REQUEST: Amend City’s Future Land Use Element and Map from Employment Center, Commercial, Office, and Industrial to Transit Oriented Development for Uptown Urban Village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>L17003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>City of Fort Lauderdale and Envision Uptown, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Location</td>
<td>Area generally bound by I-95 to the east, Powerline Road to the west, Canal to the north, and NW 57th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Size</td>
<td>353 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Residential Mid Rise Multifamily/Medium High Density (RMM-25) Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial (B-3) Utilities (U) Commerce Center (CC) Boulevard Business (B-1) General Business (B-2) Industrial (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use Designation</td>
<td>Industrial Employment Center Office Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Future Land Use Designation</td>
<td>Transit Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable ULDR Sections</td>
<td>ULDR Section 47-24.8, Comprehensive Plan Amendment ULDR Section 47-25.2, Adequacy Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification Requirements</td>
<td>Newspaper ad 10 days prior to meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Required</td>
<td>Recommend approval or denial to City Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Planner</td>
<td>Jim Hetzel, Principal Planner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
The City of Fort Lauderdale and Envision Uptown, Inc. propose to amend the City of Fort Lauderdale Future Land Use Element and Map, and the Broward County Future Land Use Element and Map, for the area generally known as the Uptown Urban Village project. Envision Uptown, Inc. is the business and civic group that represents the Uptown area. The project area is comprised of 353 acres of land and has multiple land use designations: Industrial, Employment Center, Office, and Commercial. The proposal is for a single designation that will accommodate a mix of land uses supported by multi-modal transportation. The land use amendment application is part of a larger effort by the City and Envision Uptown, Inc. that includes a concurrent master plan and form based code to support Transit Oriented Development (TOD).

The overall project intent is to establish a framework to guide future growth in the area with one, unified land use designation that supports a mix of uses with transit supportive development. In order to achieve this, the LUPA contains specific text language to address the City and County’s Future Land Use Elements to foster a mix of land uses, a shift towards multi-modal transportation and transit-oriented elements and amenities, with priority on improved pedestrian connectivity. The proposed Uptown Land Use Plan Amendment report is provided as Exhibit 1.

BACKGROUND:
The initial concept for transforming the Uptown Urban Village (Uptown) area began with a group of landowners and business owners discussing challenges in recruiting a talented workforce in a suburban built environment where the majority of employees drive to work. The group began meeting with the District Commissioner and City staff to explore ways to create an
urban village to meet the needs of the changing workforce and a mix of businesses. These discussions resulted in the business and civic leaders forming the Envision Uptown, Inc. (Envision).

In 2014, the City, in conjunction with Envision, engaged the Urban Land Institute (ULI) to conduct a Technical Advisory Panel Report for Uptown. The ULI Technical Advisory Panel Program is made of of experts who analyze various topics and ultimately generate reports to assist local governments in addressing issues such as housing, parking, redevelopment, and future development patterns. The ULI Technical Advisory Panel report for the Uptown area was completed in August 2014 and contained specific recommendations including the following:

- Engage study area landowners, business and civic leaders, employees and other interested parties; e.g. Envision Uptown and other stakeholders, in preparing a shared community planning vision;
- Examine opportunities to enhance existing public and private assets (e.g. extensive corporate presence, access to transit and Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport);
- Identify improvements to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure to improve connectivity within Uptown;
- Provide opportunities for parks and open spaces that can be utilized by employees and residents alike;
- Evaluate the Uptown brand for potential modifications, including any possible trends, in an effort to create an unique district in the region with a strong sense of place;
- Evaluate existing development conditions and identify needed changes to the development standards to support the community planning vision, brand, and a live, work, learn, and play environment;
- Provide predictability for future growth and development; and
- Identify future plans that address changing the land use designations for Uptown, focus on corridor transit connections and multi-modal facilities, and adopt new land regulations to achieve desired goals.

The City Commission adopted Resolution 15-215 on October 6, 2015, accepting the ULI Technical Advisory Panel report. In 2016, the City Commission recognized the Uptown effort as a Commission Annual Action Plan (CAAP) initiative and staff began the planning process and secured a consultant.

The City hired the consultant team of TY Lin and Tindale Oliver to work on the project. The project has two scopes: (1) land use plan amendment, and (2) master plan with form based land regulations. The traffic analysis section of the LUPA application was completed by TY Lin and Tindale Oliver will be developing the master plan with form based land regulations.

The master plan and form based land regulations are currently underway. The project schedule has the LUPA proceeding ahead of the master plan due to the timeframe for transmitting to the County and the State for agency review. During this time, Tindale Oliver will be generating the components of the master plan document and conducting public meetings for input. The objective is to align the two efforts for final approval simultaneously. This approach will ensure the land regulations are in place upon adoption of the land use.

**REVIEW CRITERIA:**

Pursuant to the ULDR, Section 47-24.8, a Comprehensive Plan amendment ("land use plan amendment") application shall be reviewed in accordance with the following criteria:

1. An application shall be submitted to the Department for review by the Planning and Zoning Board (Local Planning Agency) and for approval and adoption by the City Commission, in accordance with the requirements of F.S. Ch. 163 and F.A.C. Rule 9J-5.

The City of Fort Lauderdale application includes a detailed amendment report that outlines the existing and proposed uses, an analysis of public facilities and services, a
review of applicable goals, objectives and policies in both the City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan and the Broward County Land Use Plan, and supporting exhibits. Note, Florida Administrative (F.A.C.) Rule 9J-5 was repealed by the Florida Legislature in 2011.

2. An amendment to the City’s Comprehensive Plan must be recertified by the Broward County Planning Council (BCPC) prior to the approval taking effect.

Provisional certification will be granted when Broward County Commission conducts the adoption hearing on the amendment. City staff is required to submit recertification documents to BCPC staff post adoption.

Existing and Proposed Uses:
The LUPA requires the identification of existing uses and a generation analysis for the proposed development. Uptown contains existing development including numerous office buildings, commercial shopping centers, hotels, existing mobile home park, transit facility, and car dealership. The amendment proposes additional development entitlements for residential, commercial, office, industrial, park space, hotel, and civic uses. The additional development entitlements were generated based on the following factors: (1) a market and economic analysis that was completed in March 2015 by South Florida Regional Transit Authority for the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub study, which is located within the boundaries project area, (2) existence of underutilized properties in the project area with potential redevelopment opportunities; e.g. vacant parcels, surface parking areas, and (3) lack of supporting land uses in the project area; e.g. residential, hotel, park and open space.

The total permitted intensity and density must include the existing and proposed uses. Table 1 provides a summary of existing development by use and the proposed additional development entitlements. Note, existing office use has been captured under commercial use, as listed by Broward County Property Appraiser data. See Exhibit 1, Uptown Land Use Plan Amendment report, pages 4 through 6, for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL (square feet)</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL (square feet)</th>
<th>OFFICE (square feet)</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL (units)</th>
<th>PARK (acres)</th>
<th>HOTEL (square feet)</th>
<th>CIVIC (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>1,264,447</td>
<td>3,885,656</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>132,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,314,447</td>
<td>4,110,656</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>152,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Public Facilities and Services:
The adequacy criteria of ULDR Section 47-25.2 are used to evaluate the demand created on public services and facilities by a proposed development. The LUPA application report provides a point by point narrative on the availability of public facilities to assist the Board in evaluating the demand created on public services and facilities by the proposed development. The public service analysis includes potable water, wastewater, drainage, traffic impacts, mass transit, solid waste, parks, and schools. See Exhibit 1, Uptown Land Use Plan Amendment report, pages 6 through 29, for detailed analysis information. Staff has summarized the analysis of public services below.

Water and wastewater services are provided by the City and Broward County. Broward County provides potable water for approximately half of the project area and provides wastewater for a quarter of the project area. Solid waste service is provided by Waste Management with future capacity analysis conducted by Wheelabrator Technologies, Inc., a subsidiary of Waste Management, which provided confirmation that sufficient capacity exists.
Overall traffic impacts were analyzed on a short term timeframe of five years and a long term planning horizon of twenty years. The City’s consultant, TY Lin, evaluated the level of service to the transportation network with and without the proposed amendment. The proposed LUPA is found to generate 11,070 net external daily automobile trips, 995 net external AM Peak Hour automobile trips and 1,085 net external PM Peak Hour automobile trips. The traffic analysis was completed based on trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice, and trip assignment factors to align with multi-modal transportation analysis. Given that the proposed land use designation is a mixed-use, transit related category, a multi-modal analysis was appropriate. See Exhibit 1, Uptown Land Use Plan Amendment report, pages 15 through 28, for detailed analysis information.

The City’s adopted level of service for recreation and open space is three acres per one thousand (1,000) residents, which results in 536 acres based on the City’s current population. The amendment creates a demand on parks and open space for an additional 12.6 acres. The City has a total of 1,027 acres of parks and open space and therefore, the proposed LUPA will not have an impact on the recreation and open space level of service. However, the amendment proposes a dedication of 6.5 acres of park space as part of the LUPA, which will be further defined in the master plan to ensure accessibility, type, and proximity to residential uses. See Exhibit 1, Uptown Land Use Plan Amendment report, pages 14 through 15, for detailed analysis information.

The proposed LUPA will generate approximately 173 students for elementary, middle, and high school based on student generation rates from the School Board of Broward County. The generation analysis was calculated on midrise residential rates for all of the proposed residential units. There is excess capacity at the schools impacted except for Lloyd Estates Elementary, which such impact is de minimis. Consistent with the County’s land use regulatory requirements, the City will enter into an Interlocal Agreement with Broward County and School Board for school impacts subsequent to the land use amendment approval. See Exhibit 1, Uptown Land Use Plan Amendment report, Appendix XI, for School Impact Application and Analysis.

**Comprehensive Plan Consistency:**
The proposed amendment is generally consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies, including the Future Land Use Element, Goal 1, Objective 1.21: Encourage mixed-use developments to enhance the livability of the City through encouragement of an attractive and functional mix of living, working, shopping, and recreational activities; Policy 1.21.3: Support additional mixed-use development in stagnant commercial corridors, Regional Activity Centers, Community Redevelopment Areas and other appropriate areas; and Objective 1.43: Encourage the establishment of Transit Oriented Development in areas serviced by regional transit stations. The proposed text amendment for the Uptown Transit Oriented Development will include general design principles that promote a livable, multi-modal built environment with direct access to regional transit services. Identifying the design principles will ensure consistency with Objective 1.21 described above.

The Comprehensive Plan contains the permissible development intensity for land uses at a floor area ratio (FAR) standard of 3. An evaluation of allowable development under the current land uses designations was conducted and compared with the proposed LUPA intensity. Staff applied a 40% development reduction based on the City’s Unified Land Development Code standards, which would restrict building height, form, and mass; in order to gain an understanding of site development intensity once all standards were applied. Assumptions were made on average residential unit size and hotel room size. As a result, the proposed LUPA development program is significantly less than what is permitted by the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Table 2 provides a summary of data that was used in determining this analysis and depicts that the LUPA (including all existing and proposed development) have a significantly lower FAR than the existing Comprehensive Plan permits.
Table 2: Maximum Development Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Employment Center</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL</th>
<th>Proposed Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Area (approx. acres)</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area (approx. sq. ft.)</td>
<td>11,230,557</td>
<td>409,906</td>
<td>317,412</td>
<td>3,491,270</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Plan (FAR 3)</td>
<td>33,691,671</td>
<td>1,229,718</td>
<td>952,236</td>
<td>10,473,810</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Development</td>
<td>4,315,806</td>
<td>14,621</td>
<td>3,723</td>
<td>952,287</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed LUPA Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>2,520,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DU square footage was estimated based on average of 900 square feet per unit (900 x 2,800 units)
**Hotel Room square footage was estimated based on average of 400 square feet per room (400 x 450 rooms)
***Hotel Rooms for existing hotels captured in existing development square feet

Total development permitted based on FAR of 3; Intensity Standards, City's Comp Plan: 46,347,435
Reduction factor of 40% based on typical development patterns and ULDR standards: 18,538,974
Total development proposed (LUPA) including existing and new development: 8,531,437

**Public Participation:**
The City has conducted various public participation outreach efforts. These efforts include public meetings, website content, public notices, and newspaper advertisement. The City has conducted, to date, a total of five meetings with interested parties and one public open house meeting at the start of the project. Table 3 outlines the meeting details.

**TABLE 3: Public Meeting Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEETING TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ATTENDEES</th>
<th>ATTENDEES GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 25, 2016</td>
<td>Project Start</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Envision Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16, 2016</td>
<td>Status Meeting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Envision Representatives, Interested Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Public Open House</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Envision Representatives, Interested Parties, General Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 2017</td>
<td>Status Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Envision Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 2017</td>
<td>Status Meeting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Envision Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 2017</td>
<td>Status Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Envision Representatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the City's Urban Design and Planning webpage contains information about the project. The website content includes background information, project map, meeting dates, and contact information.

Pursuant to ULDR, Section 47-24.8, a newspaper advertisement was published ten days prior to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting thereby providing general public notice of the proposed land use amendment. A portion of the amendment area is along municipal boundaries and as such, the City is required to send written notification letters to the adjacent Cities. Letters dated January 2, 2018 were sent to the Cities of Oakland Park and Pompano Beach.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**
Staff recommends the Board approve this request, consistent with:
- ULDR Section 47-24.8, Comprehensive plan amendment; and
- ULDR Section 47-24.2, Adequacy Requirements

**PLANNING & ZONING BOARD REVIEW OPTIONS:**
If the Planning and Zoning Board, acting as the Local Planning Agency (LPA), determines that the application meets the criteria for a land use plan amendment, the Planning and Zoning Board shall recommend that the City Commission approve adoption of the ordinance on first
reading to amend the Future Land Use Element and Map and transmit the amendment to Broward County, as proposed; or

If the Planning and Zoning Board determines that the application does not meet the criteria for a land use plan amendment, the Planning and Zoning Board shall not recommend that the City Commission approve adoption of the ordinance on first reading to amend the Future Land Use Element and Map and transmit the amendment to Broward County, as proposed.
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I. TRANSMITTAL INFORMATION

A. Letter of transmittal from municipal mayor or manager documenting that the local government took action by motion, resolution or ordinance to transmit a proposed amendment to the Broward County Land Use Plan. Please attach a copy of the referenced motion, resolution or ordinance. The local government’s action to transmit must include a recommendation of approval, denial or modification regarding the proposed amendment to the Broward County Land Use Plan.

See Appendix I for the letter of transmittal, signed by the City Manager.

B. Name, title, address, telephone, facsimile number and email of the local government contact.

City of Fort Lauderdale
Department of Sustainable Development
700 NW 19th Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311
Contact: Anthony Fajardo, Director, Department of Sustainable Development
Phone: 954-828-5984
Email: afajardo@fortlauderdale.gov

C. Summary minutes from the local planning agency and local government public hearings on the transmittal of the Broward County Land Use Plan amendment.

See Appendix II for Local Planning Agency (Planning and Zoning Board) meeting minutes and Appendix III for City Commission meeting minutes.

D. Description of public notification procedures followed for the amendment by the local government, including notices to surrounding property owners, advertisements in local publications, signage at proposed site, etc.

Per Chapter 163, F.S. and Section 47-27, City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR), the LUPA will follow public notification procedures. This includes:

- Newspaper Advertisements
- Public Notification of Meeting Agendas
- Mailings

In addition, the City has been various public participation outreach efforts. These efforts include public meetings, website content, public notices, and newspaper advertisement. The City has conducted, to date, a total of five meetings with interested parties and one public open house meeting at the start of the project. Table 1 outlines the meeting details.
TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC OUTREACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEETING TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ATTENDEES</th>
<th>ATTENDEES GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 25, 2016</td>
<td>Project Start</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Envision Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16, 2016</td>
<td>Status Meeting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Envision Representatives, Interested Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Public Open House</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Envision Representatives, Interested Parties, General Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 2017</td>
<td>Status Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Envision Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 2017</td>
<td>Status Meeting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Envision Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 2017</td>
<td>Status Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Envision Representatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Fort Lauderdale, Urban Design and Planning

E. Whether the amendment is one of the following:
   * Development of Regional Impact
   * Small scale development activity (per Florida Statutes)
   * Emergency (please describe on separate page)

   The amendment is none of the above.

2. APPLICANT INFORMATION

A. Name, title, address, telephone, facsimile number and email of the applicant.

   City of Fort Lauderdale
   Department of Sustainable Development
   700 NW 19th Avenue
   Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311
   Contact: Anthony Fajardo, Director, Department of Sustainable Development
   Phone: 954-828-5984
   Email: afajardo@fortlauderdale.gov

   Envision Uptown, Inc. (co-applicant)
   6300 NE 1 Avenue, Suite 100
   Fort Lauderdale, FL 33334
   Contact: Cary Goldberg, Agent
   Phone: 954-776-1005
   Email: cary@diversifiedcos.com

B. Name, title, address, telephone, facsimile number and email of the agent.

   City of Fort Lauderdale
   Department of Sustainable Development
   700 NW 19th Avenue
   Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311
   Contact: Jim Hetzel, Principal Planner, Department of Sustainable Development
   Phone: 954-828-5019
Email: jhetzel@fortlauderdale.gov

C. Name, title, address, telephone, facsimile number and email of the property owner.

The amendment area contains multiple owners. See Appendix IV for list of property owners.

D. Applicant's rationale for the amendment. The Planning Council requests a condensed version for inclusion in the staff report (about two paragraphs). Planning Council staff may accept greater than two paragraphs, if submitted in an electronic format.

The City of Fort Lauderdale is seeking to amend the existing underlying land uses from Employment Center, Industrial, and Commercial to an Activity Center (County Land Use Plan) / Transit Oriented Development (City Land Use Plan) land use designation.

The overall intent is to establish a framework to guide future growth in the area by with one, unified land use designation that supports a mix of uses and transit supportive development. The project also includes the creation of a form-based code to regulate the built form consistent with the new underlying land use.

3. AMENDMENT SITE DESCRIPTION

A. Concise written description of the general boundaries and gross acreage (as defined by BCLUP) of the proposed amendment.

The proposed application is seeking to amend the existing underlying land uses from Employment Center, Industrial, and Commercial to an Activity Center (County Land Use Plan) / Transit Oriented Development (City Land Use Plan) land use designation.

The overall intent is to establish a framework to guide future growth in the area by with one, unified land use designation that supports a mix of uses and transit supportive development. The amendment area, commonly known as "Uptown," is generally described as the area in and around the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport with the area's core flanked by C-14 canal and McNab Road to the north, 57th Street to the south, Powerline Road to the west, and I-95 to the east, containing approximately 353 gross acres.

In 2014, the City engaged the Urban Land Institute (ULI) to conduct a technical advisory panel (TAP) report on the Uptown area with the goal of identifying how the City could drive future growth to Uptown. The TAP panel concluded that land use and zoning changes would be necessary to facilitate a mixed use environment, including housing, which can capitalize on the strong employment base and existing transit services. In addition, the TAP panel recommended
strategies for making the streets more walkable, livable and inviting for a wide range of mobility needs, in order to transform the area into a more vibrant urban village neighborhood.

The project also includes the creation of a form-based code to regulate the built form consistent with the new underlying land use.

B. Sealed survey, including legal description of the area proposed to be amended.

A sketch and legal description is provided. See Exhibit A.

C. Map at a scale clearly indicating the amendment’s location, boundaries, and proposed land uses.

A location map is provided. See Exhibit B.

4. EXISTING AND PROPOSED USES

A. Current and proposed local and Broward County Land Use Plan designation(s) for the amendment site. If multiple land use designations, describe gross acreage within each designation. For Activity Center amendments, the proposed text indicating the maximum residential and non-residential uses must be included.

The subject site contains various land use designations on the County and City land use plans. Those land uses are: Industrial, Employment Center, Office, and Commercial. The breakdown of existing land uses can be found in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th>CURRENT LAND USE</th>
<th>CITY ACREAGE</th>
<th>COUNTY ACREAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT LAND USE</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED LAND USE</td>
<td>Transit-oriented Development</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Fort Lauderdale, Urban Design and Planning

B. Indicate if the flexibility provisions of the Broward County Land Use Plan have been used for the amendment site or adjacent areas.

The project area contains portions of three flex zones; 20, 21, and 42. According to City’s Flex Tables, flex zone 20 has not had any flex allocated, flex zone 21 has two projects with employment to commercial flex acreage allocated, and flex zone 42 has had six projects with various flex allocated. The table below
provides the remaining flex for each of these zones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
<th>FLEXIBILITY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flex Zone</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex Units</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Units</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Units</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Commercial to Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Residential to Commercial</td>
<td>14.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Industrial to Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Employment Center To Commercial / Retail</td>
<td>85.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Fort Lauderdale, Urban Design and Planning

C. Existing use of amendment site and adjacent areas.

The existing land uses within the amendment site and adjacent areas are a variety of uses including retail commercial, office, residential, employment, airport uses, and other community facility uses.

D. Proposed use of the amendment site including proposed square footage (for analytical purposes only) for each non-residential use and/or dwelling unit count. For Activity Center amendments, also provide the existing for each non-residential use and existing dwelling units for amendment area.

The amendment site is planned to be a single land use designation as an Activity Center on the County Land Use Plan and Transit Oriented Development on the City Land Use Plan. The table below outlines the existing development and the new proposed development program for the Uptown Area.

The development program was based on the following factors: (1) the redevelopment of underutilized properties including surface parking areas, (2) lack of certain land uses; e.g. residential, and (3) a market and economic analysis that was completed by SRTA for the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub, which can be found at [http://www.browardmpo.org/index.php/cypress-creek-mobility-hub](http://www.browardmpo.org/index.php/cypress-creek-mobility-hub) (see Appendix XIII for study).

Future redevelopment that replaces existing development will either be given the credit if same use is proposed within the project or added back to available intensity for the project area.

In addition, the proposed land use program was divided into sub-areas to assist in evaluating demand of public services as well as assisting in the master plan effort that is concurrently occurring for the project.

