

The linkage analysis is comprised of several steps used to convert new employment into household and income categories in order to determine gaps in housing affordability at different income levels. The following is a description of each step of the analysis.

<u>Step 1 – Estimate of Total Employees</u>

Table 10 identifies the total number of direct employees who will work at or in the building type being analyzed. Employment density factors are used to make the conversion. The density factors used in this analysis are as follows:

- Office 222 square feet per employee. Average office density is usually found in the range 200 to 300 square feet per employee depending on the character of the office activity (i.e., corporate headquarters versus back office).
- Commercial 400 square feet per employee. This designation covers a wide range of land uses from restaurants and banks to other forms of retail outlets. The average number of employees per type of use also ranges broadly from a low employee count for discount stores to a high number of employees for a sit-down restaurant.
- Industrial 500 square feet per employee. Industrial land uses include manufacturing, warehouses and industrial parks. Typically, industrial uses have the lowest employee count per square foot of building area.
- Hotel 500 square feet per employee or one employee per room in a 500 square foot hotel room. This rate covers a cross section of hotel types from lower-service hotels where rooms may be smaller than 500 square feet to higher-service convention hotels where average room size (inclusive of the meeting space, etc.) is larger, but the number of employees per room is higher.
- Extended Stay Lodging 8,000 square feet per employee. Extended stay lodging is a subsector of hotels, but operates more as an apartment complex offering lodging services. Typically, this type of operation has only four to five full-time equivalent employees. The extended stay facility does not offer any food and beverage services. The typical studio-unit size ranges from 300 to 350 square feet.

All density factors are averages and individual uses can be expected to be fairly divergent from the average occasionally. For ease of analysis and comparison purposes, this analysis is based on prototype buildings of 100,000 square feet in size. We have used this size of building in order



to count jobs and housing units in whole numbers that can be readily understood. At the conclusion of the analysis, the findings are divided by building size to express the linkages per square foot, which are very small fractions of housing units.

					Extended Stay			
	Industrial	Commercial	Office	Hotel	Lodging			
Employees/1,000 SF	2	2.5	4.5	2	0.125			
Space per Employee	500	400	222	500	8,000			
Employees per Prototype	200	250	450	200	12.5			
Note: All density factors are averages and individual uses can be expected to be fairly divergent								
from the average from time	to time.							

Table 10.	Estimate o	f Total New	Employees in	N Prototype B	Building,	100,000	Sq. Ft.
-----------	------------	-------------	---------------------	---------------	-----------	---------	---------

Source: ITE and Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005

Based on the density factors outlined above, the number of employees in the prototype 100,000 square foot building is as follows: office will house 450 employees, commercial 250 employees, industrial 200 employees, and hotel 200 employees.

Step 2 – Adjustment for Changing Industries

This step is an adjustment to take into account any declines, changes and shifts within all sectors of the economy and to recognize that new space is not 100% equivalent to net new employees. For this analysis, a 5% adjustment is utilized to recognize the possibility of future declines and other adjustments (Table 11).

Table 11.	Estimate	of Employees	after Ad	justment
-----------	-----------------	--------------	----------	----------

					Extended Stay				
	Industrial	Commercial	Office	Hotel	Lodging				
Number of Employees	200	250	450	200	12.5				
Adjustment Factor	10	13	23	10	1				
Employees after Adjustment	190	238	428	190	12				
Note: This adjustment is to take into a	Note: This adjustment is to take into account any declines, changes and shifts within all sectors of the economy and to recognize								
that new space is not 100% equivale	nt to net new en	nployees.							

Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005

Step 3 – Industry Distribution of Employees

The distribution of employees is the first step in arriving at household income levels. The industry groupings were developed from the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW), also known as the ES-202 from the Agency for Workforce Innovation (Table 12).

• Industrial land uses were adjusted to reflect the types of industry classifications associated with this type of land use. These industries represent the workers associated with all types of manufacturing activities, the wholesale trade sector, the administration and support of waste management and remediation services, as well as the transportation and warehousing of products. Wholesale Trade represents 32.5% of this sector; a major user of industrial space.



- Commercial land uses represent a very broad group of categories, primarily led by the retail trade comprising 78.9% of all uses. Also included in this land use category are 15 other services which represent 21.1%.
- Office building "industrial" mix was adjusted to reflect the types of activities attracted to office space workers in the Coconut Creek and Broward County areas. These industries represent a broad mix of professional service activities, including architecture and engineering, computer and mathematical, legal, management, business and financial operations, healthcare, and sales. The category also includes finance, insurance, and real estate-type activities. Healthcare-related activities represent 37.8% of this sector, while finance, insurance and real estate represent 10.4%, and professional, scientific and technical services represent 22.6%.
- Hotel land use includes hotel and motel accommodations along with food services.
- Extended stay lodging land use includes hotel and motel accommodations.



Bro	ward County	Employment		
		Average Monthly	Average Quarterly	
		Avg. Monthly	Avg. Quarterly	
Industry Title	NAICS Code	Employment	Wage	Annual
Total, All Industries	10	708,008	\$10,410	\$41,640
Office				
Information	51	19,774	\$15,724	\$62,896
Finance and Insurance	52	39,335	\$14,214	\$56,856
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	53	22,936	\$10,678	\$42,712
Professional, Scientific and Tech Services	54	49,658	\$15,239	\$60,956
Management of Companies and Enterprise	55	5,191	\$18,665	\$74,660
Health Care and Social Assistance	62	83,095	\$10,974	\$43,896
		\$219,989	\$13,094	\$52,375
Hotel and Extended Stay Lodging				
Accommodation and Food Services	72	63,442	\$4,213	\$16,852
Industrial				
Manufacturing	31-33	30,109	\$11,881	\$47,524
Wholesale Trade	42	38,905	\$14,412	\$57,648
Admin & Support & Waste Mgnt. & Remed	56	50,792	\$8,273	\$33,092
Transportation and Warehousing	48-49	91	\$12,001	\$48,004
		\$119,897	\$11,174	\$44,695
Commercial				
Retail Trade	44-45	98,474	\$7,418	\$29,672
Other Services (Except Public Administrati	81	26,272	\$6,828	\$27,312
		\$124,746	\$7,294	\$29,176
Source: QCEW (ES202) data from the Age	ency for Workfo	orce Innovation (form	ally Dept. of Labor)	

Table 12. Industrial Distribution of Employees by Land Use Category

Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005

In this step, employment is translated to income based on Broward County wage and salary information for each building type. The wage and salary information provide the income inputs to the Affordable Housing Model. Workers identified in the earlier steps as being wholesale/retail warehouse workers versus workers in a retail establishment or office workers are analyzed separately.

Step 4 – Adjustment from Employees to Employee Households

This step (Tables 13a-d) converts the number of employees to the number of employee households by land-use type that will work in the building type being analyzed. The Extended stay lodging is considered a subsector to the hotel land use but has been adjusted to reflect a smaller number of employees. The SPG model utilizes a conversion sub-model developed by the Florida Department of Community Affairs and the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council. This step recognizes that there is, on average, more than one worker per household; thus, the number of housing units in demand for new workers must be reduced. The workers/worker-household ratio has eliminated from the equation all non-working households, such as retired persons, students, and those on public assistance. This step in the analysis calculates the number of employee households for each size of household based on the number



of employed members of the household (single-worker household, two-worker household, three-worker household).

<u>Step 5 – Estimates of Employee Households Meeting the Lower Income</u> <u>Definitions</u>

In this step, the analysis calculates the number of employee households that fall into each income category for each size household. Individual employee by industry sector was used to calculate the number of households that fall into these income categories by assuming that multiple-earner households are, on average, formed of individuals falling within the same income categories.