Table 4 outlines the proposed LUPA program and proposed development program by subarea. See Exhibit C for project area map with subareas.
## Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Industrial (square feet)</th>
<th>Com (square feet)</th>
<th>Office (square feet)</th>
<th>Res (units)</th>
<th>Park (acres)</th>
<th>Hotel (square feet)</th>
<th>Civic (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>1,264,447</td>
<td>3,885,656</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>132,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed LUPA</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,314,447</td>
<td>4,110,656</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>152,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subarea Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Civic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarea 4</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Fort Lauderdale, Urban Design and Planning

E. Maximum allowable development per adopted and certified land use plans under existing designation for the site, including square footage/floor area ratio/lot coverage/height limitations for each non-residential use and/or dwelling unit count.

Table 5 depicts a development potential based on a land use analysis of the current land use designation compared to the proposed LUPA program. Table 5 identifies the acreage and square footage by land use, the maximum development floor area ratio intensity standard of 3 as outlined in the City’s Comprehensive Plan, existing development, and the proposed LUPA program. Assumptions were made for residential and hotel square footage.

Table 5 depicts the development potential, as permitted under the City’s Comprehensive Plan, with the application of a 40% reduction based upon City’s Unified Land Development Code (ULDR) Zoning Requirements which would further restrict development potential with setbacks, building heights, etc., compared to the square footage for the proposed LUPA program. As shown in this table, the LUPA (including existing development and proposed) is significantly less than the Comprehensive Plan maximum development floor area ratio intensity standard of 3.
TABLE 5

DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>OF</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>Proposed Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RES*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area (approx. acres)</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area (approx. sq. ft.)</td>
<td>11,230,557</td>
<td>409,906</td>
<td>317,412</td>
<td>3,491,270</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Plan (FAR 3)</td>
<td>33,691,671</td>
<td>1,229,718</td>
<td>952,287</td>
<td>10,473,810</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Development</td>
<td>4,315,806</td>
<td>14,621</td>
<td>3,723</td>
<td>952,287</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed LUPA Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>2,520,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DU square footage was estimated based on average of 900 square feet per unit (900 x 2,800 units)

**Hotel Room square footage was estimated based on average of 400 square feet per room (400 x 450 rooms)

**Hotel Rooms for existing hotels captured in existing development square feet

COMPARISON OF DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL TO PROPOSED LUPA

| Total development permitted based on FAR of 3; Intensity Standards, City’s Comp Plan | 46,347,435 |
| Reduction factor of 40% based on typical development patterns and ULDR standards | 18,538,974 |
| Total development proposed (LUPA) including existing and new development | 8,531,437 |

Source: City of Fort Lauderdale, Urban Design and Planning

5. ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The items below must be addressed to determine the impact of an amendment on existing and planned public facilities and services. Provide calculations for each public facility and/or service. If more than one amendment is submitted, calculations must be prepared on an individual and cumulative basis.

The project area is serviced by both Broward County and City of Fort Lauderdale. Due to the split in service provider area, the proposed LUPA development program for Uptown has been divided into four subareas. Subareas one and two are serviced by Broward County and subareas three and four are serviced by the City.

A land use analysis was conducted based upon Table 6 for those areas serviced by Broward County and the City for current land use designations, Table 4 for proposed LUPA development program, and identifying difference in demand, where appropriate.

TABLE 6

CURRENT LAND USE

DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL BY SERVICE AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>EC (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>COM (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>OF (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>IND (sq. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broward County</td>
<td>9,752,787</td>
<td>486,038</td>
<td>379,405</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>1,997,559</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,808,609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Fort Lauderdale, Urban Design and Planning
A. Potable Water Analysis

1. Provide the potable water level of service per the adopted and certified local land use plan, including the adoption date of the 10 Year Water Supply Facilities Plan.

   The City adopted the 10-Year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan on April 7, 2015. The level of service standards are outlined in the adopted Water Supply Facilities Work Plan for the proposed LUPA.

2. Identify the potable water facility serving the area in which the amendment is located including the current plant capacity, current and committed demand on the plant and planned plant capacity expansions, including year and funding sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7</th>
<th>POTABLE WATER PROJECTED PLANT CAPACITY &amp; DEMAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broward County - District 1 Water Treatment Plant</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Plant Design</td>
<td>16 MGD(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current + Committed Plant Demand</td>
<td>11.3 (^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Permit</td>
<td>15.3 (^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration Date of SFWMD Permit</td>
<td>April 8, 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Broward County Water Supply Facilities Work Plan, November 24, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^1) Projected year 2015 maximum day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^2) Operating permit 06-58-00009 for District 1 Operating Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **City of Fort Lauderdale - Fiveash and Peele-Dixie Water Treatment Plants** | |
| Current Plant Design (Fiveash – 70 MGD, Peele – 12 MGD) | 82.00 MGD |
| Current + Committed Plant Demand | 42.82 MGD\(^1\) |
| SFWMD Permitted Withdrawal | 52.55 MGD\(^2\) |
| Expiration Date of SFWMD Permit | 2028 |
| Source: City Comprehensive Plan, *Table 3.7* |

3. Identify the net impact on potable water demand, based on the adopted level of service, resulting from the proposed amendment. Provide calculations, including anticipated demand per square foot or dwelling un
### TABLE 8
COUNTY SERVICE AREA - POTABLE WATER
CURRENT LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>= 0 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>486,038 sf x 3.455 ERCs/1000 sf = 1,679.3 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=503,779 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Park</td>
<td>379,405 sf x 0.636 ERCs/1000 sf = 241.3 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=72,391 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>9,752,787 sf x 0.636 ERCs/1,000 = 6,202.77 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=1,860,831GPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: ERC calculation based on "office" use)  

**Potential**  
=2,437,001 GPD  
(2.437 MGD)

### PROPOSED LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0 sf x 0.368 ERCs/1,000 sf = 0 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>= 0 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>200,000 sf x 3.455 ERCs/1000 sf = 87 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=207,488 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>100,000 sf x 0.636 ERCs/1000 sf = 31.8 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=19,080 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2,250,000 sf x 0.805 ERCs/900 sf/unit = 403 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=604,706 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>120,000 sf x 0.255 ERCs/400 sf/room = 39 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=22,950 GPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed LUPA**  
=854,224 GPD  
(.854 MGD)

**Difference**  
=1,582,777 GPD  
(1.582 MGD)

### TABLE 9
CITY SERVICE AREA - POTABLE WATER
CURRENT LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3,808,609 sf x 0.368 ERCs/1000 sf = 1,401.57 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=420,470 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>= 0 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>= 0 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>1,997,559 sf x 0.636 ERCs/1,000 = 1,270.44 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=381,134 GPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: ERC calculation based on "office" use)  

**Potential**  
=801,604 GPD  
(.801 MGD)

### PROPOSED LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>50,000 sf x 0.368 ERCs/1,000 sf = 19 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>= 5,700 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>25,000 sf x 3.455 ERCs/1000 sf = 87 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=26,100 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>150,000 sf x 0.636 ERCs/1000 sf = 63.6 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=28,620 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>270,000 sf x 0.805 ERCs/900 sf/unit = 242 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=72,600 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>60,000 sf x 0.255 ERCs/400 sf/room = 39 ERCs x 300 GPD</td>
<td>=11,475 GPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Correspondence from the potable water provider verifying the information submitted in items 1-3 above. Correspondence must contain name, position and contact information of party providing verification.

See Appendix V: Potable Water Correspondence

B. Sanitary Sewer Analysis

1. Provide the sanitary sewer level of service per the adopted and certified local land use plan.

POLICY 1.2.2: The levels of service for wastewater are as follows: 350 gallons per day per single family housing unit; other residential buildings: 250 gallons per day per housing unit; hotel/motel: 150 gallons per day per bedroom; office, retail and warehouse uses: 1 gallon per square foot per day; institutional uses: 200 gallons per day per bed; restaurant: 30 gallons per seat per day. The level of service for water shall be 197 gallons per capita per day.

2. Identify the sanitary sewer facilities serving the area in which the amendment is located including the current plant capacity, current and committed demand on the plant and planned capacity expansions, including year and funding source.

| TABLE 10 | SANITARY SEWER |
| PROJECTED PLANT CAPACITY & DEMAND |
| Broward County - District 1 Water Treatment Plant | |
| FDEP Permitted Capacity | 95 MGD \(^1\) |
| Current + Committed Plant Demand | 71 MGD \(^2\) |
| Source: Broward County Water Supply Facilities Work Plan, November 24, 2014 |
| \(^1\) Based on FDEP permit and Maximum Three Month Average Daily Flow (M3MADF). Permit #FLA041378-012-DWIP. |
| \(^2\) Annual average wastewater flow, 2010. |

| City of Fort Lauderdale - G.T. Lohmeyer Treatment Plants | |
| FDEP Plant Capacity | 56.6 MGD |
| BCDEP Plant Capacity | 48 MGD |
| Current + Committed Plant Demand | 38.33 MGD + 1.34 MGD = 39.67 MGD |
| Planned Plant Capacity | 48 MGD (BCDEP) / 56.6 MGD (FDEP) |
| Sources/Notes: |
| \(^1\) Based on FDEP permit and Maximum Three Month Average Daily Flow (M3MADF). Permit #FLA041378-012-DWIP. |
| \(^2\) Based on BCDEP Permit #WWTT-0700-12 and Annual Average Daily Flow (AADF). |
(3) The committed flow is traced by the City of Fort Lauderdale Public Works Department and varies as new developments are completed. The Capacity Analysis Report (CAR) is in the process of being updated. Expansion of plant capacity is not expected to be needed until 2037.

3. Identify the net impact on sanitary sewer demand, based on adopted level of service, resulting from the proposed amendment. Provide calculations, including anticipated demand per square foot* or dwelling unit.

### TABLE 11
COUNTY SERVICE AREA - SANITARY SEWER
CURRENT LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0 sf x 1 gal/sf</td>
<td>0 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>486,038 sf x 1 gal/sf</td>
<td>486,038 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Park</td>
<td>379,405 sf x 1 gal/sf</td>
<td>379,405 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>9,752,787 sf x 1 gal/sf</td>
<td>9,752,787 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>=10,618,230 GPD (10.618 MGD)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (Warehouse use)</td>
<td>0 sf x 1 gal/sf</td>
<td>0 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Restaurant)</td>
<td>200,000 sf x 1 gal/sf</td>
<td>200,000 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>100,000 sf x 1 gal/sf</td>
<td>100,000 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Condominium, apartment)</td>
<td>2,250,000 sf x 1 gal/sf</td>
<td>2,250,000 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (without restaurant and meeting rooms)</td>
<td>120,000 sf x 1 gal/sf</td>
<td>120,000 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Proposed LUPA**</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,670,000 GPD (2.67 MGD)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>=9,698,666 GPD (15.112 MGD)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 12
CITY SERVICE AREA - SANITARY SEWER
CURRENT LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3,808,609 sf x 1 gal/sf</td>
<td>3,808,609 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>1,997,559 sf x 1 gal/sf</td>
<td>1,997,559 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>=5,806,168 GPD (5.806 MGD)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED LAND USE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>SF x gal/sf</th>
<th>Gallons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (Warehouse)</td>
<td>50,000 x 1</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (Restaurant)</td>
<td>25,000 x 1</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>150,000 x 1</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Condo)</td>
<td>0 x 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (without restaurant)</td>
<td>0 x 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed LUPA**: 225,000 GPD (.919 MGD)

**Difference**: 5,581,168 GPD (5.581 MGD)

4. Correspondence from sewer provider verifying information submitted as part of the application on items 1-3. Correspondence must contain name, position and contact information of party providing verification.

**See Appendix VI: Sanitary Sewer Correspondence**

C. **Solid Waste Analysis**

1. Provide the solid waste level of service per the adopted and certified local land use plan.

   **The adopted level of service standard in the City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan is 7.2 pounds per capita per day.**

2. Identify the solid waste facilities serving the service area in which the amendment is located including the landfill/plant capacity, current plus committed demand on landfill/plant capacity, and planned landfill/plant capacity.

   The City collects solid waste from single family and small multi-family housing units within the City. Larger multi-family units and commercial and industrial land uses are required to contract with private hauling firms to collect solid waste.

   The City of Fort Lauderdale has entered into an agreement with Wheelabrator, Inc. for solid waste disposal service. The current capacity at the resource recovery facilities is 1.6 million tons per year. In addition, the Broward Interim Contingency (BIC) Landfill has a capacity of 4,500,000 cubic yards. Each resource recovery facility is expandable by 33%. A third resource recovery
facility location is reserved at the BIC Landfill. The current demand is 1.095 million tons per year at the resource recovery facilities and 80,000 - 100,000 tons per year at BIC. There are no current plans for expansion. There are no plans through the year 2020 for expansion of existing facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 13</th>
<th>SOLID WASTE CAPACITY &amp; DEMAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landfill/plant capacity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1.6 million tons/year (2 waste to energy facilities @ 2,250 tons/day/facility)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4,500,000 cubic yards at BIC Landfill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CDSL backup capacity, as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Demand:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1.095 million tons/year at Wheelabrator facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 80,000-100,000 tons/year at BIC Landfill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committed Capacity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1.095 mil. tons/year at Wheelabrator; none at BIC; none at CDSL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Broward County Solid Waste

3. Identify the net impact on solid waste demand, based on the adopted level of service, resulting from the proposed amendment. Provide calculations, including anticipated demand per square foot or dwelling unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 14</th>
<th>SOLID WASTE IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td><strong>Calculation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPTOWN: 2,800 Multi-family d.u.s</td>
<td>4,200 people(1) X 7.2 lbs per capita/day (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 2,800 d.u. x 1.5 persons/d.u. = 4,200 people
(2) Source: City Comp. Plan Infrast. Element Policy 5.2.1

4. Correspondence from the solid waste provider verifying that the information submitted in items 1-3 above. Correspondence must contain name, position and contact information of party providing verification.

**See Appendix VII: Solid Waste Correspondence**

D. Drainage Analysis

1. Provide the drainage level of service per adopted and certified local land use plan.

   The level of service standards for drainage as adopted by the City of Fort Lauderdale are provided below:

   **Road Protection:**
   Residential streets with rights-of-way less than fifty feet wide to have crown elevations no lower than the elevation for the respective area depicted on the ten year "Flood Criteria Map."
Streets in rights-of-way greater than fifty feet wide to have an ultimate edge of pavement no lower than the elevation for the respective area depicted on the ten year "Flood Criteria Map."

**Buildings:**
To have the lowest floor elevation no lower than the elevation for the respective area depicted on the 100 Year Flood Elevation or FEMA Map. Retain the first inch of storm water runoff on-site.

**Off Site Discharge:**
Residential projects less than 1 acre: After retaining the first inch of runoff not to exceed the inflow limit of SFWMD primary receiving canal or the local conveyance system, whichever is less.

Residential projects greater than 1 acre and nonresidential projects: Retain the greater of one inch over the site area or 2.5 inches over the percentage of impervious area.

**Storm Sewers:**
Design frequency minimum to be three-year rainfall intensity if the State Department of Transportation Zone 10 rainfall curves.

**Flood Plain:**
Calculated flood elevations based on the ten year and one hundred year return frequency rainfall of three day duration shall not exceed the corresponding elevations of the ten year Flood Criteria and the 100 Year Flood Elevation Map.

**On Site Storage:**

**Best Management Practices:**
Prior to discharge to surface or ground water, Best Management Practices will be used to reduce pollutant discharge. Regulations for roads and parking lots shall be consistent with the criteria established by the South Florida Water Management District for such uses.

*Source: City Comp. Plan Policy 4.1.3*

2. Identify the drainage district and drainage systems serving the amendment area.

The City of Fort Lauderdale is not located in a drainage or flood control district. The project will have on-site storm drainage. This may include underground piping, exfiltration trenches, and catch basins. The existing local streets have storm drainage maintained by the City.
3. Identify any planned drainage improvements, including year, funding sources and other relevant information.

   All improvements required to meet the adopted level of service will be installed by the applicant in conjunction with new development.

4. Indicate if a Surface Water Management Plan has been approved by, or an application submitted to, the SFWMD and/or any independent drainage district, for the amendment site. Identify the permit number(s), or application number(s) if the project is pending, for the amendment site. If an amendment site is not required to obtain a SFWMD permit, provide documentation of same.

   A Surface Water Management Plan has not been approved for the site but will be prepared as part of the project.

5. If the area in which the amendment is located does not meet the adopted level of service and there are no improvements planned (by the unit of local government or drainage authority) to address the deficiencies, provide an engineering analysis which demonstrated how the site will be drained and the impact on the surrounding properties. The information should include the wet season water level for the amendment site, design storm elevation, natural and proposed land elevation, one hundred year flood elevation, acreage for proposed water management retention area, elevations for buildings, roads and years, storage and runoff calculations for the design storm and estimated time for flood waters to recede to the natural land elevation.

   Development within the site will be required to meet the drainage standards of the City, Broward County Department of Planning and Environmental Protection, and the South Florida Water Management District. The amendment site will meet the adopted level of service for development within the site.

6. Correspondence from local drainage district verifying the information submitted as part of the application on items 1-5 above. Correspondence must contain name, position and contact information of party providing verification.

   See Appendix VIII: Drainage Correspondence

E. Recreation and Open Space

1. Provide the recreation and open space level of service per the adopted and certified local land use plan.
The adopted level of service for recreation and open space in the City is 3 acres per one 1,000 residents.

2. For amendments which will result in an increased demand for “community parks” acreage, as required by the Broward County Land Use Plan, an up-to-date inventory of the municipal community parks inventory must be submitted.

See Appendix IX: Park and Recreation Data

3. Identify the net impact on demand for “community parks” acreage, as defined by the Broward County Land Use Plan, resulting from this amendment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 15</th>
<th>RECREATION &amp; OPEN SPACE IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Calculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>UPTOWN: 2,800 Multi-Family d.u.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+ 12.6 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 2,800 d.u. x 1.5 persons/d.u. = 4,200 people
(2) City Comp. Plan Parks & Rec Element Objective 1.1

4. Identify the projected “community parks” acreage needs based on the local government’s projected build-out population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 16</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PARK NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Horizon</td>
<td>Population(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 (short)</td>
<td>212,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 (long)</td>
<td>237,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) City Comprehensive Plan Parks and Recreation Element, Table 1
(2) Broward County Planning Council Recertified Parks & Facilities 01.27.2011

5. As applicable, describe how the local government and/or applicant are addressing Broward County Land Use Plan Policies 2.5.4 and 2.5.5 (a. through e.), regarding the provision of open space.

In addition to the park needs identified above, the Uptown Master Plan envisions the need for additional parklands as the area grows and develops. The Uptown Master Plan will recommend additional pocket parks, as well as extensive plazas, green belts and pedestrian linkages that will make it a walkable uptown area. Similarly, the 2015 Fort Lauderdale Parks and Recreation Long Range Strategic Plan propose several potential pocket parks and identify several areas for new neighborhood parks in Uptown. The implementation of the Uptown Master Plan and the Long Range Strategic Plan by the City of Fort Lauderdale will ensure that the proper park and recreational needs are met as the area progresses.
F. Traffic Circulation Analysis

1. Identify the roadways impacted by the proposed amendment and indicate the number of lanes, current traffic volume, adopted level of service and current level of service for each roadway.

The proposed amendment site contains approximately 353 acres and includes the uptown area of Fort Lauderdale known as Uptown Urban Village Area, which is commonly referred to as Uptown. Uptown is generally described as the area in around the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport, with the area's core flanked by C-14 canal and McNab Road to the north, 57th Street to the south, Powerline Road to the west, and I-95 to the east.

Pursuant to Policies, 1.7.1 and 1.7.2 (see Transportation Element, Volume 1-254 (page number 9-10 through 9-13), City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan, Ordinance C-15-08 as adopted in 2008 with updates through 2015), the adopted comprehensive plan LOS for FIHS roadways is E and non FIHS roadways is D for development located in the City's Central District. Affected roadway segment in the study area in the long-term (Year 2040) includes Powerline Road (SR 845) from Commercial Boulevard to Cypress Creek Road. It should be noted that the affected roadway segment on Powerline Road (SR 845) operates at LOS F on a daily (24 hours) basis with average daily traffic exceeding slightly over maximum service volume. Further, this segment operates at LOS C during AM and PM Peak Hours. Additionally, net new trips from the proposed amendment does not exceed three (3) percent of roadway service capacity. Therefore, none of the roadway segments in the study area is significantly impacted by the proposed amendment and level of service in all of the corridors within the study area are acceptable.

Table 15 includes Year 2016 daily traffic volumes (adjusted to existing 2017 conditions by applying 0.5 percent growth factor), current laneage and LOS for each study area roadway segment based on FDOT's Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes (Table 1) and Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes (Table 4).

---

1 The Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) updated Broward County Roadway Capacity Analysis for 2011 and 2035 in September 2012. Since the current adopted regional travel demand model, SERPM 7.0 has Year 2040 planning horizon, it is appropriate and relevant for conducting this traffic impact analysis.
### Table 17: Existing Conditions, Year 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Number of Lanes</th>
<th>Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes</th>
<th>Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes</th>
<th>Existing Conditions (Year 2017)</th>
<th>Year 2017 - Level of Service (LOS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>North of NW 57th Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400</td>
<td>59,900</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>2,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of NW 57th Street</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400</td>
<td>59,900</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>2,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400</td>
<td>59,900</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>3,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400</td>
<td>59,900</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>3,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>26,300</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of NW 56th Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>26,300</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>North of NW 56th Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>44,700</td>
<td>4,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of NW 56th Street</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>47,900</td>
<td>4,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>59,300</td>
<td>4,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>59,300</td>
<td>4,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>S. of Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>126,400</td>
<td>154,300</td>
<td>255,400</td>
<td>22,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>47,900</td>
<td>4,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>NW 6th Way</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920</td>
<td>72,090</td>
<td>63,810</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920</td>
<td>72,090</td>
<td>63,810</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920</td>
<td>72,090</td>
<td>63,810</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920</td>
<td>72,090</td>
<td>63,810</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>NW 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>NW 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Quality/Level of Service Handbook, FDOT, 2013; Derived from FDOT Florida Traffic Online, 2016
2. Identify the projected level of service for the roadways impacted by the proposed amendment for the long-range planning horizon. Please utilize average daily and p.m. peak hour traffic volumes per Broward Metropolitan Planning.
Table 18: Projected Traffic Volume, Short Term - Year 2022 without Proposed Land Use Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Number of Lanes</th>
<th>Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes</th>
<th>Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes</th>
<th>Year 2022, Short Term w/o Proposed LUPA</th>
<th>Year 2022, Short Term w/o Proposed LUPA - Level of Service (LOS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>North of NW 57th Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 59,900 5750 5,390</td>
<td>33,000 2,650 2,800</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of NW 57th Street</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 59,900 5750 5,390</td>
<td>33,000 2,650 2,800</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 59,900 5750 5,390</td>
<td>40,700 3,250 3,510</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>North of NW 56th Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851</td>
<td>27,000 1,870 2,630</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of NW 56th Street</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851</td>
<td>27,000 1,870 2,630</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851</td>
<td>27,000 1,870 2,630</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851</td>
<td>32,000 2,870 2,870</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851</td>
<td>21,600 1,790 2,220</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-95</td>
<td>S. of Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>N of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>126,400 154,300 176,600 11,100 13,390 15,010 262,000 23,400 23,400</td>
<td>F F F</td>
<td>F F F</td>
<td>F F F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851</td>
<td>45,800 4,130 4,130</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>NW 6th Way</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920 72,090 6,381 6,489</td>
<td>60,800 4,920 5,090</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>NW 6th Way</td>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920 72,090 6,381 6,489</td>
<td>60,800 4,920 5,090</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>I-95/SR-9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920 72,090 6,381 6,489</td>
<td>60,800 4,920 5,090</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851</td>
<td>23,200 2,360 2,280</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>NW 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851</td>
<td>17,600 1,590 1,590</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>NW 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851</td>
<td>17,600 1,590 1,590</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851</td>
<td>17,600 1,590 1,590</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Quality/Level of Service Handbook, FDOT, 2013; Derived from FDOT Florida Traffic Online, 2016
## Table 19: Projected Traffic Volume, Short Term - Year 2022 with Proposed Land Use Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Number of Lanes</th>
<th>Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes</th>
<th>Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes</th>
<th>Year 2022, Short Term w/Proposed LUPA</th>
<th>Year 2022, Short Term w/Proposed LUPA - Level of Service (LOS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>North of NW 57th Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 59,900 - 5,250 5,390 -</td>
<td>33,400 2,700 2,820 - 3,450 3,530 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of NW 57th Street</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 59,900 - 5,250 5,390 -</td>
<td>33,400 2,700 2,800 - 3,450 3,530 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 59,900 - 5,250 5,390 -</td>
<td>41,100 3,250 3,530 - 3,500 3,510 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>North of NW 56th Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 - 4,725 4,851 -</td>
<td>27,500 1,890 2,650 - 2,550 2,600 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of NW 56th Street</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 - 4,725 4,851 -</td>
<td>27,300 1,870 2,630 - 2,500 2,600 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 - 4,725 4,851 -</td>
<td>28,000 1,970 2,670 - 2,550 2,600 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 - 4,725 4,851 -</td>
<td>35,200 3,130 3,050 - 3,000 3,000 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-95</td>
<td>S. of Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>N of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>126,400 154,300 176,600 11,100 13,300</td>
<td>15,010 264,000 23,530 23,530 23,530</td>
<td>F F F</td>
<td>F F F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 - 4,725 4,851 -</td>
<td>45,800 4,150 4,140 - 4,100 4,130 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>NW 6th Way</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920 72,090 - 6,381 6,489 -</td>
<td>61,500 4,970 5,140 - 4,950 5,120 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>NW 6th Way</td>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920 72,090 - 6,381 6,489 -</td>
<td>62,300 5,020 5,190 - 5,000 5,200 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>I-95/SR-9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920 72,090 - 6,381 6,489 -</td>
<td>62,200 4,960 5,170 - 4,950 5,160 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 - 4,725 4,851 -</td>
<td>23,800 2,390 2,300 - 2,320 2,310 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>NW 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 - 4,725 4,851 -</td>
<td>18,700 1,700 1,670 - 1,700 1,670 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>NW 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 - 4,725 4,851 -</td>
<td>17,600 1,600 1,590 - 1,580 1,580 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 - 4,725 4,851 -</td>
<td>18,400 1,690 1,630 - 1,680 1,630 -</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>C C C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Quality/Level of Service Handbook, FDOT, 2013; Derived from SERPM 7.0, FDOT District 4
Table 20: Projected Traffic Volume, Long Term - Year 2040 without Proposed Land Use Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Number of Lanes</th>
<th>Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes</th>
<th>Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes</th>
<th>Year 2040, Long Term w/o Proposed LUPA</th>
<th>Year 2040, Long Term w/o Proposed LUPA - Level of Service (LOS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>North of NW 57th Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 59,900 5,250 5,390 59,600 4,130</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of NW 57th Street</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 59,900 5,250 5,390 59,600 4,160</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 59,900 5,250 5,390 52,200 3,700</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 59,900 5,250 5,390 55,400 4,020</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>North of NW 56th Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851 23,600 1,990</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of NW 56th Street</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851 24,700 2,150</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851 41,000 2,810</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851 34,600 2,590</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851 21,200 1,650</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-95</td>
<td>S. of Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>N of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>126,400 154,300 176,600 11,100 13,390 15,010 263,400 16,200 16,170</td>
<td>F F F</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851 58,400 3,850</td>
<td>F C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>NW 6th Way</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920 72,090 6,381 6,489 50,500 3,630</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>NW 6th Way</td>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920 72,090 6,381 6,489 64,300 4,170</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>I-95/5/SR-9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920 72,090 6,381 6,489 64,700 2,660</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851 30,700 2,130</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>NW 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851 16,900 1,160</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>NW 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851 15,000 1,060</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910 4,725 4,851 35,500 2,700</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>ADT PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS 'C' LOS 'D' LOS 'E' ADT AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour Daily AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Quality/Level of Service Handbook, FDOT, 2013; SERPM 7.0, FDOT District 4
### Table 21: Projected Traffic Volume, Long Term - Year 2040 with Proposed Land Use Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Number of Lanes</th>
<th>Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes</th>
<th>Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes</th>
<th>Year 2040, Long Term w/ Proposed LUPA</th>
<th>Year 2040, Long Term w/ Proposed LUPA - Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>% Increase in Segment Volume Compared to w/o Project</th>
<th>Greater than 3% of Roadway Service Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>North of NW 57th Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 99,900</td>
<td>5,250 5,390 60,800 4,420 4,200</td>
<td>F C C</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of NW 57th Street</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 99,900</td>
<td>5,250 5,390 60,800 4,320 4,260</td>
<td>F C C</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58,400 99,900</td>
<td>5,250 5,390 53,500 3,610 3,920</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>North of NW 56th Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910</td>
<td>4,725 4,851 25,200 2,060 2,180</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of NW 56th Street</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910</td>
<td>4,725 4,851 25,700 2,140 2,100</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of Andrews Way</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910</td>
<td>4,725 4,851 44,400 3,130 3,460</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910</td>
<td>4,725 4,851 45,100 3,470 3,550</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>North of W. McNab Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910</td>
<td>4,725 4,851 23,800 1,930 2,520</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-95</td>
<td>S. of Commercial Boulevard/SR 870</td>
<td>S. of W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>126,400 154,300 176,600 11,100 13,390 15,010</td>
<td>270,500 16,620 16,600 270,500 16,620</td>
<td>F F F</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910</td>
<td>4,725 4,851 58,200 3,930 4,230</td>
<td>F C C</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>NW 6th Way</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920 72,090</td>
<td>6,381 6,489 52,900 3,790 4,130</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cypress Creek Road</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,920 72,090</td>
<td>6,381 6,489 69,200 4,510 5,420</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910</td>
<td>4,725 4,851 32,700 2,290 2,580</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>West of Powerline Road/SR 845</td>
<td>NW 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910</td>
<td>4,725 4,851 20,700 1,520 1,940</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>NW 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910</td>
<td>4,725 4,851 14,900 1,090 1,540</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McNab Road</td>
<td>East of Andrews Avenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52,560 53,910</td>
<td>4,725 4,851 38,100 3,030 3,250</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Quality/Level of Service Handbook, FDOT, 2013; SERPM 7.0, FDOT District 4
3. Planning Council staff will analyze traffic impacts resulting from the amendment. The applicant may provide a traffic impact analysis for the amendment – calculate anticipated average daily and p.m. peak hour traffic generation for the existing and proposed land use designations. If the amendment reflects a net increase in traffic generation, identify access points to/from the amendment site and provide a distribution of the additional traffic on the impacted roadway network for the long-range planning horizon.Organization (MPO) plans and projection.

The Southeast Regional Planning Model (SERPM 7.0) with a long term planning horizon of Year 2040 was used to analyze traffic impacts resulting from the proposed land use for the amendment area. Trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice and trip assignment procedures available in SERPM 7.0 were applied to understand multimodal impacts on the study area’s transportation network as well as throughout the South Florida region.

The short term planning horizon Year 2022 trip generation calculation was based on the assumption that 30 percent of net new trips generated from the proposed amendment in the long term, Year 2040, would occur in the short term, Year 2022 since development was anticipated to take place over a 20-year timeframe. Furthermore, according to the Broward MPO’s 2015 Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Master Plan - Economic and Market Analysis Report, the proposed land use program for this amendment accounts for 40 percent of total market potential. To be more conservative, instead of distributing traffic impacts equally over the next 20 years in 5-year increments, which would yield 25 percent trips, the LOS analysis is based on 30 percent trips.

Tables 20 and 21 provide average daily trip generation calculations by mode for the proposed land use program for the amendment area in the short term (2022) and long term (Year 2040).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 23</th>
<th>Net New Daily Trips, Short Term - Year 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Person Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>(A) Within the Study Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>3,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SERPM 7.0, FDOT District 4
### TABLE 24
Net New Daily Trips, Long Term - Year 2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>(A) Within the Study Area</th>
<th>(B) Study Area to Other Area</th>
<th>(C) Others to Study Area</th>
<th>(D) = (B+C) From/To Study Area</th>
<th>(A+D) Study Area Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>18,460</td>
<td>18,420</td>
<td>36,880</td>
<td>43,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>11,480</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,170</td>
<td>19,740</td>
<td>19,740</td>
<td>39,480</td>
<td>57,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SERPM 7.0, FDOT District 4

Tables show average daily traffic volume as well as PM Peak Hour traffic volumes on various roadway segments that provide access to and from the study area along with corresponding LOS in the short term (Year 2022) and long term (Year 2040).

The proposed land use amendment is found to generate 11,070 net external daily automobile trips, 995 net external AM Peak Hour automobile trips and 1,085 net external PM Peak Hour automobile trips in the short term (Year 2022). It is anticipated to produce 36,880 net external daily automobile trips, 3,320 net external AM Peak Hour automobile trips and 3,610 net external PM Peak Hour automobile trips in the long term (Year 2040).

In a traditional land use plan amendment, the Applicant would evaluate the trips from the allowable land use, against the trips from the proposed land use. In this case, the City is requesting to amend the existing underlying land uses from Employment Center, Industrial, and Commercial to an Activity Center (County Land Use Plan) / Transit Oriented Development (City Land Use Plan) land use designation.

As shown in the Tables 4 and 5 on page 6, the LUPA (including existing development and proposed) is significantly less than the City’s Comprehensive Plan identifies. The calculations in Table 5-8 use maximum development permitted by the City’s Comp plan, which is based on an FAR intensity standard of three (3). When all existing development square

---

2 SERPM 7.0 converts total person trips into automobile and transit trips using a mode choice model. The mode choice model evaluates utility of each mode based on in-vehicle travel time, cost, level of comfort, wait times amongst other variables to determine the possibility of people choosing a mode. While SERPM 7.0 does not include bicycle and sidewalk networks, intra zonal trips were stratified in to bike and walk trips based on average trip lengths. Further, AM and PM Peak Hour automobile trips were derived using 9% and 10% peak hour factors respectively.
footage is added to the proposed LUPA program and a reduction factor applied to provide a more reasonable maximum development based on existing development patterns and the ULDR, the resulting development is substantially less than what is allowable by the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, this amendment would theoretically result in trip reduction or at least generate less adverse impacts than allowable land use designation.

4. Provide any relevant transportation studies relating to this amendment, as applicable.

A number of transportation planning studies are underway at this time within the study area or adjacent to it. City staff has coordinated with all of the partner agencies including FDOT, Broward County Transit (BCT), Broward County Planning Council (BCPC), Broward MPO, and Broward County Traffic Engineering Department (BCTED) since April 2016 on a regular basis to integrate all on-going projects and planning initiatives to the extent possible.

I-95 PD&E Study
The FDOT is evaluating transportation improvements and/or alternatives its on-going I-95 PD&E Study from South of SR 870/Commercial Boulevard to North of Cypress Creek Road. An alternatives public workshop was conducted by the FDOT on April 29, 2017. The FDOT project team confirmed the following key developments and approach for identifying improvements through the on-going PD&E Study from South of SR 870/Commercial Boulevard to North of Cypress Creek Road:

• Focus on capacity improvements along I-95 from Cypress Creek Road to Commercial Boulevard
• No longer consider the removal of the left turn movements at the Cypress Creek Road & Andrews Avenue intersection.
• Access “ramp” from NE 1st Avenue to I-95 will not be considered because FHWA would not approve driveways within Interstate Limited Access (LA) right of way.
• Potentially re-build the Andrews Avenue Bridge over I-95 to allow more pavement width on I-95 to build auxiliary lanes from Cypress Creek Road to Commercial Boulevard.

Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Streetscape Improvements
The FDOT is assisting the Broward MPO in advancing the streetscape concepts identified for the following facilities in the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Master Plan into preliminary design phase.

• Cypress Creek Road from Powerline Road to just west of South Florida Rail Corridor (SFRC)
• Andrews Way, and
• NW 59th Court

The goal of this project is to identify specific bicycle/pedestrian and safety
improvement projects that could be prioritized by the MPO for implementation.

Development of Regional Impact (DRI)
The FDOT has requested the Cities of Oakland Park and Fort Lauderdale to rescind an approved DRI for its' park-and-ride lot in the southeast corner of Cypress Creek Road and Andrews Avenue. Since the DRI was approved, the adopted land use data incorporates the additional population and employment anticipated to be generated by this DRI. Consequently, any changes to the underlying DRI would not result in any incremental changes to the proposed land use program for this amendment. In other words, the proposed land use program along with the underlying or adopted land use data reflects the worst case from a traffic impact analysis standpoint.

Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Master Plan
The Broward MPO completed the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Master Plan in 2015. This Master Plan was very comprehensive in that included three key components, existing conditions analysis, economic and market assessment and alternative development strategies for implementation. An integral component of this Master Plan was enhancing bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to the existing Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station. To this end, alternative streetscape concepts were developed for several streets that are within this amendment's study area including Andrews Avenue, Andrews Way, NW 6th Way, NW 59th Court, and Cypress Creek Road.

Developing Long-Term Strategies for Resiliency in the Face of Climate Change: The Uptown Urban Village, 2014; Technical Assistance Panel (TAP), Urban Land Institute (ULI)
The ULI's TAP investigated strategies that could be used to create a walkable, livable village core with the Uptown neighborhood - the amendment area. Key strategies included creating pedestrian linkages, reducing posted speed limits, greenways, pathways and linear parks, on-street parking, streetscape improvements to provide shade and aesthetics, safe street crossing as well as a multiway boulevard concept for Cypress Creek Road.

G. Mass Transit Analysis

1. Identify the mass transit modes, existing and planned mass transit routes and scheduled service (headway) serving the amendment area within one-quarter of a mile.

Existing Mass Transit Service
The amendment area has significant mass transit service providing local and regional connectivity in Broward County through Broward County Transit's (BCT) fixed bus route and throughout South Florida region with South Florida Regional Transpiration Authority's (SFRTA) Tri-Rail commuter rail service.
The BCT routes provide line haul service and can take users practically anywhere in Broward County: work, school, shopping, library, parks, cultural and civic centers and other places of interest. BCT’s public transportation service covers approximately 410 square miles with a total operating fleet of 320 buses on fixed routes. With over 1,600 bus stops, BCT routes are available to almost anywhere in Broward County.

Existing mass transit routes serving employees, tourists and businesses in the amendment area includes BCT’s fixed bus route - Route 14 along McNab Road and Andrews Avenue, Route 60 along Andrews Avenue and 62 along McNab Road and Andrews Avenue. BCT Route 14 also provides connection to Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station in the northbound direction. Table 5-9 shows operating characteristics of the three BCT fixed bus routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Span of Service</th>
<th>Headway (in minutes), Peak/Off Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 14</td>
<td>5:00a – 11:57p</td>
<td>20/20, 45/45, 45/45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 60</td>
<td>5:10a – 11:37p</td>
<td>20/20, 30/30, 50/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 62</td>
<td>5:00a – 9:34p</td>
<td>40/40, 60/60, 60/60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Broward County Transit Connected, 2014-2023 Major TDP Update

The SFRTA provides commuter rail service in Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach Counties. The rail line goes as far south as Miami International Airport (MIA) and as far north as Mangoina Park in Palm Beach County. In Broward County, there are seven stations including Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station that is in the study area. Table 23 shows Tri-Rail commuter rail operating plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Span of Service</th>
<th>Headway (in minutes), Peak/Off Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>4:18a – 11:35p</td>
<td>20/20, 60/60, 60/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>4:00a – 10:29p</td>
<td>20/20, 60/60, 60/60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SFRTA FastForward, Transit Development Plan, 2014-2024, Major Update

To facilitate first and last mile connections to Tri-Rail passengers, the SFRTA offers commuter bus service at no extra charge. Currently, the SFRTA operates three Cypress Creek (CC) commuter bus routes, CC1, CC2 and CC3 providing connection to areas employment centers and business parks during AM and PM peak hours. Table 24 shows operating characteristics of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Span of Service</th>
<th>Headway (in minutes), Peak/Off Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>4:18a – 11:35p</td>
<td>20/20, 60/60, 60/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>4:00a – 10:29p</td>
<td>20/20, 60/60, 60/60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Cypress Creek commuter buses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Span of Service</th>
<th>Headway (in minutes), Peak/Off Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Source: SFRTA FastForward, Transit Development Plan, 2014-2024, Major Update

Planned Mass Transit Service

According to 2017-2026 BCT Connected, the TDP Annual Update headway improvements for routes 14, 60 and 62 have been identified in its Vision Plan for 2017-2027 Service Plan and service span improvements included in 2028-2036 Service Plan. It should be noted that at this time funding is not available for these Vision Plan service improvements. Further, route realignments on BCT route 14 and 62 to new Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station identified in 2016 TDP Service Plan were on-hold until station-area and access redesign/construction is completed.

2. Describe how the proposed amendment furthers or supports mass transit use. Quantify the change in demand resulting from this amendment.

Based on SERPM 7.0 forecast for year 2040, the proposed amended is expected to increase transit ridership from 1,850 boardings per day to 2,265 boardings per day, an increase of approximately 415 daily boardings, or 23 percent more riders. These passengers would be accommodated on BCT fixed bus route and Tri-Rail commuter rail service. Further, SERPM 7.0 forecasts an increase in bicycle trips from 500 bicycle trips per day to 1,000 bicycle trips per day (200 percent increase) over a period of 20-years from 2015 to 2040 while walk trips will increase from 4,800 daily trips to 21,000 daily trips (336 percent increase). The majority of these bicycle and walk trips will occur within the study area.

3. Correspondence from transit provider verifying the information submitted as part of the application on items 1-2 above. Correspondence must contain name, position and contact information of party providing verification.

See Appendix X: Transit Provider correspondence below.

4. Describe how the proposed amendment furthers or supports mass transit use.
In addition to this amendment request, the City is currently working on a masterplan for the Uptown Urban Village Area. The City is also in the process of developing a form-based code to regulate the built form consistent with new land use designation to encourage and foster a multimodal, walkable, pedestrian- and transit-friendly, mixed use built environment. The amendment will specifically add 2,800 dwelling units and increase jobs density from 19 jobs/acre to 23/ acres (approximately 17% increase) as well as increase land use diversity in an area that is primarily characterized by single use - suburban type office and light industrial development today. Based on the anticipated increase in jobs and population density coupled with land use diversity and enhanced bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to existing bus stop and Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station, both BCT and Tri-Rail ridership is anticipated to increase significantly.

H. PUBLIC EDUCATION ANALYSIS

Please be advised that the Planning Council staff will request from The School Board of Broward County (SBBC), as per Policy 2.15.2 of the BCLUP, an analysis of the impacts of the amendment on public education facilities. Per SBBC Policy 1161, the applicant will be subject to a fee for the analysis and review of the land use plan application. The applicant should contact the Growth Management Section of the SBBC to facilitate this review and determine the associated fees.


   See Appendix XI: School Board Public School Impact Application and Analysis

2. The associated fee in the form of a check made payable to the SBBC.

   To be provided with transmittal.

6. ANALYSIS OF NATURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

   Indicate if the site contains, is located adjacent to or has the potential to impact any of the natural and historic resource(s) listed below, and if so, how they will be protected or mitigated. Planning Council staff will request additional information from Broward County regarding the amendment’s impact on natural and historic resources.

   A. Historic sites or districts on the National Register of Historic Places or locally designated historic sites.

   A review with information available at the time of this request included the Official City of Fort Lauderdale Resources Map and the Florida Master Site File
(FMSF); the proposed amendment site does not include any sites and/or districts that are currently designated in the City of Fort Lauderdale.

B. Archaeological sites listed on the Florida Master Site File.

A review with information available at the time of this request included the Official City of Fort Lauderdale Resources Map and the Florida Master Site File (FMSF), no archaeological sites are located within the amendment site. Additionally, the amendment site does not fall within the boundaries of any recognized Archeologically Significant Zones.

C. Wetlands

A review of the Broward County Comprehensive Plan indicates there are three areas affecting the amendment site; an area of existing Cypress canopy which is existing, and two areas of monitoring maintenance.

D. Local Areas of Particular Concern as Identified within the Broward County Land Use Plan.

A review of the Broward County Comprehensive Plan indicates there is one area as Environmentally Sensitive Land, which is also included in the wetlands response above as protected; Site 83.

E. “Endangered” or “threatened species” or “species of special concern” or “commercially exploited” as per the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (fauna), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (flora and fauna), or the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (fauna). If yes, identify the species and show the habitat location on a map.