Table 13a. Adjustment from Employee to Employee Households - Industrial

MODEL: BROWARD COUNTY 2005								M	edian Ir	ncome 2	2005:	\$58,100
Very Low: le	ess than	\$29,050		Low:	\$29,050	to	\$46,480		Moderate:	\$46,480	to	\$69,720
Land Use:	Industrial	NAICS	Code		Avg. Wage	\$44,695	Quarter	4th 2004				
Income Group	Wage F Low	Ranges High	Midpoint	Number of Employees	Total Wages	Heads of Household	Single Worker HHs	HH Income	2- Worker HHs	HH Income	3+ Worker HHs	HH Income
Very Low	\$8,250	\$9,999	\$9,125	1	\$9,125	0	0	\$9,125	0	\$16,862	0	\$20,859
	\$10,000	\$12,499	\$11,250	1	\$11,250	0	0	\$11,250	0	\$20,789	0	\$25,716
	\$12,500	\$14,999	\$13,750	1	\$13,750	0	0	\$13,750	0	\$25,409	0	\$31,431
	\$15,000	\$17,499	\$16,250	1	\$16,250	0	0	\$16,250	0	\$30,029	0	\$37,146
	\$17,500	\$19,999	\$18,750	1	\$18,750	0	0	\$18,750	0	\$34,649	0	\$42,861
	\$20,000	\$22,499	\$21,250	1	\$21,250	0	0	\$21,250	0	\$39,269	0	\$48,576
	\$22,500	\$24,999	\$23,750	1	\$23,750	0	0	\$23,750	0	\$43,889	0	\$54,291
	\$25,000	\$27,499	\$26,250	1	\$26,250	0	0	\$26,250	0	\$48,509	0	\$60,006
	\$27,500	\$29,049	\$28,275	1	\$28,275	0	0	\$28,275	0	\$52,251	0	\$64,636
Low	\$29,050	\$32,499	\$30,775	1	\$30,775	1	0	\$30,775	0	\$56,871	0	\$70,351
	\$32,500	\$34,999	\$33,750	1	\$33,750	1	0	\$33,750	0	\$62,369	0	\$77,151
	\$35,000	\$37,499	\$36,250	5	\$181,248	3	1	\$36,250	1	\$66,989	0	\$82,866
	\$37,500	\$39,999	\$38,750	25	\$968,738	14	6	\$38,750	6	\$71,609	2	\$88,581
	\$40,000	\$42,499	\$41,250	40	\$1,649,980	22	9	\$41,250	9	\$76,229	3	\$94,296
	\$42,500	\$44,999 ¢46,470	\$43,750	50	\$2,187,475	27	12	\$43,750	12	\$80,849	4	\$100,011
Modoroto	\$45,000	\$40,479	\$45,740	30	\$1,372,185 \$722,502	10	1	\$45,740	1	\$84,527	2	\$104,560
Moderate	\$40,400	\$49,999 \$52,400	\$40,240 \$51,250	15	\$725,093	10	4	\$40,240 \$51,250	4	\$09,147	2 1	\$110,275
	\$52,500	\$51 000	\$53,750	3	\$53,750	1	0	\$53,750	0	\$00,320		\$122.871
	\$55,000	\$57 <u>4</u> 99	\$56,250	1	\$56,750 \$56,250	1	0	\$56,750	0	\$103.949	0	\$128 586
	\$57,500	\$59,999	\$58,750	1	\$58,750	1	0	\$58,750	0	\$108,549	0	\$134 301
	\$60,000	\$62,499	\$61 250	1	\$61,250	1	0	\$61,250	0	\$113 189	0	\$140.016
	\$62,500	\$64,999	\$63,750	1	\$63,750	1	0 0	\$63,750	0	\$117 809	0	\$145,731
	\$65.000	\$67,499	\$66.250	1	\$66.250	1	0	\$66.250	0	\$122,429	0	\$151,446
	\$67.500	\$69.719	\$68.610	1	\$68,610	1	0	\$68.610	0	\$126,790	0	\$156.841
Middle-Upper	\$69,720	\$72,499	\$71,110	1	\$71,110	1	0	\$71,110	0	\$131,410	0	\$162,556
	\$72,500	\$74,999	\$73,750	1	\$73,750	1	0	\$73,750	0	\$136,289	0	\$168,591
	\$75,000	\$77,499	\$76,250	0	\$0	0	0	\$76,250	0	\$140,909	0	\$174,306
	\$77,500	\$79,999	\$78,750	0	\$0	0	0	\$78,750	0	\$145,529	0	\$180,021
(A) Total emplo	yees and wa	ages of this	model:	190	\$8,146,100	106	50		50		6	
(B) Total wages	of 190 emp	oloyees at	\$44,695	190	\$8,492,086							
NOTE: Source:	Uses the m (formerly D Strategic F	nost recent ept. of Lab Planning Gr	QCEW (ES or). Totals roup, Inc., 2	5202) data fro may not equa 2005, 2000 U	om the Agency f al due to roundi S Census of Po	or Workforce ng. pulation and	Innovation Housing, Ea	ast Central F	- Florida Regio	onal Plannin	g Council	



Table 13b. Adjustment from Employee to Employee Households – Com	mercial
--	---------

MODEL:	BROW	ARD CO	OUNTY	2005				M	edian In	come 2	2005:	\$58,100
Very Low: le	ss than	\$29,050		Low:	\$29,050	to	\$46,480		Moderate:	\$46,480	to	\$69,720
Land Use:	Commercia	NAICS	Code	44-45	Avg. Wage	\$29,176	Quarter	4th 2004				
Income Group	Wage I Low	Ranges High	Midpoint	Number of Employees	Total Wages	Heads of Household	Single Worker HHs	HH Income	2- Worker HHs	HH Income	3+ Worker HHs	HH Income
Very Low	\$8,250 \$10,000 \$12,500 \$15,000 \$17,500 \$20,000	\$9,999 \$12,499 \$14,999 \$17,499 \$19,999 \$22,499	\$9,125 \$11,250 \$13,750 \$16,250 \$18,750 \$21,250	1 1 5 10	\$9,125 \$11,250 \$13,750 \$81,248 \$187,495 \$318 743	0 0 2 4 6	0 0 1 2 3	\$9,125 \$11,250 \$13,750 \$16,250 \$18,750 \$21,250	0 0 1 2 2	\$16,862 \$20,789 \$25,409 \$30,029 \$34,649 \$39,269	0 0 0 0	\$20,859 \$25,716 \$31,431 \$37,146 \$42,861 \$48,576
	\$22,500 \$22,500 \$25,000 \$27,500	\$22,499 \$24,999 \$27,499 \$29,049	\$23,750 \$26,250 \$28,275	20 30 40	\$310,743 \$474,990 \$787,485 \$1,130,980	8 13 17	5 7 9	\$23,750 \$26,250 \$28,275	2 3 5 6	\$43,889 \$48,509 \$52,251	1 1 1	\$40,070 \$54,291 \$60,006 \$64,636
Low	\$29,050 \$32,500 \$35,000 \$37,500 \$40,000	\$32,499 \$34,999 \$37,499 \$39,999 \$42,499	\$30,775 \$33,750 \$36,250 \$38,750 \$41,250	60 30 15 5 1	\$1,846,470 \$1,012,485 \$543,743 \$193,748 \$41,250	33 16 8 3 1	14 7 4 1 0	\$30,775 \$33,750 \$36,250 \$38,750 \$41,250	14 7 4 1 0	\$56,871 \$62,369 \$66,989 \$71,609 \$76,229	4 2 1 0 0	\$70,351 \$77,151 \$82,866 \$88,581 \$94,296
Moderate	\$42,500 \$45,000 \$46,480 \$50,000	\$44,999 \$46,479 \$49,999 \$52,499	\$43,750 \$45,740 \$48,240 \$51,250	1 1 1	\$43,750 \$45,740 \$48,240 \$51,250	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	\$43,750 \$45,740 \$48,240 \$51,250	0 0 0 0	\$80,849 \$84,527 \$89,147 \$94,709	0 0 0 0	\$100,011 \$104,560 \$110,275 \$117,156 \$122,874
	\$52,500 \$55,000 \$57,500 \$60,000 \$62,500 \$65,000	\$54,999 \$57,499 \$59,999 \$62,499 \$64,999 \$67,499	\$53,750 \$56,250 \$58,750 \$61,250 \$63,750 \$66,250	0	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	\$53,750 \$56,250 \$58,750 \$61,250 \$63,750 \$66,250	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	\$99,329 \$103,949 \$108,569 \$113,189 \$117,809 \$122,429	0 0 0 0	\$122,871 \$128,586 \$134,301 \$140,016 \$145,731 \$151,446
Middle-Upper	\$67,500 \$69,720 \$72,500 \$75,000 \$77,500	\$69,719 \$72,499 \$74,999 \$77,499 \$79,999	\$68,610 \$71,110 \$73,750 \$76,250 \$78,750	0 0 0 0	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	\$68,610 \$71,110 \$73,750 \$76,250 \$78,750	0 0 0 0	\$126,790 \$131,410 \$136,289 \$140,909 \$145,529	0 0 0 0 0	\$156,841 \$162,556 \$168,591 \$174,306 \$180,021
(A) Total employ (B) Total wages	yees and wa	ages of this ployees at	model: \$29,176	238 238	\$6,841,736 \$6,944,000	114	54	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	54		6	* / • = -
NOTE: Source:	Uses the n (formerly D Strategic P	nost recent lept. of Lab lanning Gro	QCEW (ES or). Totals oup, Inc., 2	5202) data fro may not equ 005; 2000 US	om the Agency f al due to round Census of Po	or Workforce ing. pulation and l	Innovation Housing, Ea	st Central F	lorida Regio	nal Planning	g Council	