The project area is mostly developed and the applicant is not aware of any listed species on the site.

F. Plants listed in the Regulated Plant Index for protection by the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

The project area is mostly developed and the applicant is not aware of any listed species on the site.

G. Wellfields - Indicate whether the amendment is located within a wellfield protection zone of influence as defined by Broward County Code, Chapter 27, Article 13 “Wellfield Protection.” If so, specify the protected zone and any provisions, which will be made to protect the wellfield

The Broward County Natural Resource Map does not identify any water wellfield protection zones of influence on the amendment site.
H. Soils – Describe whether the amendment will require the alteration of soil conditions or topography. If so, describe what management practices will be used to mitigate the area’s natural features.

The amendment site is an urban area. Redevelopment resulting from this amendment will not require the alteration of soil conditions or topography other than typical construction activity.

I. Beach Access – Indicate if the amendment is ocean-front. If so, describe how public beach access will be addressed.

The site is not ocean-front.

7. AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Describe how the local government is addressing Broward County Land Use Plan Policy 2.16.2, consistent with Article 5 of this Document.

Overview of City Initiatives
In 2015, the City engaged Florida International University to conduct an Affordable Housing Study. The study was completed using a methodology approved at that time under the County Land Use Plan. The study was presented to the City of Fort Lauderdale City Commission in conjunction with a City Affordable Housing Policy. The City Commission accepted the results of study and adopted the policy document on October 6, 2015.

Subsequent to October 2015, the City Commission conducted a series of development workshops to discuss development patterns throughout the City. The objective of the workshops was to discuss development trends, review existing regulations that guide development, gather input from the public, and to set direction for future growth within the City. Over the course of four workshops, the Commission discussed numerous topics that affect development trends including but not limited to market trends, city-wide zoning patterns, flexibility policy, multi-modal transportation options, and affordable housing.

City Commission directed staff to conduct meetings on a city-wide approach to address affordable housing, which included joint workshop between the Planning and Zoning Board and the Affordable Housing Advisory Board. The meeting was held on July 19, 2017, and a summary of recommendations from the joint workshop as well as summary of strategies to address affordable housing city-wide was generated.

On November 7, 2017, City staff presented to the City Commission the results on the joint workshop and potential options for addressing affordable housing. The recommendations include:

• Provide funding options including in lieu of fee for rehabilitation of existing
housing;

- **Sale of surplus City-owned commercial or industrial properties** should go into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund; Consider reduced parking requirements for affordable housing projects;
- **Consider location of affordable housing to reduce concentration in areas**;
- **Require mixed-use development to provide housing for those employed in the same mixed-use project or be subject to a linkage fee**;
- **Provide for a dedicated revenue stream for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund**;
- **Incorporate any policies to include and require non-residential development to support affordable housing effort**;
- **Some affordable housing should be located in proximity to the barrier island**;

- **Adopt new Unified Flex Strategy**, collapsing flex zones into citywide pool with (1) Allocation of new flex units permitted in RACs (except Central Beach) and along major corridors; (2) Determine appropriate amount / percentage for affordable or moderate housing for projects in RACs and major corridors when flex units are applied; (3) Adopt a new Mixed-Use Zoning Category with form-based design standards to ensure appropriate type and scale of development along major corridors when applying flex units;
- **Provide for In-Lieu of Fee as an option to developing affordable housing**;
- **Create a Buy-Down Program** to utilize monies from the affordable housing trust fund for potential partnerships with developers to reduce cost of unit;

City Commission directed staff to proceed with the Unified Flex Strategy, determine appropriate amount / percentage for affordable or moderate housing for the City RACs and Unified Flex, develop an in-lieu of fee, and create a buy-down program. These efforts are moving forward at this time.

Appendix XII contains the Florida International University Affordable Housing Study, the City’s Affordable Housing Policy, and the November 7, 2017 Affordable Housing and Unified Flex Strategy PowerPoint Presentation.

**Proposed Uptown Affordable Housing**
The proposed LUPA program includes 2,800 residential units. Such units are anticipated to be multifamily, midrise development, and located in certain parts of the project area based upon the Uptown Urban Village Master Plan. The master
plan will identify best location for residential in proximity to Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport (FXE), office complexes, strategic retail locations, and existing industrial warehouse uses.

The LUPA is proposing that fifteen percent (15%) of the 2,800 units, approximately 420 units, will be set aside for affordable housing units that meet the moderate income level bracket as defined by BCLUP Policy 2.16.3, not to exceed one hundred twenty percent (120%) of area median income.

Such units will be monitored annual by collecting data on market rate rentals for the project area. The data will include rental rates by unit size and other available data. Envision Uptown, LLC, will procure a real estate market consultant to collect such data and provide it to the City for inclusion in the Development Monitoring Report for Uptown. The City and Envision will ensure that a minimum of fifteen percent (15%) of the 2,800 units will be provided as affordable units as described herein.

8. LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

Describe how the amendment is consistent with existing and planned future land uses in the area (including adjacent municipalities and/or county jurisdictions). Identify specific land development code provisions or other measures that have or will be utilized to ensure land use compatibility.

Land use compatibility shall be consistent with the City of Fort Lauderdale Future Land Use Element objectives and policies, which will guide development in the Uptown TOD.

9. HURRICANE EVACUATION ANALYSIS

(Required for amendments located in a hurricane evacuation zone as identified by the Broward County Emergency Management Agency). Provide a hurricane evacuation analysis based on the proposed amendment, considering the number of permanent and seasonal residential dwelling units (including special residential facilities) requiring evacuation, availability of hurricane shelter spaces, and evacuation routes and clearance times. The hurricane evacuation analysis shall be based on the best available data/modeling techniques as identified by the Broward County Emergency Management Agency.

The amendment site is not located in a hurricane evacuation zone.

10. REDEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

Indicate if the amendment is located in an identified Redevelopment (i.e., Community Redevelopment Agency, Community Development Block Grant) area. If so, describe how the amendment will facilitate redevelopment and promote
approved redevelopment plans.

The project area is not located in a CRA or part of CDBG.

11. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

Indicate whether the proposed amendment site is adjacent to other local governments. If so, please provide additional copies for the notification and/or review by adjacent local governments.

The project area is adjacent to the Cities of Oakland Park and Pompano Beach. Both cities were notified of the proposed LUPA. Additional copies have been provided.

12. DESCRIBE CONSISTENCY WITH HIGHLIGHTED REGIONAL ISSUES AND POLICIES OF THE BROWARD COUNTY LAND USE PLAN

POLICY 2.1.1; Broward County shall maintain a balanced Land Use Plan to implement a regional vision including the provision of essential public services and facilities, as well as enhanced sustainability and livability.

POLICY 2.4.2; Upon application, Local governments must may propose a specific area for designation on the Broward County Land Use Plan as a Transit Oriented Corridor an Activity Center. The municipality shall include within their land use element policies that ensure the proposed Local Activity Center will support the location of uses in a manner oriented around the five-minute (i.e. quarter-mile) walk and/or within approximately quarter-mile on either side of a transit corridor. Multiple nodes of activity oriented around the five-minute (i.e. quarter-mile) walk or transit corridor may be included within one Local Activity Center. The municipality shall include within their land use element policies that ensure that the proposed Local Activity Center will support the location of uses and internal circulation such that pedestrian mobility is a priority. All land uses in an a Local Activity Center shall be directly accessed via pedestrian ways, and accessible to existing or future alternate public transportation modes, including bicycle and transit.

POLICY 2.4.3; Residential use is required as a principal component within an Activity Center. Maximum residential density must be specified by the local government, and must be described in the permitted uses section of the Broward County Land Use Plan. Residential densities may be specified either as units per gross acre in geographically designated areas and/or as a maximum number of permitted units (e.g. pool of units in the Activity Center).

POLICY 2.4.4; At least two non-residential uses must be permitted in the Activity Center as a principal use: e.g. retail, office, restaurants and personal services, hotel/motel, light industrial (including “live work” buildings), research business, civic and institutional.
POLICY 2.4.5; Minimum and Maximum FAR (Floor Area Ratio) for non-residential uses within an Activity Center must be specified by the local government and described in the permitted uses section of the Broward County Land Use Plan. Minimum non-residential FARs (Gross) of 2 are encouraged. Non-residential intensities may vary along transit corridors and may be specified at the option of the local government, either as a maximum FAR in geographically designated areas and/or as an overall maximum square footage by use [e.g. pool of square footage by permitted use (retail, office etc.) or land use category (commercial)].

POLICY 2.4.6; For proposed new or revised Regional Activity Center or Local Activity Centers areas, Broward County shall, to address new proposed dwelling units and impacts, coordinate and cooperate in assisting municipalities to identify existing and proposed policies, methods and programs to achieve and/or maintain a sufficient supply of affordable housing to serve such areas.

POLICY 2.4.7; Local governments shall consider community needs for affordable housing when proposing a Local an Activity Center and include within their local land use element policies which encourage affordable housing opportunities, through various mechanisms such as the utilization of “affordable housing units,” the direction of public housing program funds into the Local Activity Center, reduced lot size for dwelling units, construction of zero lot line and cluster housing, vertical integration of residential units with non-residential uses, the allowance of accessory dwelling units, or through other mechanisms proven effective in increasing the affordable housing stock. To promote Local Activity Centers which propose to include “low income” housing as a viable component, Broward County shall support all reasonable means and methods to mitigate potential negative impacts to public facilities and services which may result from the amendment.

POLICY 2.4.8; Local governments shall include within their local land use element policies that promote the preservation, rehabilitation and use of historic buildings within a proposed Local Activity Center.

POLICY 2.4.9; Local land use elements shall require design guidelines that incorporate pedestrian and bicycle paths and greenways to accomplish fully-connected routes to all destinations within the Local Activity Center. The paths should be spatially defined by buildings, trees and lighting, and should incorporate designs which discourage high speed traffic.

POLICY 2.4.10; To reduce reliance on automobile travel, local governments shall ensure convenient access to high use mass transit stops or multi-modal facilities within a proposed Local Activity Center.

POLICY 2.4.11; Local governments shall include within their local land use element policies that encourage internal transit systems to serve the residents and employees within the proposed Local Activity Center (e.g. trolley, community transit services). Transit shelters should be incorporated in the local design guidelines to
provide safe and comfortable service and to encourage transit usage.

POLICY 2.4.12; In consideration of non-residential land uses in areas proposed for designation as a Transit Oriented Development an Activity Center, the impact analysis for the designation in the Broward County Land Use Plan may be based on the amount of non-residential development which could be permitted as per the intensity standards of the effective local government land use element, rather than the alternative 10,000 square feet per gross acre standard utilized for non-residential impact analysis.

POLICY 2.4.13; Local land use element policies must include guiding principles for municipal design guidelines to adequately address the transition to adjacent residential development and to promote connectivity to transit stations and stops.

POLICY 2.4.14; Park land, public plazas, urban open space or green space/pocket park uses that are accessible to the public must be provided as an integrated component within a proposed Activity Center.

POLICY 2.4.15; The municipality shall include within their land use element policies that ensure that areas designated as Activity Centers include design features that promote and enhance pedestrian mobility, including connectivity to transit stops and stations, based on the following characteristics: • Integrated transit stop with shelter, or station (within the area). • Wide (5 feet shall be the minimum consistent with ADA requirements) pedestrian and bicycle paths that minimize conflicts with motorized traffic and are adequately landscaped, shaded and provide opportunities for shelter from the elements. • Buildings should front the street (zero or minimal setbacks are encouraged). • Vehicle parking strategies that encourage and support transit usage (such as parking that does not front the street, shared parking, parking structures, and/or reduced parking ratios). • Streets (internal and adjacent to the area) should be designed to discourage isolation and provide connectivity (such as streets in the grid pattern). (f/k/a Policy 28 and Combined Policies 10.04.08 and 10.05.06)

POLICY 2.4.16; Local plan policies must include requirements for internal pedestrian and transit amenities to serve the residents and employees within the area designated as an Activity Center (such as seating on benches or planter ledges, shade, light fixtures, trash receptacles, information kiosks, bicycle parking) or other amenities that could be incorporated into adjacent publicly accessible areas and plaza (such as clocks, fountains, sculpture, drinking fountains, banners, flags and food and refreshment vendor areas.) (f/k/a Policy 29 and Combined Policies 10.04.09 and 10.05.07)

POLICY 2.4.17; The intent of the required Design Guideline Principles design features is to provide guidelines for municipal implementation of the Transit Oriented Development Activity Center land use category. Municipalities are encouraged to use some or all of the above design elements, or to develop other design strategies, which accomplish the goals of using design elements to enhance pedestrian and
transit mobility. County review of applications seeking the Transit Oriented Development Activity Center land use category designations will only determine whether the municipality has adopted, through plan policies, a cohesive set of implementation strategies to accomplish the design strategies sought, and will not seek to require a specific design approach or a fixed set of design approaches as a requirement for County approval of the land use designation sought. (f/k/a Policy 30 and Revised Policy 10.05.08)

POLICY 2.4.18; Municipalities which propose a Mixed Use - Residential an Activity Center designation shall include policies within their land use element which establish design guidelines for mixed use within their land development codes. Policies should promote an urban form which creates well integrated land use combinations, balances intensity and density, and promotes the safe, interconnectivity of vehicular, pedestrian and other non-motorized movement. Policies should integrate the public realm, through open space, urban public plazas and/or recreational areas. (f/k/a Policy 31 and Revised Policy 10.06.03)

POLICY 2.4.19; Municipalities which propose a Mixed Use - Residential an Activity Center designation shall include policies within their land use element which establish appropriate design standards, within their land development codes, to ensure a mixed use development is compatible with adjacent land uses and adjacent adopted Future Land Use designations. (f/k/a Policy 32 and Revised Policy 10.06.04)

POLICY 2.20.1; Adopt, implement and encourage land use provisions which promote the principles of the “Smart Growth” initiative seeking to maintain and create desirable and efficient communities for Broward County residents, visitors and economic interests including quality housing for all, integrated with excellent and sufficient public facilities and services, recreational opportunities and open space areas, and which maximizes preservation and conservation of natural resources.

13. ADDITIONAL SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

A. Other support documents or summary of support documents on which the proposed amendment is based.

The LUPA is based on studies completed by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) Technical Advisory Panel and Broward MPO and SFRTA for the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub report. Both efforts identified the need to change the underlying land use to a mixed-use land designation that promotes stronger linkage to land use and multi-modal transportation.

B. Any proposed voluntary mitigation or draft agreements.

There is no proposed voluntary mitigation at this time.

14. PLAN AMENDMENT COPIES

A. 15 copies for the BCPC (Please include additional copies, if amendment site is adjacent to other municipalities and/or county jurisdictions). Additional copies may be requested by the Planning Council Executive Director after the initial application submittal.

To be provided with transmittal.

B. 10 copies of the corresponding local land use plan amendment application, if transmitting concurrent to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO), including transmittal letter from municipality to DEO.

To be provided with transmittal.
EXHIBIT A

Sketch and Legal Description
Legal Description:

Lands lying in Section 9 and 10, Township 49 South, Range 42 East, City of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida; being described as follows:

Begin at the intersection of the south right of way line of McNab Road and the west right of way line of Florida East Coast Railway (Seaboard Coast Line Railroad); thence northeasterly along said west right-of-way to a point of intersection with the centerline of right-of-way for Cypress Creek Canal (C-14); thence southeasterly along said centerline to the east boundary of Section 10, Township 49 South, Range 42 East; thence southerly along said east boundary to the west limited access right-of-way line of Interstate ninety-five (I-95);

The following courses being along said west limited access right-of-way line of Interstate Ninety-Five (I-95) and also being the City of Fort Lauderdale municipal boundary limits;

Thence southerly, westerly, southerly, westerly and southerly along said limited access right-of-way line to the north right-of-way line of the now vacated N.E. 1st Way lying between Parcel "G" and Parcel "H" of the plat "PINE CREST ISLES" (Plat Book 63, Page 48, Broward County Records); thence continue southerly, westerly, southerly, westerly and west along said limited access right-of-way line to the north right of way line of E. Cypress Creek Road; thence west along said north right of way line to the east right of way line of North Andrews Avenue Extension; thence southwesterly along said east right of way line to the north line of the plat limits of “CYPRESS CREEK CENTER” (Plat Book 104, Page 13, Broward County Records); thence northeasterly and east along the north line of Parcel “A” of said plat to the northeast corner thereof; thence south, southeasterly and south along said parcel “A” and said plat limits and southerly prolongation to the non-vehicular access line of Interstate 95 and being the most easterly south corner of Parcel “A” of the plat "CYRESS FINANCIAL CENTER" (Plat Book 125, Page 42, Broward County Records); thence southwesterly and northwesterly along the easterly and westerly line of said Parcel “A” and continue west and southwesterly along said non-vehicular access line of Interstate 95 and also being the east line of North Andrews Way to the south boundary line of Section 10, Township 49 South, Range 42 East; thence west along said south boundary, departing said west limited access right-of-way line of Interstate ninety-five (I-95) and said City of Fort Lauderdale municipal boundary limits, to the east right of way line of Powerline Road (NW 9th Ave); thence northerly along said east right of way line to south line of Parcel “A” of the plat "CYRESS CREEK OFFICE & INDUSTRIAL PARK" (Plat Book 115, Page 2, Broward County Records); thence east on the easterly prolongation of said south line of Parcel “A” to the east right of way line of NW 10th Terrace and the northerly prolongation of to the southwest corner of Parcel “A” of the plat "MADIGAN PLAT" (Plat Book 126, Page 13, Broward County Records); thence north along the west line of said Parcel “A” to the northwest corner thereof, thence east along the north line of said Parcel “A” and the easterly prolongation thereof to the east right of line of Powerline Road (NW 9th Ave); thence north along said east right of line of Powerline Road to the south line of Tract 3 of the plat "F-X-E PLAT" (Plat Book 119, Page 4, Broward County Records); thence east along said south line of Tract 3 to the west right of way line of Florida East Coast Railway; thence northeast along said west right of way line of Florida East Coast Railway to the point of beginning.
Description prepared by a licensed professional surveyor and mapper;
Dated: August 15, 2017
Michael W. Donaldson LS 6490.
EXHIBIT C
Project Area and Subarea Map
EXHIBIT D
Proposed City Text
EXHIBIT C
CITY TEXT AMENDMENT

Uptown Urban Village Transit Oriented Development

General Location: South of W Mc Nab Road, north of NW 57th Street, between I-95 and Powerline Road

Size: 353 Acres

Density and Intensity of Permitted Land Uses:

- Residential: 2,800 dwelling units
- Commercial: 4,110,656 square feet
- Office: 250,000 square feet
- Industrial: 1,314,447 square feet
- Hotel: 1,168 rooms
- Transportation: no specified limit
- Community and Civic Facilities: 152,611 square feet
- Park-Open Space: 6.5 acres minimum

Comments:

1. Uptown TOD has direct access to the Cypress Creek Tri Rail Station, Interstate 95, and Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport.

2. Uptown TOD shall contain priorities for a modal shift through the provision of transit oriented design, pedestrian and transit amenities, safe and comfortable connectivity, publicly accessible areas and plazas, and promote internal modal capture as part of overall development and mixed-use projects.

3. Uptown TOD design principles shall integrate public area through open space, urban public plazas, and/or recreational or community facility areas. Design principles shall promote connectivity and access to transit stations and stops, while establishing a “sense of place”. Developments shall promote and enhance pedestrian mobility, including connectivity to regional transit station.

3. Additional or expanded, stand-alone automobile oriented uses such as large surface parking lots, gas stations, auto repair, car washes, auto dealers, self-storage, big box retailers, single-family detached dwelling units, and drive-through facilities are discouraged and shall be limited.
EXHIBIT
Proposed County Text
Activity Center - Uptown Urban Village Transit Oriented Development

General Location: South of W Mc Nab Road, north of NW 57th Street, between I-95 and Powerline Road

Size: 353 Acres

Density and Intensity of Permitted Land Uses:

- Residential: 2,800 dwelling units
- Commercial: 4,110,656 square feet
- Office: 250,000 square feet
- Industrial: 1,314,447 square feet
- Hotel: 1,168 rooms
- Transportation: no specified limit
- Community and Civic Facilities: 152,611 square feet
- Park-Open Space: 6.5 acres minimum

Comments:

1. Uptown TOD has direct access to the Cypress Creek Tri Rail Station, Interstate 95, and Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport.

2. Uptown TOD shall contain priorities for a modal shift through the provision of transit oriented design, pedestrian and transit amenities, safe and comfortable connectivity, publicly accessible areas and plazas, and promote internal modal capture as part of overall development and mixed-use projects.

3. Uptown TOD design principles shall integrate public area through open space, urban public plazas, and/or recreational or community facility areas. Design principles shall promote connectivity and access to transit stations and stops, while establishing a “sense of place”. Developments shall promote and enhance pedestrian mobility, including connectivity to regional transit station.

3. Additional or expanded, stand-alone automobile oriented uses such as large surface parking lots, gas stations, auto repair, car washes, auto dealers, self-storage, big box retailers, single-family detached dwelling units, and drive-through facilities are discouraged and shall be limited.
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APPENDIX V

Potable Water Correspondence
January 29, 2018

Jim Hetzel, AICP
City of Fort Lauderdale
700 NW 19 Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311

RE: ABILITY TO PROVIDE POTABLE WATER & WASTEWATER SERVICE TO:
FORT LAUDERDALE UPTOWN – SUB-AREA 1 AND SUB-AREA 2

Dear Mr. Hetzel:

Reference is made to your emails of January 18 and January 22, 2018 regarding the ability of Broward County Water & Wastewater Services (WWS) to provide potable water and wastewater services to the referenced development located within the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Nothing in this letter reserves capacity for the referenced development.

POTABLE WATER SOURCE OF SUPPLY AND TREATMENT

The referenced development will be supplied with potable water treated at the District 1 Water Treatment Plant (1AWTP).

The referenced development is expected to decrease potable water demand from its current land use potential of 2.437 million gallons per day (MGD) to 0.854 MGD, for a decrease of 1.582 MGD average day finished water demand. The level of service standard for potable water source of supply (wellfields) and treatment plants is maximum day flow. The average day to maximum day conversion factor for the 1AWTP is 1.18, therefore the proposed development will decrease finished potable water maximum day demand by 1.867 MGD (1.582 times 1.18).

As of December 2017, the one-year maximum day flow of the 1AWTP was 7.40 MGD and committed capacity was 0.16 MGD maximum day flow, for a total of 7.56 MGD. Committed capacity means capacity for which construction permits have already been signed but the development is not yet generating demand.

Source of Supply

The 1AWTP receives its raw water supply from the 1A and wellfield whose source is the Biscayne Aquifer. This wellfield has a Consumptive Use Permit (CUP) from the South Florida Water Management District.
January 29, 2018

(SFWMD) that was issued on April 10, 2008 and will expire on April 10, 2028. The CUP allows for an annual average raw water withdrawal of 10.04 MGD. Even though the level of service standard for source of supply is maximum day flow, the CUP does not contain maximum day withdrawal values. However, the CUP average withdrawals can be translated to its finished water maximum day equivalent, which is 12.59 MGD for the 1AWTP, based on a maximum day to average day ratio of 1.28 and a 2% allowance for in-plant uses of raw water.

Current available source of supply capacity is 5.03 MGD (12.59 – 7.56).

The 2014 population projections forecasted that by 2040, our current customers and non-rezoning-non-land plan amendment future customers would require 9.75 MGD of maximum day wellfield capacity, leaving 0.29 MGD (10.04-9.75)

Please note that the above-mentioned limitation on our source of supply is a "paper" limitation imposed by the CUP. The wellfields have an actual firm physical capacity of over 19.00 MGD.

Treatment Plant

The 1AWTP’s permitted capacity is 16.00 MGD. Current available treatment plant capacity is 8.44 MGD (16.00 – 7.56).

By 2040, our current customers and non-land use plan amendment future customers are forecasted to require 9.75 MGD of treatment capacity, leaving 6.25 MGD (16.00 – 9.75) finished water maximum day demand of treatment capacity for rezoning and land use plan amendments.

WASTEWATER TREATMENT

The referenced development’s wastewater will be treated at North Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (NRWWTP).

The referenced development is expected to decrease wastewater demand from its current land use potential of 10.618 MGD to 0.919 MGD, for a decrease of 9.69 MGD average day demand. The level of service standard for wastewater treatment plants is average day flow.

Treatment Plant

As of December 2017, the one-year average day flow for the NRWWTP was 66.8 MGD and committed capacity was 1.61 MGD average day flow, for a total of 68.41 MGD. Committed capacity means capacity for which construction permits have already been signed but the development is not yet generating demand.

The NRWWTPs permitted capacity is 95.00 MGD. Current available treatment plant capacity is 26.59 MGD (95.00 – 68.41). No expansion to the treatment capacity of the plant is contemplated at this time.
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POTABLE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM AND WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM PIPING

The level of service standard for potable water distribution systems is maximum day plus fire flow or peak hour, whichever is most stringent. The level of service standard for wastewater collection systems is peak flow. In addition, WWS analyzes piping systems in both existing and future demand configurations to determine which configuration is most stringent. WWS does not analyze piping systems at this early stage in the development process as our piping systems continually change. Please contact this office again when site plan details are firmer, a few months prior to the beginning of detailed design, to obtain more information on the piping system’s ability to provide the required level of service.

Please contact me at (954) 831-0930 or maispuro@broward.org if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mario C. Aispuro

cc: Rolando Nigaglioni, P.E., Planning, Development and GIS Manager
File: Rezoning and Land Use Plan Amendments
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(SFWMD) that was issued on April 10, 2008 and will expire on April 10, 2028. The CUP allows for an annual average raw water withdrawal of 10.04 MGD. Even though the level of service standard for source of supply is maximum day flow, the CUP does not contain maximum day withdrawal values. However, the CUP average withdrawals can be translated to its finished water maximum day equivalent, which is 12.59 MGD for the 1AWTP, based on a maximum day to average day ratio of 1.28 and a 2% allowance for in-plant uses of raw water.

Current available source of supply capacity is 5.03 MGD (12.59 – 7.56).

The 2014 population projections forecasted that by 2040, our current customers and non-rezoning-non-land plan amendment future customers would require 9.75 MGD of maximum day wellfield capacity, leaving 0.29 MGD (10.04-9.75)

Please note that the above-mentioned limitation on our source of supply is a “paper” limitation imposed by the CUP. The wellfields have an actual firm physical capacity of over 19.00 MGD.

Treatment Plant

The 1AWTP’s permitted capacity is 16.00 MGD. Current available treatment plant capacity is 8.44 MGD (16.00 – 7.56).

By 2040, our current customers and non-land use plan amendment future customers are forecasted to require 9.75 MGD of treatment capacity, leaving 6.25 MGD (16.00 – 9.75) finished water maximum day demand of treatment capacity for rezoning and land use plan amendments.

WASTEWATER TREATMENT

The referenced development’s wastewater will be treated at North Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (NRWWTP).

The referenced development is expected to decrease wastewater demand from its current land use potential of 10.618 MGD to 0.919 MGD, for a decrease of 9.69 MGD average day demand. The level of service standard for wastewater treatment plants is average day flow.

Treatment Plant

As of December 2017, the one-year average day flow for the NRWWTP was 66.8 MGD and committed capacity was 1.61 MGD average day flow, for a total of 68.41 MGD. Committed capacity means capacity for which construction permits have already been signed but the development is not yet generating demand.

The NRWWTPs permitted capacity is 95.00 MGD. Current available treatment plant capacity is 26.59 MGD (95.00 – 68.41). No expansion to the treatment capacity of the plant is contemplated at this time.
POTABLE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM AND WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM PIPING

The level of service standard for potable water distribution systems is maximum day plus fire flow or peak hour, whichever is most stringent. The level of service standard for wastewater collection systems is peak flow. In addition, WWS analyzes piping systems in both existing and future demand configurations to determine which configuration is most stringent. WWS does not analyze piping systems at this early stage in the development process as our piping systems continually change. Please contact this office again when site plan details are firmer, a few months prior to the beginning of detailed design, to obtain more information on the piping system’s ability to provide the required level of service.

Please contact me at (954) 831-0930 or maispuro@broward.org if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Mario C. Aispuro

cc: Rolando Nigaglioni, P.E., Planning, Development and GIS Manager
    File: Rezoning and Land Use Plan Amendments
APPENDIX VII
Solid Waste Correspondence
Wheelabrator South Broward has ample capacity to handle the waste to be generated by this project in Fort Lauderdale. The capacity of the plant is 825,000 tons per year. We currently receive approximately 735,000 tons per year from the cities in Broward County under contract with Wheelabrator SouthBroward. We have an obligation under our contract to accept up to 1,300,000 tons per year of Municipal Solid Waste, with the extra volume over our plant capacity diverted to two approved alternate disposal facilities.

Should you need any further information, please feel free to contact me.

Bob Hely
Wheelabrator South Broward

Hi Robert,

I have been very busy the past few weeks, and this got lost in my emails. I meant to reply earlier, we need more information regarding how Wheelabrator technologies has the capacity to handle waste generated. We need some data that shows the plant has enough capacity, and we would prefer a letter similar to the example letter I previously attached. Let me know if this is possible, I need to know soon, thanks.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message originates from Wheelabrator Technologies Inc. This message and any attachments are solely for the use of the intended recipients. They may contain privileged and/or confidential information or other information protected from disclosure. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you received this email in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution or
APPENDIX VIII

Drainage Correspondence
TO BE INSERTED
# Appendix IX:
## Park and Recreation Data

### Urban Open Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Murray Greenway</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>SW 7th Avenue/New River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Drive Canal Ends</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>Bayview Drive at NE 15th, 16th, 17th &amp; 18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Lifshey Park</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>3054 N. Ocean Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances L. Abreu Place</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>899 N. Rio Vista Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idlewyld Park/Merle Fogg Park</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2600 Las Olas Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack and Harriet Kaye Park</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1151 Bayview Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale Villas Entranceway</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>901 NW 14th Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Landing Greenway</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>SW 9th Ave./New River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Landing Park</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>630 SW 9th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Pickle Park</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>632 Middle River Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Horn Greenway</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>SW 11th Street/Tarpon River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeting Park</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>433 NW 23rd Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpon Cove Park</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>804 SW 11th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpon River Park</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>50 SW 11th Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend Park</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1400 Argyle Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingham Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2100 N. Atlantic Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Park</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2402 S. Federal Hwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood Heights Triangle Park</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>801 SW 28th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.50</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighborhood Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Herman Park</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1760 W 29th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Beck Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100 N. Victoria Park Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benneson Park</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1330 SW 33rd Terr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Keith Preserve</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1720 SW 17th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant Peney Park</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2100 SW 4th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Lake Park</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1331 SE 12th Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Ridge Park</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2401 NE 27th Terr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C. Alexander Park</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5101 Seabreeze Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphin Isles Park</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2125 SE 33rd Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dottie Mancini Park</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6520 SE 22nd Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esterre Davis Wright Park</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1626 SW 23rd St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamingo Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1600 SW 21st Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield Park</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2401 NE 8th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie-Blake Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2801 SW 2nd St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbordale Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1817 S. Miami Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1001 SE 11th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Park &amp; Extension</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>600 NW 19th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major William Lauderdale Park</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>400 SW 11th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Aire Park</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>3352 NW 63rd St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Feldman Park</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>310 NE 6th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poinciana Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>401 SE 21st St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provident Park</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1412 NW 6th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverland Woods Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3950 Riverland Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sistrunk Park</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>200 NW 6th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Middle River Park</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1718 NW 6th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranahan Park</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10 E. Broward Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Lakes North Park</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4600 Twin Lakes Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2 N. Victoria Park Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Young Park</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1000 SE 9th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2851 N. Atlantic Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.51</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bass Park</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2750 NW 19th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Park</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4401 Bayview Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Park</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>1450 W. Sunrise Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colee Hammock Park</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1500 Brickell Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Elizabeth Hays Civic Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3781 SW Riverland Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence C. Hardy School and Southside Park</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>25 SW 9th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd Hull Stadium</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2800 SW 8th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale Stadium</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1301 NW 55th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George English Park</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>1101 Bayview Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore Betz Park</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1611 SW 9th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle River Terrace Park</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1329 NE 7th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osswald Park</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>2220 NW 21st St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Aire Village Park</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6401 NW 21st Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverland Park</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>950 SW 27th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Park</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>555 SW 11th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Small Community Park</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>SW 34th Ave. one block north of Davie Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warfield Park</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1000 N. Andrews Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>161.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## School-Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croissant Park</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>245 West Park Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floranda Park (E. School)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5251 NE 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutt Park</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1700 SW 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale Manors Park</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1340 Chateau Park Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fork Park (E. School)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>101 NW 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Park</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3775 SW 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker Park Elem.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1001 NW 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Large Urban Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Park</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>1150 G. Harold Martin Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Pond Park</td>
<td>152.5</td>
<td>2201 NW 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyder Park</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>3299 SW 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>338.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Special Use Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beach, Public</td>
<td>77.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canine Beach</td>
<td>Included in public beach</td>
<td>Sunrise Blvd. ay A1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale Beach Park</td>
<td>Included in public beach</td>
<td>1100 Seabreeze Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Community Center</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3351 NE 33&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton Activity Center</td>
<td>2890 SW 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverwalk Linear Park</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20 N. New River Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96.89</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX X
Mass Transit Correspondence
TO BE INSERTED
APPENDIX XI
School Board Application
# PUBLIC SCHOOL IMPACT APPLICATION

The School Board of Broward County, Florida  
Growth Management Section  
Facility Planning and Real Estate Department  
600 SE 3rd Avenue, 8th Floor, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301; Phone: 754-321-2177, Fax: 754-321-2179  
www.browardschools.com

## GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X] Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] DRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Flex/Reserve Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Plat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Site Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY

School Board Number

County Project Number  
City Project Number L17003

Project Name  
Uptown Urban Village Land Use Plan Amendment

Has this project been previously submitted (since Feb. 01, 2008)?  
[ ] No  
[ ] Yes, provide the SBBC Number n/a

Application Fee Amount Due/Paid*  
[ ] Is proof of Payment attached?  
[ ] Check No.  
[ ] Online Payment Order No. (if applicable)

* Make check payable to “School Board of Broward County.” No cash will be accepted.

## PROJECT LOCATION AND SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 and 10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General location of the project  
Cypress Creek Blvd  
Side of West side of I-95

at/between  
Mc Nab Road and NW 57th Street  
and  
Powerline Road

Area Acreage  
353

Jurisdiction  
Fort Lauderdale

## APPLICANT INFORMATION

Owner's Name  
City of Fort Lauderdale and Envision Uptown, Inc.

Phone  
954-828-5019

Address  
700 NW 19 Avenue  
City  
Fort Lauderdale  
State  
FL  
Zip  
33311

Developer/Agent  
Jim Hetzel, Principal Planner, City of Fort Lauderdale, Project Manager/Agent

Address  
Same as above  
City  
State  
Zip

Phone  
Fax Number

Agent's E-mail  
jhetzel@fortlauderdale.gov

## DEVELOPMENT DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center, Com, Office, Ind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Form No. 4756  
06/15
Zoning Designation Existing Commercial, Office, Industrial, Resident Proposed Same

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Type</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Built Units</th>
<th>Bedroom Mix</th>
<th>Un-built Units</th>
<th>Bedroom Mix</th>
<th>Residential Type</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Bedroom Mix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 BR or Less</td>
<td>4 BR or &gt;</td>
<td>3 BR or Less</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 BR or &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse/ Duplex/ Villa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 BR or Less</td>
<td>2 BR_3 BR or &gt;</td>
<td>1 BR or Less</td>
<td>Townhouse/ Duplex/ Villa</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 BR_3 BR or &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Apartment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 BR or Less</td>
<td>2 BR_3 BR or &gt;</td>
<td>1 BR or Less</td>
<td>Garden Apartment</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 BR_3 BR or &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Rise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 BR or Less</td>
<td>2 BR or &gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid Rise</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 BR or &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Rise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 BR or Less</td>
<td>3 BR or &gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 BR or &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this project include a non-residential development? [ ] Yes

If yes, please describe other proposed uses [ ] Commercial, Office, Industrial, Civic, Park Space

vested rights/exemption information

Amount of Vested/Exempt development (including number of units, type, and bedroom mix)

There is an existing mobile home park in project area that contains 239 mobile homes.

Exemption Criteria (check any/all as applicable)

- Generates less than one student*
- Age restricted to persons 18 and over*
- Statutory exemption*
- Applicable Statute*
- Site Plan located within a plat with a valid final SCAD letter*

Vesting Criteria (check any/all as applicable)

- Located within previously approved plan amendment or rezoning with a valid mitigation agreement with the School Board through an executed and recorded DRC or Tri-Party*
- Obtained site plan final approval prior to February 1, 2008*
- Site plan located within a plat for which school impacts have been satisfied*

Associated Application Number

* Supporting documentation is required

Signature of Applicant/Agent: ___________________________ Date: __________________

Please attach a survey of the project site

NOTE: 90-Day review period only commences upon a determination of completeness by School District Staff. Applicant submitting a plat application must include an official letter containing plat name and municipal project number and must indicate that the plat has been approved or accepted by the municipality

ALL APPLICANTS MUST SUBMIT THE APPLICATION TO THE 8th FLOOR
School Impact Analysis - Supplemental Information

A. Identify the existing public elementary and secondary education facilities serving the area in which the amendment is located.

   Elementary:  Lloyd Estates
   Cypress
   Middle:  Rickards
   High School:  Northeast

B. Identify the existing school enrollment and permanent design capacity of the public elementary and secondary education facilities serving the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>20th Day Benchmark</th>
<th>Permanent Capacity</th>
<th>Over + (Under -)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Estates</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rickards</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>2318</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: School Board of Broward County 20th Day Enrollment 9.19.12

C. Identify the additional student demand resulting from this amendment - calculations must be based on applicable student generation rates specified in the Broward County Land Development Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 11</th>
<th>SCHOOL IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.028 x 78 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.013 x 36 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Students</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBBC School Boundaries and Broward County Department of Planning and Environmental Protection

Based on recent development trends and the locations of remaining buildable land in Uptown, it is likely that future residential development in Uptown will consist primarily of mid-rise buildings. Historically, this area was pre-dominantly an industrial district which had not created a significant impact to the School
District. Development in the Uptown area is limited to mid-rise development due to height restrictions from the FXE Airport FAA height limitations. However, as can be seen in the table above, the two bedroom mid-rise buildings used in this report’s analysis, which calculated the worst-case scenario, resulted in a maximum of 173 total students. Based on existing school enrollment, which indicates excess capacity at every school except for Lloyd Estates Elementary, the impacts of the proposed amendment are de minimis. The existing available capacity at Northeast High School (currently under capacity by 476 students) can sufficiently accommodate the additional school children under the proposed amendment. Future developments will also continue to be required to receive a School Capacity Availability Determination from the School Board of Broward County. If sufficient capacity is not available at the primary school, applicants will be required to attend a capacity allocation hearing to receive approval to send school children to the second nearest school, upon approval by the School Board.

D. Identify the planned and/or funded improvements to serve the area in which the amendment is located as included within the School Board’s five year capital plan - provide student demand projections and information regarding planned permanent design capacities and other relevant information.

Fort Lauderdale High
Project Scope: Demolish existing tennis courts; Demolish existing swimming pool; Construct a (2) 3-story Administration Classroom Buildings of 68,940 GSF to include Administration, 3 general classrooms, 5 resource rooms, 4 science labs and related spaces, a 4-classroom ESE suites, 1 Business Technology lab, 1 family and Consumer Science (ProStart) lab, 1 Health Occupations Lab, 1 Pre-Law Public Service Education Lab, Custodial Spaces, textbook Storage, and Student, Staff, and Public restrooms. Construct Parent Drop Off and Pick Up area and visitor Parking. Demolish buildings 1, 2, 3.

Project Status: Active
Status Comments: Project ongoing
APPENDIX XII
Florida Atlantic University Affordable Housing Study
City Affordable Housing Policy
City Unified Flex Strategy Presentation
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Background

The City of Fort Lauderdale Affordable Housing and Economic Analysis was prepared by the Florida International University Metropolitan Center to assist the City with creating an affordable housing policy. The scope of study centered on understanding how housing choice and opportunity, the local economy and transportation costs all play a role in determining housing affordability in Fort Lauderdale. An understanding of the shifting demands for housing is critical for the creation of effective housing policies and strategies. The following study provides the City with a current market perspective on the key demand and supply factors impacting the production and availability of affordable housing. The increasing demand for worker housing, in particular, has magnified the importance of providing a wide spectrum of owner and renter choice and opportunity with respect to affordability, location and access to jobs.

The analysis provides an assessment of current housing market supply and demand conditions and trend analysis. The methodology provides several layers of population, economic and housing analysis based on population trends, employment and housing supply and demand. The study first provides a City-wide analysis with Broward County comparisons followed by a two-phase neighborhood analysis. The neighborhood analysis was performed for all established “neighborhood associations” in the City. Given the small area and boundary irregularities of many of the neighborhood associations, it was agreed that for planning purposes the analysis would be most accurately and effectively performed by delineating “Neighborhood Area Analysis Districts” that would capture like sub-markets within the City. The Phase I analysis focused on neighborhood associations in proximity to and including the Downtown. The Phase II analysis included the balance of the City’s neighborhood associations.

B. City-wide Analysis – Key Findings

Population Trends

- The City’s population has increased by 10.8 percent (16,478 residents) since 2000 and by 0.8 percent (1,327 residents) since 2010. The population growth rate of the City has been slightly higher than Broward County during this period;

- Significantly, the number of households in the City has decreased by 7.3 percent (5,685) since 2009. The City’s recent household loss is attributed to an 11.8 percent decrease in family households (4,482 family households);

- Since 2009 there has been a 2.8 percent (1,617 persons) decrease in the City’s prime age (20-44) worker population. The City’s fastest growing (51.5 percent) age grouping is between 50-69 years of age;

- An estimated 43 percent of the City of Fort Lauderdale’s population 25 years of age and over have some college or an associate’s degree with 33 percent having a Bachelor’s, graduate or professional degree comparing favorably with Broward County.
Economic Analysis

- The City of Fort Lauderdale’s current median household income is $49,119 which is 29.6 percent higher than 2000 ($37,887). However, the City’s median household income is 4.3 percent lower than Broward County’s ($51,251);
- Both the City’s percentages of families and people whose income in the past 12 months was below the poverty level are significantly higher than in 2000;
- According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 65.2 percent (141,986 workers) of the City of Fort Lauderdale’s population age 16 and over are in the labor force up from 61.3 percent (126,162 workers) in 2000;
- The City’s employed population 16 years and older is primarily employed in management, business, science and art occupations (36.6 percent), sales and office occupations (25.4 percent) and service occupations (21.4 percent);
- An estimated 57,052 (72.1 percent) of the City’s workers commute to work by car, truck or van and drove alone with a mean travel time to work is 24.3 minutes one way. Only 3,629 workers (4.6 percent) use public transportation.

Housing Analysis

- The City’s housing inventory increased by 12,109 units (15 percent) since 2000. Growth in the City’s total housing inventory was attributed to a 23.8 percent (6,605 units) increase in 1-unit, detached unit (single-family) structures and a 20.7 percent (4,991 units) increase of units in structures with 20 or more units;
- The City’s occupied units are comprised of 38,944 (54.3 percent) owner units and 32,805 (45.7 percent) renter units;
- There are currently 21,140 vacant units in the City with an overall vacancy rate of 22.8 percent. The City’s current vacancy rate represents a 71.4 percent (8,800 units) increase since 2000;
- The City’s increasing number of housing vacancies is largely due to “for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use” vacancies. Seasonal, recreation or occasional use vacancies have increased by 4,014 units (55 percent) from 2000-2013;
- According to 2009-2013 5-Year ACS estimates, the median value of an owner-occupied housing unit in the City of Fort Lauderdale is $245,700. Based on these estimates, the current value of owner-occupied units in the City represents a 63.6 percent increase since 2000;
- According to a recent Zillow’s Fort Lauderdale Market Overview, the median sale price of a single-family home in the City is $331,050. The median sale price of a 3-bedroom single-family home was $372,000 and $674,000 for a 4-bedroom;
- There are an estimated 62.2 percent of owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage (23,885 owners). Significantly, 51.7 percent of current owner households with a mortgage pay in excess of 30 percent of their income on housing costs up from 37.6 percent in 2000;
There are 32,805 occupied housing units in the City of Fort Lauderdale paying rent (45.7 percent of all occupied units). The median monthly gross rent of all renter-occupied units in the City is $1,057 which represents a 63.3 percent increase since 2000;

An estimated 55.0 percent (18,051 households) of the City’s renter households are paying in excess of 30 percent of their incomes on housing costs. This represents a 39.7 percent (5,131 renters) increase in cost-burdened renter households in the City since 2000;

Significantly, 30 percent (9,960 households) of the City’s renters are “severely” cost-burdened paying in excess of 50 percent of their incomes on housing costs;

An affordability analysis for owner units in the City shows significant gaps within all household income categories including the “middle” household income category (101-120 percent of median);

An affordability analysis of renter units in the City indicates growing and substantial affordability gaps for “extremely low” ($689) and “very low” ($443) income households earning below 50 percent of the City’s median household income. An affordability gap ($75) also exists for “low” income renter households earning between 51-80 percent of the median household income;

Significantly, the City’s Housing & Transportation Affordability Index (H&T Index) of 66 percent is far above the 45 percent benchmark.