Table 13c. Adjustment from Employee to Employee Households – Office

MODEL:	BROW	ARD CO	OUNTY	′ 2005				M	edian Ir	come 2	2005:	\$58,100
Very Low: le	ss than	\$29,050		Low:	\$29,050	to	\$46,480	-	Moderate:	\$46,480	to	\$69,720
Land Use:	Office	NAICS	Code	44-45	Avg. Wage	\$52,375	Quarter	4th 2004				
Income Group	Wage	Ranges	Midpoint	Number of Employees	Total Wages	Heads of Household	Single Worker HHs	HH Income	2- Worker HHs	HH Income	3+ Worker HHs	HH Income
VervLow	\$8 250	\$9,999	\$9 125	0	\$0	0	0	\$9 125	0	\$16 862	0	\$20,859
1019 2011	\$10.000	\$12.499	\$11.250	o o	\$0 \$0	0	0	\$11.250	0	\$20,789	0	\$25,716
	\$12.500	\$14.999	\$13.750	o	\$0	0	0	\$13,750	0	\$25,409	0	\$31,431
	\$15,000	\$17,499	\$16,250	0	\$0	0	0	\$16,250	0	\$30,029	0	\$37,146
	\$17,500	\$19,999	\$18,750	1	\$18,750	0	0	\$18,750	0	\$34,649	0	\$42,861
	\$20,000	\$22,499	\$21,250	1	\$21,250	0	0	\$21,250	0	\$39,269	0	\$48,576
	\$22,500	\$24,999	\$23,750	1	\$23,750	0	0	\$23,750	0	\$43,889	0	\$54,291
	\$25,000	\$27,499	\$26,250	1	\$26,250	0	0	\$26,250	0	\$48,509	0	\$60,006
	\$27,500	\$29,049	\$28,275	1	\$28,275	0	0	\$28,275	0	\$52,251	0	\$64,636
Low	\$29,050	\$32,499	\$30,775	1	\$30,775	1	0	\$30,775	0	\$56,871	0	\$70,351
	\$32,500	\$34,999	\$33,750	1	\$33,750	1	0	\$33,750	0	\$62,369	0	\$77,151
	\$35,000	\$37,499	\$36,250	1	\$36,250	1	0	\$36,250	0	\$66,989	0	\$82,866
	\$37,500	\$39,999	\$38,750	5	\$193,748	3	1	\$38,750	1	\$71,609	0	\$88,581
	\$40,000	\$42,499	\$41,250	10	\$412,495	5	2	\$41,250	2	\$76,229	1	\$94,296
	\$42,500	\$44,999	\$43,750	15	\$656,243	8	4	\$43,750	4	\$80,849	1	\$100,011
	\$45,000	\$46,479	\$45,740	30	\$1,372,185	16	7	\$45,740	7	\$84,527	2	\$104,560
Moderate	\$46,480	\$49,999	\$48,240	40	\$1,929,580	26	11	\$48,240	11	\$89,147	4	\$110,275
	\$50,000	\$52,499	\$51,250	60	\$3,074,970	40	16	\$51,250	16	\$94,709	7	\$117,156
	\$52,500	\$54,999	\$53,750	80	\$4,299,960	53	22	\$53,750	22	\$99,329	9	\$122,871
	\$55,000	\$57,499	\$56,250	60	\$3,374,970	40	16	\$56,250	16	\$103,949	7	\$128,586
	\$57,500	\$59,999	\$58,750	40	\$2,349,980	26	11	\$58,750	11	\$108,569	4	\$134,301
	\$60,000	\$62,499	\$61,250	30	\$1,837,485	20	8	\$61,250	8	\$113,189	3	\$140,016
	\$62,500	\$64,999	\$63,750	15	\$956,243	10	4	\$63,750	4	\$117,809	2	\$145,731
	\$65,000	\$67,499	\$66,250	10	\$662,495	7	3	\$66,250	3	\$122,429	1	\$151,446
	\$67,500	\$69,719	\$68,610	5	\$343,048	3	1	\$68,610	1	\$126,790	1	\$156,841
Middle-Upper	\$69,720	\$72,499	\$71,110	5	\$355,548	4	2	\$71,110	2	\$131,410	0	\$162,556
	\$72,500	\$74,999	\$73,750	5	\$368,748	4	2	\$73,750	2	\$136,289	0	\$168,591
	\$75,000	\$77,499	\$76,250	5	\$381,248	4	2	\$76,250	2	\$140,909	0	\$174,306
	\$77,500	\$79,999	\$78,750	5	\$393,748	4	2	\$78,750	2	\$145,529	0	\$180,021
(A) Total employees and wages of this model: 42			428	\$23,181,736	272	129		129		15		
(B) Total wages of 428 employees at \$52,375 42				428	\$22,416,317							
NOTE: Source:	Uses the r (formerly D Strategic F	Jack Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005; 2000 US Census of Population and Housing, East Central Florida Regional Planning Council.										



Table 13d. Adjustment from Employee to Employee Households – Hotel

MODEL:	BROW		OUNTY	′ 2005			Median Income 2005:				\$58,100	
Very Low: le	ss than	\$29,050		Low:	\$29,050	to	\$46,480		Moderate:	\$46,480	to	\$69,720
Land Use:	Hotel	NAICS	Code	72	Avg. Wage	\$16,852	Quarter	4th 2004				
Income Group	Wage Low	Ranges High	Midpoint	Number of Employees	Total Wages	Heads of Household	Single Worker HHs	HH Income	2- Worker HHs	HH Income	3+ Worker HHs	HH Income
Very Low	\$8,250 \$10,000 \$12,500 \$15,000 \$17,500	\$9,999 \$12,499 \$14,999 \$17,499 \$19,999	\$9,125 \$11,250 \$13,750 \$16,250 \$18,750	25 35 40 45 25	\$228,113 \$393,733 \$549,980 \$731,228 \$468,738	10 15 17 19 10	6 8 9 10 6	\$9,125 \$11,250 \$13,750 \$16,250 \$18,750	4 5 7 4	\$16,862 \$20,789 \$25,409 \$30,029 \$34,649	1 1 1 1	\$20,859 \$25,716 \$31,431 \$37,146 \$42,861
	\$20,000 \$22,500 \$25,000 \$27,500	\$22,499 \$24,999 \$27,499 \$29,049	\$21,250 \$23,750 \$26,250 \$28,275	10 1 1 1	\$212,495 \$23,750 \$26,250 \$28,275	4 0 0 0	2 0 0 0	\$21,250 \$23,750 \$26,250 \$28,275	2 0 0 0	\$39,269 \$43,889 \$48,509 \$52,251	0 0 0	\$48,576 \$54,291 \$60,006 \$64,636
Low	\$29,050 \$32,500 \$35,000 \$37,500 \$40,000 \$42,500	\$32,499 \$34,999 \$37,499 \$39,999 \$42,499 \$44,999	\$30,775 \$33,750 \$36,250 \$38,750 \$41,250 \$43,750	1 1 1 1 1	\$30,775 \$33,750 \$36,250 \$38,750 \$41,250 \$43,750	1 1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0 0	\$30,775 \$33,750 \$36,250 \$38,750 \$41,250 \$43,750	0 0 0 0 0	\$56,871 \$62,369 \$66,989 \$71,609 \$76,229 \$80,849	0 0 0 0 0	\$70,351 \$77,151 \$82,866 \$88,581 \$94,296 \$100,011
Moderate	\$45,000 \$46,480 \$50,000 \$52,500 \$55,000	\$46,479 \$49,999 \$52,499 \$54,999 \$57,499	\$45,740 \$48,240 \$51,250 \$53,750 \$56,250	1 0 0 0	\$45,740 \$45,740 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	\$45,740 \$48,240 \$51,250 \$53,750 \$56,250	0 0 0 0 0	\$84,527 \$89,147 \$94,709 \$99,329 \$103,949	0 0 0 0	\$104,560 \$110,275 \$117,156 \$122,871 \$128,586
	\$57,500 \$60,000 \$62,500 \$65,000 \$67,500	\$59,999 \$62,499 \$64,999 \$67,499 \$69,719	\$58,750 \$61,250 \$63,750 \$66,250 \$68,610	0 0 0 0	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	\$58,750 \$61,250 \$63,750 \$66,250 \$68,610	0 0 0 0 0	\$108,569 \$113,189 \$117,809 \$122,429 \$126,790	0 0 0 0	\$134,301 \$140,016 \$145,731 \$151,446 \$156,841
Middle-Upper	\$69,720 \$72,500 \$75,000 \$77,500	\$72,499 \$74,999 \$77,499 \$79,999	\$71,110 \$73,750 \$76,250 \$78,750	0 0 0 0	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	\$71,110 \$73,750 \$76,250 \$78,750	0 0 0 0	\$131,410 \$136,289 \$140,909 \$145,529	0 0 0 0	\$162,556 \$168,591 \$174,306 \$180,021
(A) Total employees and wages of this model: 190 (B) Total wages of 190 employees at \$16,852 190 NOTE: Uses the most recent QCEW (ES202) data from (formerly Dept, of Labor). Totals may not equited to the provided to the prov					\$2,932,820 \$3,201,880 om the Agency f al due to roundi	80 or Workforce ng.	38 Innovation		38		4	
Source:	Strategic F	Planning Gro	oup, Inc., 2	005; 2000 US	Census of Po	oulation and I	Housing, Ea	st Central F	lorida Regio	nal Plannin	ig Counci	Ι.



<u>Step 6 – Estimates of Households that meet HUD Income Criteria</u> (Affordability Model)

For this step, an affordability model was developed to determine the affordability of households by HUD's income and levels. This step has been performed for each industry/land-use category and multiplied by the number of households (demand by and type of land-use). The extended stay lodging land use is considered a subsector of the analysis conducted for the hotel land use and has been adjusted to reflect the smaller number of employees. Tables 14a-d show the results of the previous steps in terms of the number of households that meet HUD's income criteria.