C. Neighborhood Analysis – Key Findings

Population Trends

The City’s population is largely concentrated in eight (8) Neighborhood Area Analysis Districts:

- Coral Ridge North - Imperial Point (24,621 residents)
- South Middle River (20,059 residents)
- Poinciana Park – Croissant - River Oaks - Rio Vista (16,822 residents)
- Melrose - Riverland (15,636 residents)
- Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso - Flagler Villages (15,455 residents)
- Sunset - Lauderdale Isles - Flamingo Park (13,877 residents)
- Poinsetta Heights - Victoria Park - Colee Hammock (13,712 residents)
- Downtown - Tarpon River (13,268 residents)

The above Neighborhood Area Analysis Districts comprise 80 percent (133,459 residents) of the City’s population;

Each of the above Neighborhood Area Analysis Districts vary in age of population and educational attainment, however, the majority have much higher percentages of residents age 55 and younger than the City, as a whole;

The highest percentages of resident populations age 55 and younger reside in the Dorsey-Riverbend - Progresso - Flagler Villages (83.2 percent), South Middle River (78.8 percent) and the Melrose - Riverland (77.7 percent) Neighborhood Area Analysis Districts;
The Neighborhood Area Analysis Districts with higher percentages of resident populations age 55 and over than the City as a whole include Harbor Beach (49.9 percent); Las Olas - Seven Isles (49.4 percent); Coral Ridge North - Imperial Point (48.2 percent); Poinsetta Heights - Victoria Park - Colee Hammock (40.0 percent) and Coral Ridge South - South Lauderdale Beach (38.5 percent).

Economic Analysis

- The civilian population age 16 and over in the aforementioned eight (8) Neighborhood Area Analysis Districts comprise 55 percent of the City’s labor force (78,171 workers);
- The largest number of workers are found in Coral Ridge North - Imperial Point (13,048); Poinciana Park - Croissant - River Oaks - Rio Vista (11,324 workers); South Middle River (10,642 workers);
- The highest concentrations of workers are found in Palm Aire (75.3 percent); Twinlakes (74.4 percent); and Poinsetta Heights - Victoria Park - Colee Hammock (72.8 percent);
- The highest percentages of workers in management, business, science, and arts occupations are found in Las Olas Isles - Seven Isles (60.6 percent); Downtown - Tarpon River (48.4 percent); Coral Ridge South - South Lauderdale Beach (47.7 percent) Coral Ridge North - Imperial Point (47.2 percent); and Poinsetta Heights - Victoria Park - Colee Hammock (45.4 percent);
- The highest percentages of workers in service occupations are found in South Middle River (35.7 percent); Melrose - Riverland (35.5 percent) and Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso - Flagler Villages (29.1 percent);
- The highest percentages of workers in sales and office occupations are found Coral Ridge South - South Lauderdale Beach (29.7 percent); Twinlakes (28.1 percent); and Coral Ridge North - Imperial Point (28.0 percent);

Housing Analysis

- The largest concentrations of housing inventory are found in Coral Ridge North - Imperial Point (19,990 units); Poinsetta Heights - Victoria Park - Colee Hammock (9,653 units); Poinciana Park - Croissant - River Oaks - Rio Vista (9,351 units);
- Owner occupancy rates are highest in Twinlakes (87.3 percent); Las Olas Isles - Seven Isles (79.7 percent); Harbor Beach (71.1 percent) and Sunset - Lauderdale Isles - Flamingo Park (70.7 percent);
- Renter occupancy rates are highest in Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso - Flagler Villages (69.6 percent); South Middle River (60.0 percent) and Poinsetta Heights - Victoria Park - Colee Hammock (55 percent);
- The highest overall vacancy rates are found in Harbor Beach (44 percent); Coral Ridge North - Imperial Point (31 percent) and Las Olas Isles - Seven Isles (29 percent);
- The lowest overall vacancy rates are found in Sunset - Lauderdale Isles - Flamingo Park (7 percent) and Melrose - Riverland (8 percent);
Neighborhood Area Analysis Districts with the highest percentages of owner cost-burdened households include Las Olas Isles - Seven Isles (66.0 percent); Downtown - Tarpon River (59.4 percent); Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso - Flagler Villages (58.9 percent);

Renter cost-burdened households are widespread throughout the Neighborhood Area Analysis Districts with the highest percentages found in Palm Aire (73.9 percent); Twinlakes (73.9 percent); South Middle River (65.9 percent) and Melrose - Riverland (65.2 percent);

Most of the City’s neighborhoods have excessive Housing and Transportation (H&T) Affordability Indices ranging from 60 to 70 percent.

D. Housing Policy Implications

Access to affordable housing continues to be a pressing public policy issue in South Florida. The complexity of the “post-bubble” housing market places significant responsibilities on local governments and agencies. Affordable and accessible housing for working families and households is vital to the local economy and contributes greatly to community attachment and well-being. The study’s findings show that housing affordability is a major issue in many of Fort Lauderdale’s working neighborhoods for existing and potential owners and renters alike. This is due to a number of contributing factors including loss of equity, prolonged job loss, persistently high average rents and rising transportation costs. Therefore, City officials will need to broaden the definition of affordability to encompass both transportation and housing costs. Public investments should be targeted to lower combined housing and transportation costs by creating more location efficient communities including transit-oriented development, mixed-use and the creation of more compact and walkable communities. In essence, transportation costs are more susceptible to reduction than housing costs. The general definition of a location-efficient area is one that is well-served by transit, and is conducive to biking, walking and other modes of transportation. Building mixed-income, mixed-use housing near transit is a key tool to meaningfully address the City of Fort Lauderdale’s housing demands by tackling housing and transportation costs together while expanding access to jobs, educational opportunities, and prosperity for all City residents.
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BACKGROUND

The *City of Fort Lauderdale Affordable Housing and Economic Analysis* provides a current market perspective on the key demand and supply factors impacting the production and availability of affordable housing in the City of Fort Lauderdale. A basic premise of all housing markets is the need to create and maintain a “spectrum” of housing choice and opportunity for local residents. This axiom establishes that housing choice and needs differ in most communities due to a variety of factors including: household income, population age, proximity of employment and mere preference. A spectrum of owner and rental housing choice and opportunity is particularly important in supporting the range of income groups that reside in the City.

An understanding of the shifting demands for housing is critical for the creation of effective housing policies and strategies. The increasing demand for worker housing has magnified the importance of providing a wide spectrum of owner and renter choice and opportunity with respect to affordability, location and access to jobs.

**Defining Affordable Housing and Measuring Affordability**

Housing affordability is generally defined as the capacity of households to consume housing services and, specifically, the relationship between household incomes and prevailing housing prices and rents. The standard most used by various units of government is that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing. Families who pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing are considered cost burdened and may have difficulty affording necessities such as food, clothing, transportation, and medical care. This is also the standard definition for housing programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and most state programs. However, this definition of housing affordability has its limitations because of the inability to determine whether households spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing by necessity or choice. Specifically, the definition does not consider that upper income and smaller households can afford to spend much more than 30 percent of their incomes on housing and still have enough income left over to satisfy other basic needs, whereas low income households that pay even 10 percent of their incomes on housing costs may be forced to forgo essential medical care and healthy food.

**Affordability Indices**

One measure of housing affordability is the cost of homeownership, commonly conveyed through housing affordability indices. These indices generally indicate that affordability increased substantially toward the end of the last decade, primarily as a result of lower interest rates during that period. A housing affordability index for an area brings together the price and the income elements that contribute to housing affordability. The following describes the most recognized affordability indices:

**National Association of Realtors (NAR) Index**

The most common index is that produced by the National Association of Realtors (NAR). The affordability index measures whether or not a typical family could qualify for a mortgage loan on a
typical home. A typical home is defined as the national median-priced, existing single-family home as calculated by NAR. The typical family is defined as one earning the median family income as reported by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. These components are used to determine if the median income family can qualify for a mortgage on a typical home. To interpret the indices, a value of 100 means that a family with the median income has exactly enough income to qualify for a mortgage on a median-priced home. An index above 100 signifies that family earning the median income has more than enough income to qualify for a mortgage loan on a median-priced home, assuming a 20 percent down payment. For example, a composite Housing Affordability Index (HAI) of 120.0 means a family earning the median family income has 120 percent of the income necessary to qualify for a conventional loan covering 80 percent of a median-priced existing single-family home. An increase in the HAI, then, shows that this family is more able to afford the median priced home. The calculation assumes a down payment of 20 percent of the home price and it assumes a qualifying ratio of 25 percent. That means the monthly principal and interest (P&I) payment cannot exceed 25 percent of the median family monthly income.

Housing Opportunity Index

The National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) has developed a Housing Opportunity Index, which is defined as the share of homes affordable for median household incomes for each metropolitan statistical area (MSA). The NAHB Index has certain intuitive limitations, however, as housing affordability scores are generally more favorable in metropolitan areas that are also rated as “least desirable places to live” according to Places Rated Almanac (Brookings Institution, 2002). The “median house price-income ratio” used by the National Association of Realtors and other housing analysts is a key economic indicator in assessing local market trends and vitality.

Housing and Transportation Affordability Index

As noted above, housing affordability is generally defined as the capacity of households to consume housing services and, specifically, the relationship between household incomes and prevailing housing prices and rents. The standard HUD definition that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs is most frequently used by various units of government. However, a number of housing studies in recent years have shown a clear correlation between workforce housing demand and transportation costs. The critical link between housing and transportation costs has significant implications with respect to housing choice and affordability. Housing and transportation costs can severely limit a working household’s choice both in terms of housing and job location. Rising gas and overall transportation costs have significant impacts on both homeowners and renters. The location of affordable rental housing is particularly relevant as proximity to job centers and access to transit is vital to a renter dominated workforce principally comprised of low- and moderate income households.

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) demonstrates the inadequacy of traditional measures of housing cost burden. While housing alone is traditionally considered affordable when consuming no more than 30 percent of income, the H+T Index limits the combined costs of transportation and housing consuming to no more than 45 percent of household income. Why does this matter? According to CNT, a typical household’s transportation costs can range from 12 percent of household income in communities with compact development and access to transit options, to more than 32 percent in the far exurbs.
Methodology and Scope of Analysis

The City of Fort Lauderdale Affordable Housing and Economic Analysis provides an assessment of current housing market supply and demand conditions and trend analysis. The methodology provides several layers of population, economic and housing analysis based on population trends, employment and housing supply and demand. The study includes the following elements:

- **Population Characteristics:** This section provides a current assessment of the City of Fort Lauderdale’s population trends including race and ethnicity, age and educational attainment values;

- **Economic Characteristics:** This section provides a current assessment of the City of Fort Lauderdale’s economy including household income, poverty, labor force, occupations and commuter patterns;

- **Housing Supply and Demand Analysis:** This section analyzes the affordability levels of the City of Lauderdale’s owner and renter housing based on current housing values in relation to household income.;

- **Neighborhood Analysis:** This section provides a drill down analysis at the neighborhood level of the same population, economic and housing supply and demand data as performed at the City level.
A. Population Characteristics

Population Change

According to recent 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey (ACS) estimates, the City of Fort Lauderdale has a current population of 168,603 residents. The City’s population has increased by 10.8 percent (16,478 residents) since 2000 and by 0.8 percent (1,327 residents) since 2010. The population growth rate of the City has been slightly higher than Broward County during this period.

There are currently 71,749 households in the City which represents a 4.8 percent increase since 2000. Significantly, the number of households in the City has decreased by 7.3 percent (5,685) since 2009. The City’s recent household loss is attributed to an 11.8 percent (4,482 households) decrease in family households. Overall, family households comprise 46.7 percent of all occupied units in the City down from 48.2 percent in 2000.

In comparison, Broward County experienced a 1.3 percent increase in households since 2000, but a 1.0 percent decrease (7,014) in total households since 2009. The County also had a slight decrease (756 households) in family households since 2009. Overall, family households comprise 63.1 percent of the County’s total occupied households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1: City and County Population Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Fort Lauderdale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change 2010-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Race and Ethnicity

The racial and ethnic composition of the City of Fort Lauderdale has been gradually changing since 2000. While the City’s White Alone (50.9 percent) and Black or African American (30.9 percent) populations continue to comprise the largest shares of the City’s racial composition, there has been a significant shift in the growth of the racial groups. The city’s White Alone population decreased by 2.6 percent since 2000 while the City’s Black or African American population increased by 23.9 percent. Hispanic or Latinos of any race have been the fastest growing population, increasing by 81.2 percent (11,292 persons) since 2000. Hispanic or Latinos now comprise 14.9 percent of the City’s population up from 9.1 percent in 2000.
The racial and ethnic composition of the City is fairly similar to that of Broward County, both in terms of composition and population shifts. The County has also experienced a decrease (1.3 percent) in its White alone population since 2000, but a more dramatic increase of 45.4 in its Black or African American population. Likewise, the County’s Hispanic or Latino population has increased by 70 percent (190,280 persons) since 2000 and now comprise 25.9 percent of the County’s population up from 16.7 percent in 2000.

### Table 1.2(a): City and County Race and Ethnicity Comparisons, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>City of Fort Lauderdale</th>
<th>Broward County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>88,225</td>
<td>1,145,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>41,994</td>
<td>333,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>36,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races:</td>
<td>5,727</td>
<td>5,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>38,231</td>
<td>1,351,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>13,894</td>
<td>271,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, 2000 SF1 100 percent data

### Table 1.2(b): City and County Race and Ethnicity Comparisons, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>City of Fort Lauderdale</th>
<th>Broward County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>85,878</td>
<td>1,129,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>52,058</td>
<td>484,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>59,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>60,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races:</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>44,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>143,417</td>
<td>1,323,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>25,186</td>
<td>461,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, ACS, 2013 5-Year Estimates
**Age**

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, the current median age of the City of Fort Lauderdale’s population is 42.3 up from 39.6 in 2000. Significantly, however, is a 2.8 percent (1,617 persons) decrease in the City’s prime age (20-44) worker population. The City’s fastest growing (51.5 percent) age grouping is between 50-69 years of age.

Broward County’s median age of 39.8 is significantly lower than the City of Fort Lauderdale. However, the County has also experienced a decrease of 0.6 percent (3,862 persons) in the prime age (20-44) worker population. Comparable to the City is the County’s 40.7 percent (165,932 persons) growth in the 45-69 age grouping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>City of Fort Lauderdale</th>
<th>Broward County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>152,125</td>
<td>1,623,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>102,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>8,438</td>
<td>110,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>8,175</td>
<td>109,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>8,093</td>
<td>93,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>8,311</td>
<td>81,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>10,613</td>
<td>105,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years</td>
<td>12,151</td>
<td>124,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 years</td>
<td>13,658</td>
<td>147,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years</td>
<td>13,784</td>
<td>138,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 years</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>117,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 years</td>
<td>10,575</td>
<td>97,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>8,594</td>
<td>75,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>6,247</td>
<td>60,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69 years</td>
<td>6,001</td>
<td>56,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74 years</td>
<td>5,967</td>
<td>59,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79 years</td>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>56,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84 years</td>
<td>3,402</td>
<td>44,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>42,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years and over</td>
<td>122,854</td>
<td>1,241,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>23,378</td>
<td>260,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median age (years)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Fort Lauderdale</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broward County</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, 2000 SF4 Estimates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>City of Fort Lauderdale</th>
<th>Broward County</th>
<th>City of Fort Lauderdale</th>
<th>Broward County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>168,603</td>
<td>1,784,889</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,784,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>105,197</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>8,614</td>
<td>104,146</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>7,489</td>
<td>114,123</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>8,774</td>
<td>114,029</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>9,804</td>
<td>109,360</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>12,902</td>
<td>117,203</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years</td>
<td>12,031</td>
<td>116,066</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 years</td>
<td>10,360</td>
<td>117,393</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years</td>
<td>11,812</td>
<td>133,045</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 years</td>
<td>13,455</td>
<td>142,033</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 years</td>
<td>14,465</td>
<td>136,990</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>12,786</td>
<td>117,502</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>11,157</td>
<td>98,636</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69 years</td>
<td>9,182</td>
<td>78,385</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74 years</td>
<td>5,908</td>
<td>55,101</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79 years</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>43,695</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84 years</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>39,501</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>42,484</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years and over</td>
<td>138,254</td>
<td>1,390,222</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>26,133</td>
<td>305,838</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age (years)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, ACS, 2013 5-Year Estimates
Educational Attainment

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 43 percent of the City of Fort Lauderdale’s population 25 years of age and over have some college or an associate’s degree with 33 percent having a Bachelor’s, graduate or professional degree. Significantly, the City’s 25+ population with less than a high school diploma has decreased since 2000.

The City’s overall educational attainment is generally similar to Broward County with respect to the percentages of the 25+ population with some college or higher degrees including a Bachelor’s, graduate or professional degree. However, the percentages of the City’s 25+ population with less than a high school diploma are somewhat higher than the County, as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>City of Fort Lauderdale</th>
<th>Broward County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (incl. equivalency)</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, 2000 SF4 Estimates

---

**Table 1.4(b): City and County Educational Attainment Comparisons- 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>City of Fort Lauderdale</th>
<th>Broward County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (incl. equivalency)</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, ACS, 2013 5-Year Estimates
B. Economic Characteristics

Median Household Income

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, the City of Fort Lauderdale’s current median household income is $49,119 which is 29.6 percent higher than 2000 ($37,887). The City’s median household income is 4.3 percent lower than Broward County’s median household income of $51,251.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.5: City and County Median Household Income Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Household Income</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**<strong>2000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Lauderdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Poverty

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 15.0 percent of families in the City of Fort Lauderdale and 20.6 percent of people had incomes in the past 12 months below the poverty level. Both the percentages of families and people whose income in the past 12 months was below the poverty level are significantly higher than in 2000.

In Broward County, the percentage of families and people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level is lower than the City of Fort Lauderdale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.6: City and County Poverty Rate Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Lauderdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labor Force

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 65.2 percent (141,986 workers) of the City of Fort Lauderdale’s population age 16 and over are in the labor force up from 61.3 percent (126,162 workers) in 2000. The current percentage of unemployed is 8.1 percent with 34.8 percent of the 16+ population not in the labor force.

Broward County has a slightly larger percentage (67.2) of the population 16+ in the labor force and similar percentages of unemployed (8.0 percent) and persons not in the labor force (32.8 percent). (Note: According to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO), the April 2015 unemployment rate for Broward County was 4.8 percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.7(a): City and County Labor Force Comparisons, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor Force</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Labor Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, 2000 SF3 Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.7(b): City and County Labor Force Comparisons, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor Force</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Labor Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, ACS, 2013 5-Year Estimates

The City of Fort Lauderdale’s employed population 16 years and older is primarily employed in management, business, science and art occupations (36.6 percent), sales and office occupations (25.4 percent) and service occupations (21.4 percent). According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science and art occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607). The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

Commuter Characteristics

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 57,052 (72.1 percent) City of Fort Lauderdale workers commute to work by car, truck or van and drove alone. Only 3,629 workers (4.6 percent) use public transportation, excluding taxicabs. The mean travel time to work is 24.3 minutes one way. The commuter patterns of the City’s workers have remained essentially unchanged since 2000 though there has been a discernible
uptick in the employed labor force 16+ that work at home, walk or use alternative means of transportation.

C. Housing Supply and Demand

Housing Inventory and Tenure

Table 1.8(a): City and County Housing Inventory Comparisons, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Inventory</th>
<th>City of Fort Lauderdale</th>
<th>Broward County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, 2000 SF3 Estimates

According to the most recent 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey (ACS) estimates, the City of Fort Lauderdale’s housing inventory increased by 12,109 units (15 percent) since 2000. Growth in the City’s total housing inventory was attributed to a 23.8 percent (6,605 units) increase in 1-unit, detached unit (single-family) structures and a 20.7 percent (4,991 units) increase of units in structures with 20 or more units. The percentage (36.9 percent) of Fort Lauderdale’s inventory of detached, single-family units is less than Broward County (41.4 percent), as a whole. Conversely, the percentage (31.3 percent) of units in structures with 20 or more units is greater in Fort Lauderdale than Broward County (27.8 percent).

Table 1.8(b): City and County Housing Inventory Comparisons, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Inventory</th>
<th>City of Fort Lauderdale</th>
<th>Broward County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, ACS, 2013 5-Year Estimates

According to 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey (ACS) estimates, 77.2 percent (71,749 units) of the City of Fort Lauderdale’s housing units are occupied. The City’s occupied units are comprised of 38,944 (54.3 percent) owner units and 32,805 (45.7 percent) renter units. There are
currently 21,140 vacant units in the City with an overall vacancy rate of 22.8 percent. The City’s current vacancy rate represents a 71.4 percent (8,800 units) increase since 2000.