					Payment				
					Less				
Number	of			Monthly	Taxes				
Households		Income	Rent	Payment	and	Mortgage	Home Price		
Low	1	\$36,250	\$1,158	\$1,208	\$1,088	\$181,386	\$190,933		
	6	\$38,750	\$1,242	\$1,292	\$1,163	\$193,895	\$204,100		
	9	\$41,250	\$1,325	\$1,375	\$1,238	\$206,405	\$217,268		
	12	\$43,750	\$1,408	\$1,458	\$1,313	\$218,914	\$230,436		
	7	\$45,740	\$1,475	\$1,525	\$1,372	\$228,871	\$240,917		
Moderate	4	\$48,240	\$1,558	\$1,608	\$1,447	\$241,381	\$254,085		
	1	\$51,250	\$1,658	\$1,708	\$1,538	\$256,442	\$269,939		
	1	\$66,989	\$2,183	\$2,233	\$2,010	\$335,196	\$352,838		
	6	\$71,609	\$2,337	\$2,387	\$2,148	\$358,313	\$377,172		
	9	\$76,229	\$2,491	\$2,541	\$2,287	\$381,431	\$401,506		
	12	\$80,849	\$2,645	\$2,695	\$2,425	\$404,548	\$425,840		
	7	\$84,527	\$2,768	\$2,818	\$2,536	\$422,952	\$445,212		
	2	\$88,581	\$2,903	\$2,953	\$2,657	\$443,237	\$466,565		
	4	\$89,147	\$2,922	\$2,972	\$2,674	\$446,069	\$469,546		
	3	\$94,296	\$3,093	\$3,143	\$2,829	\$471,833	\$496,667		
	1	\$94,709	\$3,107	\$3,157	\$2,841	\$473,900	\$498,842		
	4	\$100,011	\$3,284	\$3,334	\$3,000	\$500,430	\$526,768		
	2	\$104,560	\$3,435	\$3,485	\$3,137	\$523,192	\$550,728		
	2	\$110,275	\$3,626	\$3,676	\$3,308	\$551,788	\$580,830		
	1	\$117,156	\$3,855	\$3,905	\$3,515	\$586,219	\$617,073		
	94								
Number of ho	Number of households generated by the demand model for industrial land use.								
Note: Monthly Rental Payments are based on 40% of annual income adjusting for utility expenses. Mortgage									
is based on a	i 30-y€	ear loan, 6% fina	ncing and a	5% dow n pay	ment.				
Source: Stra	tegic F	Planning Group, I	nc., 2005						

Table 14a. Affordability Analysis of Workers Households – Industrial Land Use

Very low income category (orange) represents below 50% of AMI, Low income category (green) represents 50 to 80% of AMI, and Moderate income category (yellow) represents 80 to 120% of AMI.



					Payment		
					Less		
Number of	of			Monthly	Taxes and		
Househol	ds	Income	Rent	Payment	Insurance	Mortgage	Home Price
Very Low	1	\$16,250	\$492	\$542	\$487	\$81,308	\$85,588
	2	\$18,750	\$575	\$625	\$562	\$93,818	\$98,756
	3	\$21,250	\$658	\$708	\$637	\$106,327	\$111,923
	5	\$23,750	\$742	\$792	\$712	\$118,837	\$125,091
	7	\$26,250	\$825	\$875	\$787	\$131,346	\$138,259
	9	\$28,275	\$892	\$942	\$848	\$141,478	\$148,925
Low	1	\$30,029	\$951	\$1,001	\$901	\$150,258	\$158,166
	14	\$30,775	\$976	\$1,026	\$923	\$153,988	\$162,092
	7	\$33,750	\$1,075	\$1,125	\$1,012	\$168,874	\$177,762
	2	\$34,649	\$1,105	\$1,155	\$1,039	\$173,375	\$182,500
	4	\$36,250	\$1,158	\$1,208	\$1,087	\$181,383	\$190,930
	1	\$38,750	\$1,242	\$1,292	\$1,162	\$193,893	\$204,098
	2	\$39,269	\$1,259	\$1,309	\$1,178	\$196,493	\$206,834
Moderate	3	\$43,889	\$1,413	\$1,463	\$1,317	\$219,610	\$231,168
	5	\$48,509	\$1,567	\$1,617	\$1,455	\$242,727	\$255,502
	6	\$52,251	\$1,692	\$1,742	\$1,568	\$261,452	\$275,213
	1	\$54,291	\$1,760	\$1,810	\$1,629	\$271,660	\$285,958
	14	\$56,871	\$1,846	\$1,896	\$1,706	\$284,570	\$299,547
	1	\$60,006	\$1,950	\$2,000	\$1,800	\$300,257	\$316,060
	7	\$62,369	\$2,029	\$2,079	\$1,871	\$312,079	\$328,504
	1	\$64,636	\$2,105	\$2,155	\$1,939	\$323,420	\$340,442
	4	\$66,989	\$2,183	\$2,233	\$2,010	\$335,196	\$352,838
	4	\$70,351	\$2,295	\$2,345	\$2,111	\$352,016	\$370,543
	1	\$71,609	\$2,337	\$2,387	\$2,148	\$358,314	\$377,172
	2	\$77,151	\$2,522	\$2,572	\$2,315	\$386,046	\$406,364
	1	\$82,866	\$2,712	\$2,762	\$2,486	\$414,642	\$436,466
	109						
Number of households generated by the demand model for industrial land use							
Note: Monthly Rental Payments are based on 40% of annual income adjusting for utility expenses.							ility expenses.
Mortgage is b	based	on a 30 year lo	an, 6% finan	cing and a t	5% down pay	ment.	
Source: Strateg	gic Plar	nning Group, Inc., 2	2005				

Table 14b. Affordability Analysis of Workers Households – Commercial Land Use



					Payment		
					Less Taxes		
Number of				Monthly	and		
Households		Income	Rent	Payment	Insurance	Mortgage	Home Price
Low	1	\$38,750	\$1,242	\$1,292	\$1,162	\$193,893	\$204,098
	2	\$41,250	\$1,325	\$1,375	\$1,237	\$206,402	\$217,265
	4	\$43,750	\$1,408	\$1,458	\$1,312	\$218,911	\$230,433
	7	\$45,740	\$1,475	\$1,525	\$1,372	\$228,869	\$240,915
Moderate	11	\$48,240	\$1,558	\$1,608	\$1,447	\$241,378	\$254,082
	16	\$51,250	\$1,658	\$1,708	\$1,537	\$256,440	\$269,936
	22	\$53,750	\$1,742	\$1,792	\$1,612	\$268,949	\$283,104
	16	\$56,250	\$1,825	\$1,875	\$1,687	\$281,458	\$296,272
	11	\$58,750	\$1,908	\$1,958	\$1,762	\$293,968	\$309,440
	8	\$61,250	\$1,992	\$2,042	\$1,837	\$306,477	\$322,607
	4	\$63,750	\$2,075	\$2,125	\$1,912	\$318,986	\$335,775
	3	\$66,250	\$2,158	\$2,208	\$1,987	\$331,496	\$348,943
	1	\$68,610	\$2,237	\$2,287	\$2,058	\$343,305	\$361,373
	2	\$71,110	\$2,320	\$2,370	\$2,133	\$355,814	\$374,541
	1	\$71,609	\$2,337	\$2,387	\$2,148	\$358,314	\$377,172
	2	\$73,750	\$2,408	\$2,458	\$2,212	\$369,024	\$388,446
	2	\$76,229	\$2,491	\$2,541	\$2,287	\$381,431	\$401,506
-	2	\$76,250	\$2,492	\$2,542	\$2,287	\$381,533	\$401,614
	2	\$78,750	\$2,575	\$2,625	\$2,362	\$394,043	\$414,782
	4	\$80,849	\$2,645	\$2,695	\$2,425	\$404,548	\$425,840
	7	\$84,527	\$2,768	\$2,818	\$2,536	\$422,950	\$445,210
	11	\$89,147	\$2,922	\$2,972	\$2,674	\$446,067	\$469,544
	1	\$94,296	\$3,093	\$3,143	\$2,829	\$471,835	\$496,669
	16	\$94,709	\$3,107	\$3,157	\$2,841	\$473,900	\$498,843
	22	\$99,329	\$3,261	\$3,311	\$2,980	\$497,018	\$523,177
	1	\$100,011	\$3,284	\$3,334	\$3,000	\$500,432	\$526,770
	16	\$103,949	\$3,415	\$3,465	\$3,118	\$520,135	\$547,511
	2	\$104,560	\$3,435	\$3,485	\$3,137	\$523,194	\$550,731
	11	\$108,569	\$3,569	\$3,619	\$3,257	\$543,252	\$571,845
	4	\$110,275	\$3,626	\$3,676	\$3,308	\$551,791	\$580,832
	8	\$113,189	\$3,723	\$3,773	\$3,396	\$566,370	\$596,179
	7	\$117,156	\$3,855	\$3,905	\$3,515	\$586,221	\$617,075
	4	\$117,809	\$3,877	\$3,927	\$3,534	\$589,487	\$620,513
	3	\$122,429	\$4,031	\$4,081	\$3,673	\$612,604	\$644,847
	9	\$122,871	\$4,046	\$4,096	\$3,686	\$614,817	\$647,176
	1	\$126,790	\$4,176	\$4,226	\$3,804	\$634,427	\$667,818
	7	\$128,586	\$4,236	\$4,286	\$3,858	\$643,414	\$677,278
	2	\$131,410	\$4,330	\$4,380	\$3,942	\$657,544	\$692,152
	4	\$134,301	\$4,427	\$4,477	\$4,029	\$672,010	\$707,379
	2	\$136,289	\$4,493	\$4,543	\$4,089	\$681,956	\$717,849
	3	\$140,016	\$4,617	\$4,667	\$4,200	\$700,607	\$737,481
	2	\$140,909	\$4,647	\$4,697	\$4,227	\$705,074	\$742,183
	2	\$145,529	\$4,801	\$4,851	\$4,366	\$728,191	\$766,517
	2	\$145,731	\$4,808	\$4,858	\$4,372	\$729,203	\$767,582
	1	\$151,446	\$4,998	\$5,048	\$4,543	\$757,799	\$797,684
	1	\$156,841	\$5,178	\$5,228	\$4,705	\$784,794	\$826,099
	271						
Number of house	eho	lds generated	by the dem	and model t	for industrial la	nd use.	
Note: Monthly R	ent	al Payments a	re based or	n 40% of an	nual income a	djusting for ut	ility expenses.
Mortgage is bas	ed	on a 30 year lo	an, 6% fina	ancing and a	a 5% down pay	/ment.	
Source: Strategic F	Plan	ning Group, Inc., 2	2005				

Table 14c. Affordability Analysis of Workers Households – Office Land Use



				Payment			
				Less Taxes			
Number of			Monthly	and			
Households	Income	Rent	Payment	Insurance	Mortgage	Home Price	
Very Low 6	\$9,125	\$254	\$304	\$274	\$45,657	\$48,060	
8	\$11,250	\$325	\$375	\$337	\$56,290	\$59,252	
9	\$13,750	\$408	\$458	\$412	\$68,799	\$72,420	
10	\$16,250	\$492	\$542	\$487	\$81,308	\$85,588	
4	\$16,862	\$512	\$562	\$506	\$84,374	\$88,814	
6	\$18,750	\$575	\$625	\$562	\$93,818	\$98,756	
5	\$20,789	\$643	\$693	\$624	\$104,023	\$109,498	
1	\$20,859	\$645	\$695	\$626	\$104,371	\$109,864	
1	\$20,859	\$645	\$695	\$626	\$104,371	\$109,864	
2	\$21,250	\$658	\$708	\$637	\$106,327	\$111,923	
6	\$25,409	\$797	\$847	\$762	\$127,141	\$133,832	
1	\$25,716	\$807	\$857	\$771	\$128,678	\$135,451	
1	\$25,716	\$807	\$857	\$771	\$128,678	\$135,451	
Low 7	\$30,029	\$951	\$1,001	\$901	\$150,258	\$158,166	
1	\$31,431	\$998	\$1,048	\$943	\$157,275	\$165,552	
1	\$31,431	\$998	\$1,048	\$943	\$157,275	\$165,552	
4	\$34,649	\$1,105	\$1,155	\$1,039	\$173,375	\$182,500	
1	\$37,146	\$1,188	\$1,238	\$1,114	\$185,871	\$195,654	
1	\$37,146	\$1,188	\$1,238	\$1,114	\$185,871	\$195,654	
2	\$39,269	\$1,259	\$1,309	\$1,178	\$196,493	\$206,834	
1	\$42,861	\$1,379	\$1,429	\$1,286	\$214,467	\$225,755	
1	\$42,861	\$1,379	\$1,429	\$1,286	\$214,467	\$225,755	
80							
Number of ho	useholds ger	erated by	y the demar	nd model for in	dustrial land u	se.	
Note: Monthly Rental Payments are based on 40% of annual income adjusting for utility							
expenses.							
Mortgage is ba	ased on a $\overline{30}$	year loa	n, 6% financ	cing and a 5%	down paymen	t.	
Source: Strategic	Planning Grou	p, Inc., 200	5				

Table 14d. Affordability Analysis of Workers Households – Hotel Land Use

SUMMARY BY INCOME LEVEL

Tables 15 indicates the results of the analysis for each of the three income categories for the four prototypical 100,000-square foot buildings. The tables present the number of households in each affordability category and the total number up to 120% of the median income level.



					Extended Stay
	Industrial	Commercial	Office	Hotel	Lodging
Very Low	0	27	0	60	4
(Under 50% of Median Income)					
Low	35	34	14	20	1
(50% to 80% of Median Income)					
Moderate	6	39	92	0	0
(80% to 120% of Median Income)					
Total	41	100	106	80	5
Total New Worker Households	94	109	271	80	5
Very Low	0.0%	24.8%	0.0%	75.0%	80.0%
(Under 50% of Median Income)					
Low	37.2%	31.2%	5.2%	25.0%	20.0%
(50% to 80% of Median Income)					
Moderate	6.4%	35.8%	33.9%	0.0%	0.0%
(80% to 120% of Median Income)					
As a % of Total New Worker Households	43.6%	91.7%	39.1%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 15. Worker Households by Affordability Level

Note: The top chart reflects the number of worker households (by income category) generated by the development of 100,000 SF of buildings by land use type. The bottom chart shows the percentage of these new households as a percentage of total new worker

Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005

Table 15 also shows the worker households that fall into each income category as a percent of all new worker households. Approximately 39.1% of all office workers have incomes below 120% of median with most of these office workers falling into the low and moderate-income ranges. Retail workers have comparably lower incomes, with 91.7% of workers below 120% of median income, including more than 24.8% of workers in the very-low income category. All of the hotel workers fall into either the very low- or low-income categories.

ADJUSTMENT FOR COMMUTE RELATIONSHIP

Table 16 depicts the results of the analysis both before and after an adjustment for commute relationship. The 2000 Census indicated that residents of Coconut Creek hold only 9.1% of the jobs in Coconut Creek. However, this is expected to change as more commercial development takes place. As a matter of City policy, the goal is to double the number of jobs for city residents. Therefore the commute factor used in this analysis is 18.2%. The estimates of households for each income category in a 100,000 square foot prototype building are adjusted downwards by this commute factor.



Before Commute Adjustment					
					Extended Stay
	Industrial	Commercial	Office	Hotel	Lodging
Very Low	0	27	0	60	4
(Under 50% of Median Income)					
Low	35	34	14	20	1
(50% to 80% of Median Income)					
Moderate	6	39	92	0	0
(80% to 120% of Median Income)					
Total	41	100	106	80	5
After Commute Adjustment	18.2%				
Very Low	0.0	4.9	0.0	10.9	0.7
(Under 50% of Median Income)					
Low	6.4	6.2	2.5	3.6	0.2
(50% to 80% of Median Income)					
Moderate	1.1	7.1	16.7	0.0	0.0
(80% to 120% of Median Income)					
	7.5	18.2	19.3	14.6	0.9
Note: Residents of Coconut Creek hold onl	ly 9.1% of the jobs in C	oconut Creek. The	estimates of househ	olds for each incom	e category in a
protypical 100,000 SF building are adjusted	I downwards by this cor	nmute factor.			

Table 16. Worker Households Adjusted for Commute Factor

SUMMARY BY SQUARE FOOT BUILDING AREA

To this point, the analysis has illustrated results for prototype buildings of 100,000 square feet. In this step, as shown in Table 17, the results are translated to a per square foot coefficient. These coefficients state the portion of a household, by affordability level for which each square foot of building area is associated. This is the summary of the affordability housing linkage from various types of land use to employees and housing demand by income level.

 Table 17. Housing Demand Impact by Land-Use Type on a Per Square Foot Basis

					Extended Stay			
	Industrial	Commercial	Office	Hotel	Lodging			
Very Low	0	0.00004914	0	0.0001092	0.00000728			
(Under 50% of Median Income)								
Low	0.0000637	0.00006188	0.00002548	0.0000364	0.00000182			
(50% to 80% of Median Income)								
Moderate	0.00001092	0.00007098	0.00016744	0	0			
(80% to 120% of Median Income)								
Total	0.00007462	0.000182	0.00019292	0.0001456	0.000091			
Note: This is the summary of the linkage from buildings to employees translating into housing demand by income level.								

TOTAL HOUSING LINKAGE COSTS

This section takes the conclusions of the previous section on the number of households in the lower income categories associated with each building type and identifies the total cost of assistance required to make housing affordable. This section establishes "linkage costs" for each income level to produce the total linkage costs.

A key component of the analysis is the size of the affordability gap between what households can afford and the cost of producing additional housing. The analysis is conducted for the three categories of income: under 50% of median income, 50% to 80% of median income, and 80% to 120% of median income. The analysis is also conducted assuming rental housing, as well as ownership housing from each of the three income categories.