**Housing Vacancies and Characteristics**

An analysis of the City’s “vacancy status characteristics” found the increase in the City’s housing vacancies is largely due to the increasing number of “for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use” and “for rent” vacancies. Seasonal, recreation or occasional use vacancies have increased by 4,014 units (55 percent) from 2000-2013 with “for rent” vacancies increasing 1,016 units (40.1 percent). The City also had significant increases in the number of vacancies in the category of “other vacant” (3,404 units/331 percent). Vacancy increases in this category are generally attributed to some combination of newly constructed, not occupied units and/or an inventory of distressed properties. The City’s vacancy status characteristics largely mirror that of Broward County. The County also experienced significant increases in for rent, for seasonable, recreational, or occasional use and all other vacancy categories since 2000.

**Housing Values**

A basic premise of all housing markets is there should exist a spectrum of housing choice and opportunity for local residents. This axiom establishes that housing choice and needs differ in most communities due to a variety of factors, including: employment mix, household income, population age, proximity of employment and mere preference. Local housing and labor markets are inextricably linked to one another. Industries are served by local housing markets that provide choices and opportunities for both current and future workers. The level of affordable housing demand is largely determined by job growth and retention. Employment growth will occur through the retention and expansion of existing firms and new economic growth resulting from start-ups, spin-offs, and relocations to the City of Fort Lauderdale. Essentially, populations follow job growth and the demand for housing will be influenced by the location, type and wage levels of the City and Broward County with respect to future employment growth. The affordability component of housing demand, however, is based on local wages and salaries that are then translated into household incomes. Therefore, the availability of an existing supply of various housing types and price levels must be maintained to address the housing demand of the variety of occupations that comprise the local industrial base.

The “value” of owner-occupied housing units is an important determinant of housing accessibility and affordability. Housing values have fluctuated significantly in many housing markets during the past decade due initially to the 2004-2006 “housing bubble” and then followed by the subsequent collapse and economic recession. However, recent trends in the housing market in Broward County and South Florida show steady increases in the value of both owner and rental housing.
The Greater Fort Lauderdale Realtors March 2014-2015 year-over-year analysis of housing market activity in Broward County showed a significant uptick in the median sale prices of both traditional single-family and townhomes/condos. Traditional closed sales of single-family homes in March 2015 showed a $320,000 median sale price and a 10.7 percent year-over-year increase. Traditional closed sales for townhomes/condos showed a $140,000 median sale price and 7.7 percent year-over-year increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.10: Housing Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single-Family Homes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Sale Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosures/REO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Sale Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Sale Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Townhomes/Condos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Sale Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosures/REO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Sale Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Sale Price</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Greater Fort Lauderdale Realtors March 2014-2015

According to Zillow’s most recent (April 30, 2015) Fort Lauderdale Market Overview, the median sale price of a single-family home in the City was $331,050. The median sale price of a 3-bedroom single-family home was $372,000 and $674,000 for a 4-bedroom.

According to 2009-2013 5-Year ACS estimates, the median value of an owner-occupied housing unit in the City of Fort Lauderdale is $245,700. Based on these estimates, the current value of owner-occupied units in the City represents a 63.6 percent increase since 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.11: City and County Median Housing Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Housing Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Fort Lauderdale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Owner Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$245,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Gross Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broward County</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Owner Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$128,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$181,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Gross Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of median monthly household income and median monthly owner costs is shown as a percentage that establishes overall affordability and level of cost burden. Housing affordability is generally defined as the capacity of households to consume housing services and, specifically, the relationship between household incomes and prevailing housing prices and rents. As previously noted, the standard most frequently used by various units of government is that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs. This is the standard definition for housing programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and most state housing agencies. Owner and renter households paying excess of 30 percent of their income on housing costs are considered “cost burdened.”

According to 2009-2013 5-Year ACS estimates, owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage comprise 62.2 percent (23,885 owners) of the City of Fort Lauderdale’s total owner-occupied housing units. Significantly, 51.7 percent of current owner households with a mortgage pay in excess of 30 percent of their income on housing costs up from 37.6 percent in 2000. An additional 26.6 percent of owner households “without a mortgage” also pay in excess of 30 percent of their income on housing costs. The level of cost-burdened owner households with and without a mortgage in the City are similar to County-wide levels.

### Table 1.12(a): City Cost Burdened Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th>City of Fort Lauderdale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>51.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 1.12(b): County Cost Burdened Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th>Broward County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to 2009-2013 5-Year ACS estimates, there are 32,805 occupied housing units in the City of Fort Lauderdale paying rent (45.7 percent of all occupied units). The median monthly gross rent of all renter-occupied units in the City is $1,057. The current rent price represents a 63.3 percent increase since 2000.

More than half, 55.0 percent (18,051 households) of the City of Fort Lauderdale’s renter households are paying in excess of 30 percent of their incomes on housing costs. This represents a 39.7 percent (5,131 renters) increase in cost-burdened renter households in the City since 2000.

**Housing Affordability**

The following section provides a “housing affordability analysis” using the current 2009-2013 5-Year estimates of median household income and owner/rent values for the City of Fort Lauderdale. Income limits are set for the following household income categories:

- Extremely Low – 0-30% of Median = $14,736
- Very Low – 31-50% of Median = $24,560
- Low – 51-80% of Median = $39,295
- Moderate – 81-100% of Median = $49,119
- Middle 101-120% of Median = $58,943

Using 2009-2013 5-Year ACS estimates, an owner and renter housing supply/demand analysis was performed for each of the five household income categories. For owner units, affordability of home purchase was calculated at the standard 2.5:1 median home value-to-median household income ratio. For renter units, affordability was calculated using the < 30 percent of household income standard.

### Table 1.13(a): City Owner Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income Categories</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Affordable Home Purchase Price</th>
<th>Gap/ Surplus</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Affordable Home Purchase Price</th>
<th>Gap/ Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low-Income (0-30% of MHI)</td>
<td>$11,366</td>
<td>$28,415</td>
<td>$121,685</td>
<td>$14,736</td>
<td>$36,839</td>
<td>$208,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low-Income (31-50% of MHI)</td>
<td>$18,944</td>
<td>$47,359</td>
<td>$102,741</td>
<td>$24,560</td>
<td>$61,399</td>
<td>$184,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income (51-80% of MHI)</td>
<td>$30,310</td>
<td>$75,774</td>
<td>$74,326</td>
<td>$39,295</td>
<td>$98,238</td>
<td>$147,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-Income (81-100% of MHI)</td>
<td>$37,887</td>
<td>$94,718</td>
<td>$55,383</td>
<td>$49,119</td>
<td>$122,798</td>
<td>$122,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Income (101-120% of MHI)</td>
<td>$45,464</td>
<td>$113,661</td>
<td>$36,439</td>
<td>$58,943</td>
<td>$147,357</td>
<td>$98,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.13(b): County Owner Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income Categories</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Affordable Home Purchase Price</th>
<th>Gap/Surplus</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Affordable Home Purchase Price</th>
<th>Gap/Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low-Income (0-30% of MHI)</td>
<td>$12,507</td>
<td>$31,268</td>
<td>$97,332</td>
<td>$15,375</td>
<td>$38,438</td>
<td>$143,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low-Income (31-50% of MHI)</td>
<td>$20,846</td>
<td>$52,114</td>
<td>$76,486</td>
<td>$25,626</td>
<td>$64,064</td>
<td>$117,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income (51-80% of MHI)</td>
<td>$33,353</td>
<td>$83,382</td>
<td>$45,218</td>
<td>$41,001</td>
<td>$102,502</td>
<td>$78,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-Income (81-100% of MHI)</td>
<td>$41,691</td>
<td>$104,228</td>
<td>$24,373</td>
<td>$51,251</td>
<td>$128,128</td>
<td>$53,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Income (101-120% of MHI)</td>
<td>$50,029</td>
<td>$125,073</td>
<td>$3,527</td>
<td>$61,501</td>
<td>$153,753</td>
<td>$27,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The housing affordability analysis for owner units in the City shows significant gaps within all household income categories including the “middle” household income category (101-120 percent of median). Affordability gaps within the “extremely” and “very low” household income categories are fairly normal as ownership opportunities within these lower income levels is cost prohibitive. However, large affordability gaps within the “moderate” and “middle” household income categories are significant and points to the general unavailability of owner units in the City to accommodate the price points of households earning less than 120 percent of median.

The housing supply and demand analysis for renter units in the City shows a significant gap in the supply of affordable renter units for “extremely” low income households, but sizeable gaps also within the price ranges of “moderate” and “upper” household income categories.

The affordability analysis of renter units in the City indicates growing and substantial affordability gaps for “Extremely Low” ($689) and “Very Low” ($443) income households earning below 50 percent of the City’s median household income. A significant affordability gap ($75) also exists for “Low” income renter households earning between 51-80 percent of the median household income. Rent affordability in the City is similar to that of Broward County, as a whole, though affordability gaps are significantly greater in the County in the aforementioned household income categories.

Housing and Transportation Affordability Index

As previously noted, the Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, both Broward County (65 percent) and the City of Fort Lauderdale (66 percent) have an H+T Index far above the 45 percent benchmark.
## Table 1.14(a): City Renter Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income Categories</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Affordable Home Rent Price</th>
<th>Gap/ Surplus</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Affordable Home Purchase Price</th>
<th>Gap/ Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low-Income (0-30% of MHI)</td>
<td>$11,366</td>
<td>$284</td>
<td>$363</td>
<td>$14,736</td>
<td>$368</td>
<td>$689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low-Income (31-50% of MHI)</td>
<td>$18,944</td>
<td>$474</td>
<td>$173</td>
<td>$24,560</td>
<td>$614</td>
<td>$443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income (51-80% of MHI)</td>
<td>$30,310</td>
<td>$758</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>$39,295</td>
<td>$982</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-Income (81-100% of MHI)</td>
<td>$37,887</td>
<td>$947</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$49,119</td>
<td>$1,228</td>
<td>$171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Income (101-120% of MHI)</td>
<td>$45,464</td>
<td>$1,137</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$58,943</td>
<td>$1,474</td>
<td>$417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Table 1.14(b): County Renter Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income Categories</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Affordable Rent Purchase Price</th>
<th>Gap/ Surplus</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Affordable Home Purchase Price</th>
<th>Gap/ Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Low-Income (0-30% of MHI)</td>
<td>$12,507</td>
<td>$313</td>
<td>$444</td>
<td>$15,375</td>
<td>$384</td>
<td>$787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low-Income (31-50% of MHI)</td>
<td>$20,846</td>
<td>$521</td>
<td>$236</td>
<td>$25,626</td>
<td>$641</td>
<td>$530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income (51-80% of MHI)</td>
<td>$33,353</td>
<td>$834</td>
<td>$77</td>
<td>$41,001</td>
<td>$1,025</td>
<td>$146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-Income (81-100% of MHI)</td>
<td>$41,691</td>
<td>$1,042</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>$51,251</td>
<td>$1,281</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Income (101-120% of MHI)</td>
<td>$50,029</td>
<td>$1,251</td>
<td>$494</td>
<td>$61,501</td>
<td>$1,538</td>
<td>$367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following section presents a population, economic, and housing supply and demand analysis for Fort Lauderdale’s established “neighborhood associations.” Given the small area and boundary irregularities of many of the neighborhood associations, it was agreed with City staff that for planning purposes the analysis would be most accurately and effectively performed by delineating “Neighborhood Area Analysis Districts” that would capture like sub-markets within the City. The analysis relies on the most current data available from the U.S. Census at the census tract and block group levels. Each section shows the map of the Neighborhood Area Analysis District and the neighborhoods it includes. A map of all neighborhoods is also shown in the Appendix, pp. 97-97.

**South Middle River Neighborhood Area Analysis District**

The South Middle River Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Lauderdale Manors HOA, South Middle River Civic Association and Middle River Terrace Association.

**Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/ Flagler Villages Neighborhood Area Analysis District**

The Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/ Flagler Villages Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Dorsey-Riverbend HOA, Durrs Neighborhood Association, City View Townhomes Association, Home Beautiful Park Civic Association, Progresso Village and Flagler Village Associations.

**Downtown/Tarpon River Neighborhood Area Analysis District**

The Downtown/Tarpon River Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Downtown Fort Lauderdale Civic Association, Tarpon River Civic Association, Sailboat Bend Civic Association and Riverside Park Residents Association.

**Palm Aire Neighborhood Area Analysis District**

The Palm Aire Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Palm Aire Village (West), Palm Aire Village (East), and the Lofts of Palm Aire Village.

**Twinlakes Neighborhood Area Analysis District**

The Twinlakes Neighborhood Area Analysis District is composed of only the Twinlakes Neighborhood Association.

**Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Neighborhood Area Analysis District**

Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Coral Shores Civic Association, Coral Ridge Association Incorporated, Central Beach Alliance, Lauderdale Beach HOA, Dolphin Isles HOA and Birch Park Finger Streets Association.

Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Area Analysis District is composed of Poinsettia Heights Civic Association, Lake Ridge Residents Association, Victoria Park Civic Association, Sunrise Key Civic Association, Beverly Heights, and Colee Hammock HOA.

Las Olas Isles/Seven Isles Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Las Olas Isles/Seven Isles Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Navarro Isles Association, Las Olas Isles Homeowners Association, Idlewyld Improvement Association, Hendricks and Venice Isles, Nurmi Isles Homeowners Association, Sunrise Intracoastal HOA and Seven Isles Homeowners Association.

Harbor Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Harbor Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Central Beach Alliance, Harbor Beach HOA, Harbor Inlet Association, Breakwater Surf Homes, Harbor Drive Association, and Harbor Isles of Fort Lauderdale.

Poinciana Park/Croissant/River Oaks/Rio Vista Neighborhood Area Analysis District


Sunset / Lauderdale Isles / Flamingo Park Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Sunset/Lauderdale Isles/Flamingo Park Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Lauderdale West Association, Sunset Civic Association, Riverland Village, River Run Civic Association, Chula Vista, Flamingo Park Civic Association, Oak River Homeowners Association, Lauderdale Isles, Riverland Manors HOA, Riverland Woods, and River Landings.

Melrose / Riverland Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Melrose/Riverland Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Melrose Park, Melrose Manors HOA, and Riverland Civic Association.
South Middle River Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The South Middle River Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Lauderdale Manors HOA, South Middle River Civic Association and Middle River Terrace Association. The District is bordered by the Middle River to the north; NE Flagler Drive to east; East Sunrise Boulevard to the south; and I-95 to the west. The District contains a significant amount of the City’s population (20,059 residents) and housing units (7,888).

Population Characteristics

The population of the South Middle River Neighborhood Area Analysis District is primarily Black or African-American (72.2 percent) followed by White Alone (22.1 percent). Only 14.3 percent of the population 25+ years of age has a bachelor’s degree or higher while 26.2 percent do not have a high school diploma. An estimated 75.1 percent (15,083 residents) of the District’s population is over 18 years of age with 8.2 percent (1,654 residents) over 65.
The largest percentage (93.3 percent) of the District’s Black or African American population reside in the Lauderdale Manors HOA. The largest percentages of Hispanic or Latino populations (16.3 percent) and Asian populations (5.3 percent) reside in the Middle River Terrace Association.

Both the youngest (under 19 years of age) concentration (32.7 percent) of residents and the oldest (65+ years of age) concentration (8.2 percent) reside in the Lauderdale Manors HOA. South Middle River Civic Association has the highest percentage (17.6 percent) of its population 25+ years of age with a bachelor’s degree of higher in the District, while Lauderdale Manors HOA has the largest percentage (35.4 percent) of the resident population without a high school diploma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>20,059</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>4,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>14,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>18,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>1,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>4,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>5,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>4,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>15,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>12,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>1,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>1,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (incl. equivalency)</td>
<td>4,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>2,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>1,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*

**Economic Characteristics**

There is a total of 6,513 households in the South Middle River Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The median household income of the Neighborhood District ranges from lows of $15,469 in one of the Census Bock Groups that represent Lauderdale manors HOA to $41,250 in another Block Group in Lauderdale Manors. The more typical median household income in the District ranges from $24,265 in
western sections of the South Middle River Civic Association to $39,745 in the northeastern section of South Middle River Civic Association.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 27.4 percent of families in the District (1,786 families) had incomes in the past 12 months below the poverty level. The highest percentages of families with incomes below the poverty level in the District are located in two Census Block Groups which represent the South Middle River Civic Association. In these Block Groups, the percentages of families with incomes below the poverty level are at 47.9 and 38.2 percent.

Table 2.2: South Middle River Economic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>20,059</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; people with income below the poverty level</td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in Labor Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 16+</td>
<td>15,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Labor Force</td>
<td>10,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian employed population 16+</td>
<td>8,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts</td>
<td>1,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>2,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>2,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over</td>
<td>8,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>5,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 67.5 percent of the population 16+ years of age in the District are in the labor force. The District’s population 16 years and older is primarily employed in service occupations (35.7 percent) and sales and office occupations (27.4 percent). According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science and art occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607). The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 67.5 percent (5,469 workers) of the District’s employed population 16+ years of age commute to work each day by truck, car, van and drive alone. An estimated 11.3 percent carpool and 10.8 percent use public transportation.
**Housing Supply and Demand**

**Table 2.3: South Middle River Housing Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>7,888</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>3,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>1,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Tenure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupied housing units</th>
<th>6,607</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>2,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>3,962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant housing units</th>
<th>1,281</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 53.9 percent (4,250 units) of the South Middle River Neighborhood Area Analysis District’s 7,882 unit housing supply are comprised of 1-unit, detached or attached units. Only 8.3 percent of the District’s housing supply (651 units) are in structures of 20 or more units.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 60 percent (2,645 units) of the occupied housing units in the South Middle River Neighborhood Area Analysis District are owner-occupied. An estimated 40 percent of occupied units (3,962 units) in the District are renter-occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, 15.9 percent (1,281 units) are vacant. The highest vacancy rate (22.6 percent) in the District is for rental units followed by seasonal, recreational or occasional use vacancies (17.2 percent).

The median values of owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing units in the District vary significantly. The highest median owner values are found in Census Block Groups in the northeast section of South Middle River Civic Association ($218,800) and northwest section of Middle River Terrace Association ($217,900). The highest median gross rents ($1,565) are found in Census Block Groups in the western and southern sections of Lauderdale Manors HOA. The lowest median owner value ($79,500) is found in Lauderdale Manors HOA and the lowest median gross rent ($895) is found in the southern section of Middle River Terrace Association.

As previously noted, the standard most used by various units of government is that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing. According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 42.7 percent (1,129 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units are cost-burdened and 65.9 percent (2,609) of renter-occupied units.

**Table 2.4: South Middle River Cost Burdened Housing Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Occupied Households</td>
<td>3,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending 30% or more of household income on rent</td>
<td>2,609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Owner Occupied Households</td>
<td>2,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending 30% or more of household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
The housing affordability analysis found significant “gaps” in most areas of the District. Owner affordability gaps are largest in District areas where median owner values are the highest, including the northwest section of Middle River Terrace Association ($151,998) and the northeast section of South Middle River Civic Association ($137,343). Lower owner affordability gaps are generally found in Lauderdale Manors HOA, including one Census Block Group where an affordability surplus of $6,830 exists. The housing affordability analysis found substantial and widespread renter “gaps” in the District with the largest ($655) in Lauderdale Manors. The second largest renter gap is in South Middle River Civic Association ($568).

**Table 2.5: South Middle River Affordability Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>South Middle River</th>
<th>409.01</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>$40,828.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale Manors</td>
<td>409.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,675.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Middle River</td>
<td>408.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$51,263.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$97,838.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle River Terrace</td>
<td>408.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$137,343.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Affordability Gaps</td>
<td>South Middle River</td>
<td>409.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$526.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale Manors</td>
<td>409.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$379.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Middle River</td>
<td>408.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$568.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$252.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle River Terrace</td>
<td>408.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$235.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

**Housing and Transportation Affordability Index**

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, all of the neighborhoods in the South Middle River Neighborhood Analysis Area have an H+T Index above the 45 percent benchmark. The H+T Index ranges from a low of 51.09 percent in Lauderdale Manors HOA to 59.59 percent in South Middle River Civic Association.
Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Villages Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Villages Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Dorsey-Riverbend HOA, Durrs Neighborhood Association, City View Townhomes Association, Home Beautiful Park Civic Association, Progresso Village and Flagler Village Associations. The District is bordered by East Sunrise Boulevard to the north; NE Fifth Terrace to the east; East Broward Boulevard to the south; and I-95 to the west. The District has a total population of 15,455 residents and 6,892 housing units.
**Population Characteristics**

The population of the Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Villages Neighborhood Area Analysis District is primarily Black or African-American (71.4 percent) followed by White Alone (19.8 percent). An estimated 11.5 percent of the District’s population is Hispanic or Latino. Only 16.4 percent of the population 25+ years of age has a bachelor’s degree or higher while 30.1 percent do not have a high school diploma. An estimated 74.5 percent (11,527 residents) of the District’s population is over 18 years of age with 7.1 percent (1,101 residents) over 65.

The largest percentage (90.8 percent) of the District’s Black or African American population reside in the Durrs Neighborhood Association and Dorsey-Riverbend HOA (82.2 percent). The largest percentages of White Alone (53.3 percent) and Hispanic or Latino populations (37.7 percent) reside in the Flagler Village Association.

Both the youngest (under 19 years of age) concentration (32.3 percent) of residents and the oldest (65+ years of age) concentration (10.0 percent) reside in the Dorsey-Riverbend HOA. Flagler Village Association has the highest percentage (36.9 percent) of its population 25+ years of age with a bachelor’s degree of higher in the District, while Dorsey-Riverbend HOA has the largest percentage (26.4 percent) of the resident population without a high school diploma followed by Flagler Village Association (25.0 percent).

### Table 2.6: Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Villages Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>15,455</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>3,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>11,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>13,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>1,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>3,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>3,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>4,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>2,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>11,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>9,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>1,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>1,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (incl. equivalency)</td>
<td>2,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*
Economic Characteristics

There is a total of 5,720 households in the Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Villages Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The median household income of the Neighborhood District ranges from lows of $14,507 in one of the three Census Block Groups that represent the Durrs Neighborhood Association to $54,281 in Flagler Village Association. The typical median household income in the District ranges from $19,444 in Progresso Village Association to $25,795 in Dorsey-Riverbend HOA.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 31.7 percent of families in the District (1,816 families) had incomes in the past 12 months below the poverty level. The highest percentages of families with incomes below the poverty level in the District are located in Census Block Groups which represent Progresso Village Association (58.3 percent) and Durrs Neighborhood Association (48.4 percent).