INCOME AND HOUSEHOLD SIZE ASSUMPTIONS

Income definitions for housing programs are established by HUD for varying household sizes, as previously discussed (Table 18). For establishing the affordability gap, there is a need to match a household of each income level with a unit type and size according to government regulations and policies. Therefore, we have used the HUD information in establishing household size and income limits. For a two-bedroom unit with a household size of three persons, the income limit would be \$43,350 in the low income category and \$27,100 in the very low income category.

Table 18: 2005 HUD Income Limits for Various Household Sizes										
Area	Program	1 person	2 person	3 person	4 person	5 person				
Fort Lauderdale, FL PMSA										
FY 2005 MFI: 58,100	30% of Median	\$12,650	\$14,450	\$16,250	\$18,050	\$19,500				
	Very low income	\$21,050	\$24,100	\$27,100	\$30,100	\$32,500				
	Low-income	\$33.700	\$38.550	\$43.350	\$48.150	\$52,000				

Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005.

The top income of the qualifying range in each category has been used to determine maximum housing costs in this analysis. That is to say, the upper limit of households in the 50% to 80% of median category will be 80% of median, or the top end of the range.

In Table 19, the affordable rent level for a 2-bedroom apartment was \$831 per month for a family of three in the very low-income category; \$1,329 per month for a family in the lowincome category, and \$1,995 per month in the moderate income category. A low to moderate average income would be \$1,662.



	One	Two	Three
	Bedroom	Bedroom	Bedroom
Very Low Income			
Income at 50% of Median	\$24,100	\$27,100	\$30,100
Percent of Income Alloted to Housing	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%
Monthly Housing Expense	\$803	\$903	\$1,003
(Less) Utilities Expenses (8%)	(\$64)	(\$72)	(\$80)
Monthly Rent	\$739	\$831	\$923
Low Income			
Income at 80% of Median	\$38,550	\$43,350	\$48,150
Percent of Income Alloted to Housing	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%
Monthly Housing Expense	\$1,285	\$1,445	\$1,605
(Less) Utilities Expenses	(\$103)	(\$116)	(\$128)
Monthly Rent	\$1,182	\$1,329	\$1,477
Moderate Income			
Income at 120% of Median	\$57,850	\$65,050	\$72,250
Percent of Income Alloted to Housing	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%
Monthly Housing Expense	\$1,928	\$2,168	\$2,408
(Less) Utilities Expenses	(\$154)	(\$173)	(\$193)
Monthly Rent	\$1,774	\$1,995	\$2,216
Low/Moderate Average Income	\$48,200	\$54,200	\$60,200
Percent of Income Alloted to Housing	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%
Monthly Housing Expense	\$1,607	\$1,807	\$2,007
(Less) Utilities Expenses	(\$129)	(\$145)	(\$161)
Monthly Rent	\$1,478	\$1,662	\$1,846
Household Size	2 persons	3 persons	4 persons
2005 Income Standards Distributed by	HUD; Broward Cou	unty	
Expenses will vary by project and type	of utilities.		
Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005			

Table 19. Affordable Rents Based on 40% Occupancy Costs

CURRENT HOUSING COSTS

Current housing costs include the costs of existing homes in the market either for rent or for sale, as well as the costs associated with the development of new housing stock, either condominiums or town homes. For purposes of this analysis, actual market information was developed for both rental housing units available in the area and recent home sales prices were obtained from MLS data for 1-bedroom through 3-bedroom units.

A survey of local apartment complexes offering 1, 2, and 3-bedroom, garden-style apartments was conducted to identify current monthly rents. The rents for a 1-bedroom unit ranged from an average of \$871 a month to a high average of \$975 a month. The average for a 2-bedroom unit ranged from \$1,070 to \$1,197 per month. The three bedrooms average ranged from \$1,299 to \$1,428 a month. Two apartment complexes survey offered subsidized rental units (Table 20).



Table 20.Market Rents

										Subsidized
	Year	Total #		1 Bedroom	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	Units
Complex	Built	of Units	Style	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Average
Coconut Palm Club	NA	300	Garden	\$979	\$1,040	\$1,204	\$1,274	\$1,414	\$1,428	
Cypress Shores	1991	300	Garden	\$915		\$1,005	\$1,125	\$1,345		
Archstone Waterview	1988	192	Garden	\$985		\$1,340	\$1,350			
Club Caribe	1997	377	Garden	\$830	\$930	\$1,005				
Banyan Bay	1985	416	Garden	\$855	\$1,098	\$1,136				\$820
The Preserve	2001	272	Garden	\$939	\$977	\$1,022	\$1,135	\$1,341		
Fisherman's Landing	1984	268	Garden	\$770	\$830	\$950	\$1,100			\$902
RMC Appartments & Townhomes	NA	NA	Garden	\$695		\$895		\$1,095		
Average				\$871	\$975	\$1,070	\$1,197	\$1,299	\$1,428	
Average 2-Bedroom						\$1,133		\$1,363		
Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2	005									

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY GAP

RENTAL HOUSING AFFORDABILITY GAP

In determining the affordability gap for a typical garden style apartment, the average rental rate of \$1,133 for a two-bedroom unit was utilized. The rent was annualized and adjusted for operating expenses to determine its potential Net Operating Income (NOI). The NOI was then capitalized at 8% to derive an Average Market Value for the two-bedroom unit. This information was then compared to the household limits developed in Table 19. As shown in Tables 21, the affordability gap occurs at the very low income and low income levels.

This analysis shows that the affordability gap in rental housing only exists at the very low income level for a two-bedroom unit (Table 21). The determination to use the two-bedroom unit as a standard in the analysis was made by the City.

	Monthly	Annual	Less		Avg. Market	Affordable
Garden Style Apartment Project	Rent	Rent	Expenses	NOI	Value	per Unit
Market Rental Rates	\$1,133	\$13,599	\$3,808	\$9,791	\$122,387	
Affordable Gap - Apartment Units						
Very Low Income (50% of AMI)	\$831	\$9,973	\$3,808	\$6,165	\$77,065	(\$45,322)
Low Income (80% of AMI)	\$1,329	\$15,953	\$3,808	\$12,145	\$151,815	\$29,428
Moderate Income (120% of AMI)	\$1,995	\$23,938	\$3,808	\$20,131	\$251,635	\$129,248
AMI - Area Median Income for Broward County	as established	and publish	ed by HUD.			
Operating Expenses are based on average operation	erating expenses	from simila	ar size apartme	nt projects.		
Net Opearating Income (NOI) is capitalized at 8% to derive Average Market Value.						
Affordability Gap is the difference between value supported market rents and value supported at affordable income rent level						
Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005						

 Table 21. Affordability Gap – Apartment Units (2-bedrooms)

OWNERSHIP HOUSING AFFORDABILITY GAP

Table 22 provides the same analysis for ownership housing as was conducted for rental housing. Instead of determining the maximum rent levels, this analysis determines the maximum purchase price for 1, 2, and 3-bedroom units for each of the income categories. For example, the maximum purchase price of a two-bedroom unit affordable to families in the very low income bracket would be \$120,535. The maximum purchase price for a two-bedroom unit for a family in the low income category would be \$192,811 and for a family in the moderate income level, the price would be \$289,328.



	One Bedroom	Two Bedroom	Three Bedroom				
Very Low Income							
Income at 50% of Median	\$24,100	\$27,100	\$30,100				
Income Allotted to Housing at 40% of Income	\$9,640	\$10,840	\$12,040				
(Less) Ongoing Expenses (20%)	\$1,928	\$2,168	\$2,408				
Income Available for Mortgage	\$7,712	\$8,672	\$9,632				
Maximum Purchase Price	\$107,191	\$120,535	\$133,878				
Low Income							
Income at 80% of Median	\$38,550	\$43,350	\$48,150				
Income Allotted to Housing at 40% of Income	\$15,420	\$17,340	\$19,260				
(Less) Ongoing Expenses (20%)	\$3,084	\$3,468	\$3,852				
Income Available for Mortgage	\$12,336	\$13,872	\$15,408				
Maximum Purchase Price	\$171,462	\$192,811	\$214,160				
Moderate Income							
Income at 120% of Median	\$57,850	\$65,050	\$72,250				
Income Allotted to Housing at 40% of Income	\$23,140	\$26,020	\$28,900				
(Less) Ongoing Expenses (20%)	\$4,628	\$5,204	\$5,780				
Income Available for Mortgage	\$18,512	\$20,816	\$23,120				
Maximum Purchase Price	\$257,304	\$289,328	\$321,352				
Low/Moderate Average Income	\$48,200	\$54,200	\$60,200				
Income Allotted to Housing at 40% of Income	\$19,280	\$21,680	\$24,080				
(Less) Ongoing Expenses (20%)	\$3,856	\$4,336	\$4,816				
Income Available for Mortgage	\$15,424	\$17,344	\$19,264				
Maximum Purchase Price	\$214,383	\$241,069	\$267,756				
Market Rate Units (Current MLS Data)							
Condominiums	\$89,900	\$175,000	\$225,000				
Single Family Units	NA	\$221,900	\$349,790				
Household Size 2 persons 3 persons 4 persons							
Notes: Ongoing Expenses are based on estimation	tes of utilities, home	owner association	dues, property				
taxes, etc. based on unit value.							
Annual debt service assumes a 30 year mortgage	ge at 6% with a 5%	down payment.					
Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005							

Table 22. Supportable Housing Prices (1-bedroom to 3-bedroom)

Using local MLS data, the median values for condominiums were determined to be \$89,900 for a 1-bedroom unit, \$175,000 for a two-bedroom unit, and \$225,000 for a 3-bedroom unit. The median value for a 2-bedroom, single-family home was \$221,900 and \$349,790 for a three-bedroom home. If we averaged low and moderate income levels, the maximum affordable purchase price would be \$241,069.

Table 23 reflects the affordability gap by income categories for both condominium units and single family units. For condominiums, there is a gap at the very low income level and for single family units the gap occurs at the very low income and the low income categories.



	Income			_			
	Target	Annual	Maximum	Average	Affordability		
	% AMI	HH Income	Sales Price	Value	Gap per Unit		
Affordable Units							
Condominiums (Based on Currer	nt MLS Data)			\$175,000			
Very Low Income (50% of AMI)	50%	\$27,100	\$120,535		(\$54,465)		
Low Income (80% of AMI)	80%	\$43,350	\$192,811		\$17,811		
Moderate Income (120% of AMI)	120%	\$65,050	\$289,328		\$114,328		
Low/Moderate Average Income		\$54,200	\$241,069		\$66,069		
Single Family Units (Based on C	urrent MLS D	Data)		\$221,900			
Very Low Income (50% of AMI)	50%	\$27,100	\$120,535		(\$101,365)		
Low Income (80% of AMI)	80%	\$43,350	\$192,811		(\$29,089)		
Moderate Income (120% of AMI)	120%	\$65,050	\$289,328		\$67,428		
Low/Moderate Average Income		\$54,200	\$241,069		\$19,169		
AMI - Area Median Income for Brow	ard County as	established a	nd published by	HUD.			
Notes: Ongoing expenses are based on estimates of utilities, homeowner association dues, property taxes,							
etc. based on unit value.							
Annual debt service assumes a 30 y	year mortgage	e at 6% with a t	5% down payme	nt.			
Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 20	05						

Table 23. Affordability Gap – Ownership Units (2-bedrooms)

TOTAL LINKAGE COSTS

The last step in the linkage fee analysis marries the findings on the numbers of households at each of the income ranges associated with the four types of buildings to the affordability gaps, or the costs of delivering housing in Coconut Creek. Table 24 summarizes the analysis for a rental 2-bedroom unit and Table 25 is for a 2-bedroom condominium unit or single-family house. The numbers of households associated with each building type by income category, indicated on the left side of the table, are drawn from the end of the previous section's analysis, still assuming 100,000 sq. ft. buildings. The affordability gaps are from the prior discussion. The commercial development linkage fee per square foot shows the results of the calculation: number of units times affordability gap, divided by 100,000 sq. ft. to bring the conclusion back to the per square foot level.

 Table 24. Estimated Linkage Fee Before and After Commute Adjustment (Rental 2bedroom)

					Extended						Extended
					Stay	Affordability					Stay
Before Commute Adjustment	Industrial	Commercial	Office	Hotel	Lodging	Gap	Industrial	Commercial	Office	Hotel	Lodging
Very Low	0	27	0	60	4	\$45,322	\$0.00	\$12.24	\$0.00	\$27.19	\$1.81
(Under 50% of Median Income)											
Low	35	34	14	20	1	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(50% to 80% of Median Income)											
Moderate	6	39	92	0	0	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(80% to 120% of Median Income)											
Total	41.0	100.0	106.0	80.0	5.0		\$0.00	\$12.24	\$0.00	\$27.19	\$1.81
After Commute Adjustment	18.2%						18.2%				
Very Low	0.0	4.9	0.0	10.9	0.7	\$45,322	\$0.00	\$2.23	\$0.00	\$4.95	\$0.33
(Under 50% of Median Income)											
Low	6.4	6.2	2.5	3.6	0.2	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(50% to 80% of Median Income)											
Moderate	1.1	7.1	16.7	0.0	0.0	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(80% to 120% of Median Income)											
Total	7.5	18.2	19.3	14.6	0.9		\$0.00	\$2.23	\$0.00	\$4.95	\$0.33

Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005



					Extended						Extended
		• · ·			Stay	Affordability		• · ·			Stay
Before Commute Adjustment	Industrial	Commercial	Office	Hotel	Lodging	Gap	Industrial	Commercial	Office	Hotel	Lodging
Condominiums		07	0			\$54.405	6 0.00	64474	¢0.00	¢00.00	¢0.40
Very Low	0	27	0	60	4	\$54,465	\$0.00	\$14.71	\$0.00	\$32.68	\$2.18
(Under 50% of Median Income)											0 0.00
Low	35	34	14	20	1		0	0	0	0	\$0.00
(50% to 80% of Median Income)				-							
Moderate	6	39	92	0	0		0	0	0	0	\$0.00
(80% to 120% of Median Income)											
Total	41	100	106	80	5		\$0.00	\$14.71	\$0.00	\$32.68	\$2.18
Single Family											
Very Low	0	27	0	60	4	\$101,365	\$0.00	\$27.37	\$0.00	\$60.82	\$4.05
(Under 50% of Median Income)											
Low	35	34	14	20	1	\$29,089	\$10.18	\$9.89	\$4.07	\$5.82	\$0.29
(50% to 80% of Median Income)											
Moderate	6	39	92	0	0		0	0	0	0	
(80% to 120% of Median Income)											
Total	41	100	106	80	5	i	\$10.18	\$37.26	\$4.07	\$66.64	\$4.35
After Commute Adjustment	18.2%						18.2%				
Condominums											
Very Low	0.0	4.9	0.0	10.9	0.7	\$54,465	\$0.00	\$2.68	\$0.00	\$5.95	\$0.40
(Under 50% of Median Income)											
Low	6.4	6.2	2.5	3.6	0.2		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(50% to 80% of Median Income)											
Moderate	1.1	7.1	16.7	0.0	0.0	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(80% to 120% of Median Income)											
Total	7.5	18.2	19.3	14.6	0.9		\$0.00	\$2.68	\$0.00	\$5.95	\$0.40
Single Family											
Very Low	0.0	4.9	0.0	10.9	0.7	\$101,365	\$0.00	\$4.98	\$0.00	\$11.07	\$0.74
(Under 50% of Median Income)											
Low	6.4	6.2	2.5	3.6	0.2	\$29,089	\$1.85	\$1.80	\$0.74	\$1.06	\$0.05
(50% to 80% of Median Income)											
Moderate	1.1	7.1	16.7	0.0	0.0		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
(80% to 120% of Median Income)											
Total	7.5	18.2	19.3	14.6	0.9		\$1.85	\$6.78	\$0.74	\$12.13	\$0.79

Table 25. Estimated Linkage Fee Summary Based on Affordable Ownership Units (2 bedroom)

Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005

The total linkage costs are calculated for the total impacts, as indicated in the upper portion of the table, and after an adjustment for the fact that only a share of the worker households will seek housing in Coconut Creek. The 2000 Census found that slightly over 9.1% of those who work in Coconut Creek also live in Coconut Creek. However, the commute factor for Broward County was almost 20% in 2000 and it is the City's policy to double the number of jobs available to city residents. Therefore, the commute factor used in this analysis is 18.2%, which reflects the anticipated increase in commercial development activity.

The figures in Table 26 below present the total jobs housing linkage costs per square foot of building area for each of the four building types. These total commercial development linkage costs represent the ceiling for any requirements placed on new construction for affordable housing.

					Extended Stay
Tenure	Industrial	Commercial	Office	Hotel	Lodging
Rental					
Very low income	\$0.00	\$2.23	\$0.00	\$4.95	\$0.33
Ownership					
Very low income	\$0.00	\$4.98	\$0.00	\$11.07	\$0.74
Low income	\$1.85	\$1.80	\$0.74	\$1.06	\$0.05
Moderate income	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total	\$1.85	\$6.78	\$0.74	\$12.13	\$0.79

 Table 26. Total Linkage Costs per Square Foot by Land Use

Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2005.



The totals are not the recommended level for fees, they represent only the maximums established by this analysis. Based on the methodology used in the analysis, the affordable housing linkage fee for:

- an industrial land use would be \$1.85 per square foot of building area;
- a commercial land use the fee would be \$6.78 per square foot of building area;
- an office land use the fee would be \$0.74 per square foot of building area;
- a hotel the fee would be \$12.13 per square foot of building area, and
- an extended stay lodging facility would be \$0.79 per square foot of building area.

Table 27 presents the potential total estimated linkage fee revenues to be generated through the development of future industrial, commercial, office, and hotel projects. The revenues have been shown by type of housing units and income categories. The total potential revenue generated through the build-out of available land is estimated to be \$26 million.

 Table 27. Projected Commercial Development – Estimated Potential Revenues

Type of Use	Square Foot	Linkage Fee	Grand Total
Industrial	398,000	\$1.85	\$736,300
Commercial	2,550,000	\$6.78	\$17,289,000
Office	697,747	\$0.74	\$516,333
Hotel	618,400	\$12.13	\$7,501,192
Extended Stay	\$24,964		
Source: Strategic F			

As discussed later in the report, additional funds may be available from other funding sources like CDBG. Therefore, the City has determined that linkage fees should be less than the ceiling fees presented in Table 26.

Table 28 reflects the suggested lower fees.

					Extended
Tenure	Industrial	Commercial	Office	Hotel	Lodging
Rental					
Very low income	\$0.00	\$0.45	\$0.00	\$0.99	\$0.07
Ownership					
Very low income	\$0.00	\$1.00	\$0.00	\$2.21	\$0.15
Low income	\$0.37	\$0.36	\$0.15	\$0.21	\$0.01
Moderate income	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total	\$0.37	\$1.36	\$0.15	\$2.42	\$0.16

 Table 28. Proposed Linkage Costs per Square Foot by Land Use

Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2006

Table 29 presents the total potential estimated linkage fee revenues based on the lower fees presented in Table 28. The total potential revenue generated through the build-out of available land is estimated to be \$5.2 million.



Type of Use	Square Foot	Linkage Fee	Grand Total				
Industrial	398,000	\$0.37	\$147,260				
Commercial	2,550,000	\$1.36	\$3,468,000				
Office	697,747	\$0.15	\$104,662				
Hotel	618,400	\$2.42	\$1,496,528				
Extended Stay 31,600 \$0.16 \$5,0							
Source: Strategic Planning Group, Inc., 2006							

Table 29. Proposed Commercial Development – Estimated Potential Revenues

In addition to fees generated with a commercial development linkage fees, there are a number of federal and state funded programs focused on establishing an affordable housing program. The following sections identify various programs and how they can be implemented.

GOVERNMENT ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAMS

FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME)

The Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME), which is funded through HUD, provides formula grants to state and local governments, often in partnership with local non-profit groups, to fund a wide range of activities that build, buy, and/or rehabilitate affordable housing of rent or homeownership.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding program is one of the oldest entitlement programs offered by HUD. The CDBG program provides annual grants on a formula basis to many different types of guarantees through several funding streams. These funds are primarily used for local infrastructure improvements and community reinvestment projects, but funding is also used to provide some housing assistance, typically for rehabilitation activities but also for down payment assistance to very low and low income families. These funds are often leveraged with HOME funds to provide a greater assistance to each applicant.

Earlier this year, the City of Coconut Creek submitted its 31st year CDBG Application, requesting \$170,000 in funding for a down payment and rental assistance program to be administered by the City. While not yet an entitlement city, these funds will provide the foundation for the necessary programs it will take to provide housing opportunities to its residents.

Independent of the CDBG program funds, the City has already established a companion fund to the CDBG monies created through private development contributions. Most recently, the City received a formal commitment from Prestige Homes, owner/developer of a 15-acre townhouse project, for \$25,000 to be utilized for down payment and rental assistance for qualified individuals.

Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Program

The Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Program authorizes states to issue Federal tax credits for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction of affordable rental hosing. The



credits can be used by property owners to offset taxes on other income, and are generally sold to real estate investors for the purpose of raising initial development funds for a project.

Developers of affordable housing apply to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation through a competitive process which may require the developer to show a local match of funding to be eligible for credits. To qualify for these credits, a project must have a specific proportion of its units set aside for low and very low income rental housing units during the compliance period, which is a minimum of 30 years. The developer can opt to develop at least 20% of the project's housing units for rent to households at 50% AMI (Area Median Income) or less, or they can develop at least 40% of the units for rent to households at 60% or less of AMI. Once a development has been approved for housing credits, the credits can be used for ten consecutive years.

Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program

The Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program provides rental vouchers to qualifying very-low income families, the elderly and the disabled to use on the open market for rental housing. These rental vouchers provide renters with the ability to choose the location and type of home they prefer and promote the deconcentration and disbursement of very-low income households throughout the community.

<u>HOPE VI</u>

The Hope VI Program, funded by HUD, assist local public housing authorities with improving the living environment for residents of severely distressed public housing projects by creating mixed income housing developments. These developments are intended to change the physical shape and design of public housing and to place public housing recipients in non-poverty neighborhoods, effectively creating mixed-income communities.

STATE FUNDED PROGRAMS

State Housing Initiated Partnership (SHIP)

SHIP is a state housing program that provides funds directly to local governments to increase affordable housing opportunities for very low, low, and moderate income households in their communities. The program provides funding and technical assistance to non-profit housing development organizations and down payment/closing costs assistance to qualified homebuyers. The State channels 69% of the documentary stamp revenues created by the Sadowski Affordable Housing Act directly to counties and entitlement cities in Florida on a noncompetitive basis. SHIP funding is allocated through a competitive application process open to non-profit housing developers. The program is also charged with building active partnerships between government, lenders, builders and developers, real estate professionals, advocates for low-income persons and community groups, as well as leveraging public and private investments to affect the increase in local affordable housing units.

All units produced through the SHIP program must be affordable to the households residing in them, and cost no more than 30% of the household's income. The distribution of SHIP funds at the local level is distributed generally as 65% for homeownership, 25% for rental/special needs and 10% for administration.



State Apartment Incentive Loan (SAIL) Program

SAIL provides mortgage loans at low interest rates to developers that build or renovate affordable rental properties for very low and low income families. This money often serves to bridge the gap between the development's primary financing and the total costs of the development. The SAIL program is administered statewide by the Florida Housing Finance Corporation.

SAIL dollars are available to individuals, public entities, not-for-profit or for-profit organizations that propose the construction or rehabilitation of multifamily units affordable to low and very-low income individuals or families. The loans are secured by a second mortgage on the property and are distributed according to need identified through market studies. In most cases, although the SAIL loan cannot exceed 25% of the total development cost, it can be used in conjunction with other state and Federal programs.

Florida Homeownership Loan Program (HLP)

The Florida Homeownership Loan Program was established in 2002 to combine the Homeownership Assistance Program and the HOME Homeownership Programs under one umbrella program. This program is administered by the Florida Housing Finance Corporation and is a permanent loan program for homebuyers and a construction loan program for developers of affordable housing.

The Construction Loan Program provides assistance to housing developers for the production of affordable housing for low-income and very-low income persons and households. Eligible organizations include non-profit developers, non-profit sponsors, local governments and public housing authorities.

Developers are required to have a minimum of 30% of the project units set aside to eligible homebuyers that have an adjusted gross income that does not exceed 50% of the AMI and another 30% set aside for eligible homebuyers with an adjusted gross income at 80% AMI or less. All remaining project units must be sold to persons or households that have an adjusted income that does not exceed 150% of the AMI.

Construction loans may be converted to permanent mortgage loans for homebuyers purchasing homes located in a development that has received funding through the Construction Loan Program. The Permanent Loan Program assists these qualified borrowers with down payments and closing costs and helps to reduce the principal on their first mortgage.

Predevelopment Loan Program (PLP)

The Predevelopment loan Program provides financial assistance for predevelopment costs, site acquisition, and development of land for affordable housing that is built or rehabilitated for persons or families with very low and low incomes. The program is administered by the Florida Housing Finance Corporation and funds are available to non-profits, community-based organizations, local governments, and public housing authorities.

Florida Affordable Housing Guarantee Program

The Florida Affordable Housing Guarantee Program provides guarantees on taxable loans and tax-exempt loans to stimulate private sector lending for affordable housing. This program was



established in 1992 by the Florida legislature in response to the lack of credit enhancement services for the production of affordable housing and is administered by the Florida Housing Finance Corporation.

This program works to lower the costs of borrowing capital for the construction or rehabilitation of multifamily rental housing by working with federal, state and local government financing sources, as well as other qualified lending institutions. It achieves cost savings for developers of affordable housing by guaranteeing the payment of the mortgages that secure multifamily mortgage revenue bonds. When this program is combined with bond insurance, these bonds securities typically receive an "AAA" rating, thus lowering the overall cost of borrowing. The reduction in financing costs allows developers to charge lower rental rates to individuals earning incomes totaling no more than 60% of the AMI.

Multifamily Mortgage Revenue Bond Program

Administered by the Florida Housing Finance Corporation, the Multifamily Mortgage Revenue Bond Program allows local housing finance agencies to issue taxable and tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds that provide financing at lower-than- market rates for development where: 1) developments must set aside at least 20% of the units for persons or families at 50% or below the AMI, or 2) developments must set aside 40% of the units for households with incomes at 60% AMI or below.

Single-Family Mortgage Revenue Bond (MRB) Program

The Single-Family Mortgage Revenue Bond (MRB) Program uses the proceeds from the sale of both taxable and tax-exempt single family mortgage revenue bonds to finance 30-year, fixed rate mortgages for low to moderate income homebuyers. In addition to providing low-interest rate loans and closing cost assistance, this program also offers credit counseling resources and second mortgages. The program is administered by the Florida Housing Finance Corporation.

Eligible applicants include individuals who do not own their current home, do not claim their mobile home as real property, have not owned a home within the last three years, have established credit worthiness, and have an annual income that does not exceed program limits.