Table 2.7: Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Villages Economic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>15,455</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>5,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; people with income below</td>
<td>1,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poverty level</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in Labor Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 16+</td>
<td>12,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Labor Force</td>
<td>7,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian employed population 16+</td>
<td>6,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts</td>
<td>1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office</td>
<td>1,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moving</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over</td>
<td>6,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>3,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</td>
<td>1,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
estimated 24.0 percent carpool and 9.8 percent use public transportation.

### Housing Supply and Demand

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 70.3 percent (4,845 units) of the Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Villages Neighborhood Area Analysis District’s 6,892 unit housing supply are in multi-family structures of 3 or 4 units and more. An estimated 19.6 percent (1,351) of the District’s housing units are in multi-family structures of 20 units or more. 1-unit, detached or attached units. Only 22.3 percent of the District’s housing supply (1,542 units) are in 1-unit, detached or attached structures.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, only 16.1 percent (1,919 units) of the occupied housing units in the Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Villages Analysis District are owner occupied. An estimated 83.9 percent of occupied units (4,801 units) in the District are renter-occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, 17.0 percent (1,172 units) are vacant. The highest vacancy rate (50.1 percent) in the District is for rental units followed by “other” vacancies (25.5 percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>6,892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>1,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>1,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>1,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Housing Tenure | |  
| Occupied housing units | 5,720 |
| Owner-occupied | 919 | 16.1% |
| Renter-occupied | 4,801 |

| Vacant housing units | 1,172 |
| Homeowner vacancy estimates | 103 | 8.8% |
| Sold, Not Occupied | - | 0.0% |
| Rental vacancy estimates | 587 | 50.1% |
| Rented Not Occupied | 85 | 7.3% |
| Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use | 98 | 8.4% |
| Other | 299 | 25.5% |

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

The median values of owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing units in the District vary significantly. The highest median owner values are found in Census Block Groups in the northeast section of Dorsey-Riverbend HOA ($215,600) and Flagler Village Association ($190,900). The highest median gross rents ($1,181) are found in Flagler Village Association and the western section of Durr's Neighborhood Association. The lowest median owner value ($78,200) and the lowest median gross rent ($682) are found in eastern section of Durr's Neighborhood Association.
According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 58.9 percent (541 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units are cost-burdened and 62.7 percent (3,011) of renter-occupied units.

The housing affordability analysis found significant “gaps” in most areas of the District. The largest affordability gap ($127,133) is found in the eastern section of Durrs Neighborhood Association where the median household income is $14,507 and in the eastern section of Dorsey-Riverbend HOA ($122,698) where the median owner value ($215,600) is the highest in the District. Lower owner affordability gaps are found in the western section of Durrs Neighborhood Association ($33,483) and Flagler Village Association ($55,198).

The housing affordability analysis found several renter “gaps” in the District with the largest ($501) in Durrs Neighborhood Association. Other significant renter gaps exist in sections of Progresso Village Association ($422) and Dorsey-Riverbend HOA ($310).
### Table 2.10: Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Villages Affordability Analysis

#### Owner Affordability Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost 1</th>
<th>Cost 2</th>
<th>Cost 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durrs</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>$33,483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$127,133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$28,408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Beautiful Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>see overlaps note below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorsey Riverbend</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>$122,698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$106,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$92,733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$86,513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressso Village</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City View</td>
<td></td>
<td>see overlaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagler Village</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Renter Affordability Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost 1</th>
<th>Cost 2</th>
<th>Cost 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durrs</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>$326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Beautiful Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>see overlaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorsey Riverbend</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressso Village</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City View</td>
<td></td>
<td>see overlaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagler Village</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

### Housing and Transportation Affordability Index

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, the H+T Index in the Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Villages Neighborhood Area Analysis District ranges from a low of 38.20 percent in the Durrs Neighborhood Association to 53.46 percent in the Flagler Village Association. All of the other neighborhoods in the District are below the 45 percent benchmark with the exception of Dorsey-Riverbend HOA (49.21 percent).
Downtown/Tarpon River Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Downtown/Tarpon River Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Downtown Fort Lauderdale Civic Association, Tarpon River Civic Association, Sailboat Bend Civic Association and Riverside Park Residents Association. The District is bordered by East Broward Boulevard to the north; South Federal Highway to the east; Davie Boulevard to the south; and I-95 to the west. The District contains a total population of 13,268 residents and 7,974 housing units.

Population Characteristics

The population of the Downtown/Tarpon River Neighborhood Area Analysis District is primarily White, Alone followed by Black or African-American (23.5 percent). An estimated 13.9 percent of the District’s population is Hispanic or Latino.
An estimated 35.2 percent of the District’s population 25+ years of age has a bachelor’s degree or higher, while only 13.2 percent do not have a high school diploma. An estimated 88.3 percent (11,727 residents) of the District’s population is over 18 years of age with 10.0 percent (1,336 residents) over 65.

Table 2.11: Downtown/Tarpon River Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>9,323</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>11,420</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>3,665</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>4,438</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>3,391</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>11,727</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>10,751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (incl. equivalency)</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

Economic Characteristics

There is a total of 6,550 households in the Downtown/Tarpon River Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The median household income of the District ranges from lows of $21,702 and $31,813 in the Census Bock Groups that comprise the western sections of Sailboat Bend Civic Association to $111,364 in the...
Block Group that represents the eastern section of Sailboat Bend. The more typical median household income in the District ranges from $52,617 in the Riverside Park Residents Association to $69,583 in the Tarpon River Civic Association.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 19.3 percent of families in the District (1,265 families) had incomes in the past 12 months below the poverty level. The highest percentages of families with incomes below the poverty level in the District are located in the western sections of Sailboat Bend Civic Association (31 percent) and the Census Block Group that represents the western section of the Riverside Park Residents Association (28 percent).

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 68 percent of the population 16+ years of age in the District are in the labor force. The Neighborhood District’s employed population 16 years and older is primarily employed in management, business, science and art occupations (48.4 percent) and sales and office occupations (18.8 percent). According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science and art occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607). The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 70.3 percent (4,674 workers) of the District’s employed population 16+ years of age commute to work each day by truck, car, van and drive alone. Only 4.5 percent of the District’s workers use public transportation and 5.2 percent walk to work.

**Housing Supply and Demand**

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 43.8 percent (3,493 units) of the Downtown/Tarpon River Neighborhood Area Analysis District’s 7,974 unit housing supply are in multi-family structures of 20 units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.12: Downtown/Tarpon River Economic Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families &amp; people with income below poverty level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage in Labor Force</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population 16+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population in Labor Force</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Civilian employed population 16+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management, business, science, and arts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales and office</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production, transportation, and material moving</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commute to Work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workers 16 years and over</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walked</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other means</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worked at home</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*
or more. Only 25.3 percent of the District’s housing supply (2,015 units) are in 1-unit, detached or attached structures.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 38.1 percent (2,498 units) of the occupied housing units in the Downtown/Tarpon River Neighborhood Area Analysis District are owner occupied. An estimated 61.9 percent of occupied units (3,962 units) in the District are renter-occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, 17.9 percent (1,281 units) are vacant. The highest vacancy rate in the District (55.2 percent) is for seasonal, recreational or occasional use vacancies followed by rental vacancies (24.4 percent).

The median values of owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing units in the District vary significantly. The highest median owner values are found in Census Block Groups in the northeast section of Sailboat Bend Civic Association ($432,600) and eastern section of Riverside Park Residents Association ($332,500). The highest median gross rents ($1,968) are found in Census Block Groups in the eastern section of Sailboat Bend Civic Association and the Downtown Fort Lauderdale Civic Association ($1,621). The lowest median owner value ($159,600) is found in the western section of Riverside Park Residents Association and the lowest median gross rent ($818) is found in the western section of Sailboat Bend Civic Association.

### Table 2.13: Downtown/Tarpon River Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Inventory</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>3,493</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Tenure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupied housing units</th>
<th>6,550</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>2,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>4,052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant housing units</th>
<th>1,424</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
As previously noted, the standard most used by various units of government is that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing. According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 59.4 percent (1,483 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units are cost-burdened and 10.1 percent (523 units) of renter-occupied units.

The housing affordability analysis found significant homeowner “gaps” in most areas of the District. The largest affordability gap ($222,545) is found in the western section of Sailboat Bend Civic Association where the median household income is $21,702, and in the eastern section of Riverside Park Residents Association ($200,958) where the median owner value ($332,500) is the second highest in the District. Lower owner affordability gaps are found in the southern section of Tarpon River Civic Association where median household incomes are generally higher and median owner values generally lower than the District, as a whole.

The housing affordability analysis found several renter “gaps” in the District with the largest ($397) in the western section of Sailboat Bend Civic Association where the median household income is $21,702. Smaller renter affordability gaps exist in the eastern section of Riverside Park Residents Association ($119) and Downtown Fort Lauderdale Civic Association ($94).

Table 2.14: Downtown/Tarpon River Cost Burdened Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Occupied Households</td>
<td>5,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending 30% or more of household income on rent</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Owner Occupied Households</td>
<td>2,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending 30% or more of household income on mortgage</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

Table 2.15: Downtown/Tarpon River Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Affordability Gaps</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Park</td>
<td>427.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailboat Bend</td>
<td>426.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpon River</td>
<td>425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter Affordability Gaps</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Park</td>
<td>427.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailboat Bend</td>
<td>426.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpon River</td>
<td>425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
**Housing and Transportation Affordability Index**

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, the H+T Index in the Downtown/Tarpon River Neighborhood Area Analysis District ranges from a low of 45.00 percent in the Riverside Park Residents Association to 69.58 percent in the Tarpon River Civic Association. The Sailboat Bend Civic Association (54.46 percent) is also well above the 45 percent affordability benchmark.
Palm Aire Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Palm Aire Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Palm Aire Village (West), Palm Aire Village (East), and the Lofts of Palm Aire Village. The District is bordered by the City’s northern municipal boundary along McNab Road to the north; Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport to the east and south and the Florida Turnpike to the west. The District has a population of 5,478 and a total of 2,853 housing units.

Population Characteristics

The population of the Palm Aire Neighborhood Area Analysis District is primarily White Alone (68.1 percent) followed by Black or African American Alone (22.4 percent). An estimated 17.3 percent of its population identify as Hispanic or Latino. Of the population 25 years and over, 25.6 percent has completed a Bachelor’s Degree or higher, while only 7.8 percent do not have a High School Diploma.

An estimated 77.1 percent (4,226 residents) of the District’s population is over 18 years of age with 12.2 percent (666 residents) 65 and over.
Table 2.16: Palm Aire Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Characteristics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a total of 2,433 household in the Palm Aire Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The median household income of the District is $49,285 based on data recorded for Census Tract 502.04 which covers the total area of the three neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 17.2 percent of families and people (418) had an income in the past 12 months below the poverty level. An estimated 81.9 percent of the working population 16 years old and over commute to work by driving alone. |
The 2009-2013 ACS estimates reported that 75.3 percent of the population 16 years and over in the District are in the labor force, and out of the total civilian employed population age 16 and over, the majority at 33.1 percent (921) is employed in management, business, science, and arts occupations. According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science and art occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607). The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

**Table 2.17: Palm Aire Economic Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>5,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>2,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level</td>
<td>418 (17.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage in Labor Force</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 16+</td>
<td>4,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Labor Force</td>
<td>3,253 (75.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian employed population 16+</td>
<td>2,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</td>
<td>921 (33.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>579 (20.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>727 (26.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>300 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>253 (9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commute to Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over</td>
<td>2,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>2221 (81.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</td>
<td>329 (12.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>11 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>52 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>17 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>81 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*
**Housing Supply and Demand**

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 44.0 percent (1,255 units) of the Palm Aire Neighborhood Area Analysis District’s 2,853 unit housing supply is comprised of 1-unit, detached or attached units. An estimated 17.9 percent of the District’s housing supply (512 units) is in structures of 20 or more units. An estimated 54.9 percent of the occupied housing units in the District are owner-occupied and 45.1 percent renter occupied. Of the District’s total housing units (2,853), 14.7 percent are vacant. Of the vacant units, 38.3 percent are “seasonal, recreational, or occasional use” housing units and 35.7 percent are vacant as “sold but not occupied.”

The median value of owner and renter occupied housing units in the District correspond to the reported Census Tract. According to the ACS 2009-2013 estimates, the median owner-occupied house value in the District is $160,200 with a median gross rent of $1,196.

### Table 2.18: Palm Aire Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>2,853</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>2,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>1,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

### Table 2.19: Palm Aire Cost-Burdened Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th>1,098</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Occupied Households</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th>1,335</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Owner Occupied Households (with a mortgage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

As previously noted, the standard most used by various units of government is that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing. According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 31.1 percent (415 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units are cost-burdened and 73.9 percent (811) of renter-occupied units are cost-burdened.
The housing affordability analysis found a moderate $36,988 homeowner affordability gap and a small renter affordability “surplus” in the District.

Table 2.20: Palm Aire Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>Palm Aire Village (West)</th>
<th>CT 502.04</th>
<th>$36,988</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palm Aire Neighborhood District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Aire Village (East)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lofts of Palm Aire Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>Palm Aire Village (West)</th>
<th>CT 502.04</th>
<th>$36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palm Aire Neighborhood District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Aire Village (East)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lofts of Palm Aire Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

Housing and Transportation Affordability Index

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, all of the neighborhoods in the South Middle River Neighborhood Analysis Area have an H+T Index well above the 45 percent benchmark. The H+T Index ranges from 60.0 percent in Palm Aire Village (East) to 66.0 percent in Palm Aire Village (West).
Twinlakes Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Twinlakes Neighborhood Area Analysis District is composed of only the Twinlakes Neighborhood Association. This is due to the noted separation created by the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport between the Palm Aire Neighborhood Area on the northwest and Twinlakes Neighborhood Association on the southeast. The areas surrounding Twinlakes Neighborhood Association include only banks, small shops, local small career colleges and hotels. The neighborhood area extends south slightly beyond the boundaries of the City of Fort Lauderdale. For the purposes of this study, only Census Tract 502.07, Block Group 1, which covers the perimeter of the neighborhood association was evaluated and reported.

![Twinlakes Neighborhood Area Analysis District Map]
Population Characteristics

The population of the Twinlakes Neighborhood Area Analysis District is primarily composed of White Alone (72.1 percent) and Black or African American Alone (27.3 percent). An estimated 17.0 percent (231 people) identify as Hispanic or Latino. Estimates for educational attainment show 19.2 percent of the population 25 years and over with a Bachelor’s degree or higher. An estimated 11.4 percent of the District’s population do not have a high school diploma.

Table 2.21: Twinlakes Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>1,360</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>1,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>1,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 81.8 percent of the District's population is 18 years and over, but only 9.1 percent are age 65 and over.

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
Economic Characteristics

There is a total of 490 households in the Twinlakes Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The median household income of the Neighborhood District is $40,890. According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 15.7 percent of families and people in the District had incomes in the past 12 months below the poverty level.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 74.4 percent of the population 16+ years of age in the District are in the labor force. The Neighborhood Area District’s employed population 16 years and older is primarily employed in management, business, science, and arts occupations (33.4 percent) followed by management, sales and office occupations (28.1 percent) and service occupations (16.1 percent). According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science and art occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607).

The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 75.9 percent (512 workers) of the District’s employed population 16+ years of age commute to work each day by driving alone a car, truck, or van. An estimated 10.4 percent (70 workers) use public transportation and 8.4 percent (57 workers) work from home.

Table 2.22: Twinlakes Economic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>1,360</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in Labor Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 16+</td>
<td>1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Labor Force</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian employed population 16+</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpoled</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
Housing Supply and Demand

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 90.1 percent (456 units) of the Twinlakes Neighborhood Area Analysis District’s 506 unit housing supply are in 1-unit, detached structures. An estimated 2.2 percent (11 units) of the District’s housing units are in structures of two units.

An estimated 87.3 percent (428 units) of the occupied housing units in the Twinlakes Analysis District are owner occupied with 12.7 percent of occupied units (62 units) in the District renter-occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, only 3.2 percent (16 units) are vacant. Vacancies are for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use.

The median owner-occupied house value for the Twinlakes Analysis District is $163,100 with a median gross rent of $1,138.

Table 2.23: Twinlakes Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>506</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 31.1 percent (415 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units are cost-burdened while an estimated 73.9 percent (811) of renter-occupied units are cost-burdened.

The housing affordability analysis found a significant owner affordability gap of $60,875 and a $116 renter affordability gap in the District.

### Table 2.25: Twinlakes Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>Twinlakes Neighborhood District</th>
<th>Twinlakes Neighborhood Association</th>
<th>CT 502.07, BG 1</th>
<th>$60,875</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renter Affordability Gaps</td>
<td>Twinlakes Neighborhood District</td>
<td>Twinlakes Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>CT 502.07, BG 1</td>
<td>$116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing and Transportation Affordability Index**

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, the H+T Index in the Twinlakes Neighborhood Association is 59.0 percent.
Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Boulevard Park Isles HOA, Imperial Point Association, Montego Bay Townhomes, Port Royale Master Association, Bay Colony Club Condominium, Bay Colony HOA, Lake Estates Improvement Association, Landings Residential Association, Bermuda Riviera Association, Galt Mile Community Association, Coral Ridge Country Club Estate, North Golf Estates HOA, Knoll Ridge HOA, and Coral Ridge Isles Association. The District is bordered by the City of Fort Lauderdale municipal boundary on the North, A1A and the Atlantic Ocean on the east; the Central Beach Alliance and Coral Ridge Association on the south; and North Federal Highway on the west. The District contains a total population of 24,621 residents and 19,990 housing units.
Population Characteristics

The population of the Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Neighborhood Area Analysis District is primarily White Alone (93.4 percent) followed by Black or African-American (2.9 percent). An estimated 12.3 percent of the District’s population identifies as Hispanic or Latino.

An estimated 45.4 percent of the District’s population 25+ years of age has a bachelor’s degree or higher, while 6.3 percent do not have a high school diploma. An estimated 89.7 percent (22,094 residents) of the District’s population is over 18 years of age with 30.2 percent (7,434 residents) over 65.

Table 2.26: Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>24,621</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>22,990</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic Ethnicity</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>21,596</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>6,942</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>11,856</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>22,094</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>7,434</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>21,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>4,043</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>5,624</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
Economic Characteristics

There is a total of 13,782 households in the Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The median household income of the District ranges from a low of $38,920 in the Census Tract that comprises the Bermuda Riviera Association Neighborhood to $72,514 in the Census Tract just to the East which represents the Galt Mile Community Association Neighborhood. The more typical median household income in the District ranges from $56,739 in the Neighborhoods of Montego Bay Townhomes, Port Royale Master Association, Bay Colony Club Condominium, Bay Colony HOA, and Landings Residential Association to $63,750 and $63,846 in the Coral Ridge Country Club Estates which is comprised of two Census Tracts.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 8.3 percent of families and people in the District (1,139) had incomes in the past 12 months below the poverty level.

Table 2.27: Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Economic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Economic Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>24,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>13,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level</td>
<td>1,139 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in Labor Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 16+</td>
<td>22,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Labor Force</td>
<td>13,048 58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian employed population 16+</td>
<td>12,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</td>
<td>5,703 47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>1,626 13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>3,391 28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>586 4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>786 6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over</td>
<td>11,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>9,007 76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</td>
<td>609 5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>73 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>438 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>533 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>1,091 9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 58.2 percent of the population 16+ years of age in the District are in the labor force. The Neighborhood District’s employed population 16 years and older is primarily employed in management, business, science and art occupations (47.2 percent) and sales and office occupations (28.0 percent). According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science and art occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607). The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 76.6 percent (9,007 workers) of the District’s employed population 16+ years of age commute to work each day by truck, car, van and drive alone. Only 0.6 percent of the District’s workers use public transportation and 3.7 percent walk to work.
**Housing Supply and Demand**

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 57.2 percent (11,433 units) of the Coral Ridge North-Imperial Neighborhood Area Analysis District’s 19,990 unit housing supply are in multi-family structures of 20 units or more. Approximately a quarter (27.6 percent) of the District’s housing supply (5,517 units) are in 1-unit, detached or attached structures.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 66.1 percent (9,109 units) of the occupied housing units in the Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Neighborhood Area Analysis District are owner occupied, while an estimated 33.9 percent of occupied units (4,673 units) are renter-occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, 31.1 percent (6,208 units) are vacant. The highest vacancy rate in the District (72.1 percent) is for seasonal, recreational or occasional use vacancies followed by “other” vacancies (12.2 percent).

The median values of owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing units in the District vary significantly. The highest median owner values are found in Census Tract covering the eastern portion of Coral Ridge Country Club Estates ($471,900) and eastern border of the District under the Census Tract corresponding to Galt Mile Community Association ($394,900). The highest median gross rents ($1,435) are found in Galt Mile Community Association and the Neighborhoods covered by Census Tract 402.04 ($1,304) which include Montego Bay Townhomes, Port Royale Master Association, Bay Colony Club Condominium, Bay Colony HOA, and Landings Residential Association. Both the lowest median owner value ($176,200) and the lowest median gross rent ($775) are found in the Bermuda Riviera Association.

### Table 2.28: Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Inventory</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>11,433</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Tenure</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>13,782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>9,109</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>4,673</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>6,208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
Table 2.29: Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Cost-Burdened Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Occupied Households</td>
<td>4,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>2,848  60.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Owner Occupied Households (with a mortgage)</td>
<td>4,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>2,327  49.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

As previously noted, the standard most used by various units of government is that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing. Thus, according to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 49.3 percent (2,327 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units are cost-burdened and 60.9 percent (2,848 units) of renter-occupied units are cost-burdened.

The housing affordability analysis found significant homeowner gaps in most areas of the District. Owner affordability gaps range from a low of $78,900 in the Galt Mile Community Association to a high of $312,285 in the Landings Residential Association.

The housing affordability analysis found a renter surplus throughout the District ranging from a low of $68 in Bay Colony Club Condominiums to $617 in the Landings Residential Association.
### Table 2.30: Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Affordability Gaps/Surplus</th>
<th>Neighborhood District</th>
<th>CT/Shape/Location</th>
<th>Affordability Gaps/Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Park Isles</td>
<td>CT 402.05 BG 3</td>
<td>$87,768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Ridge Isles Association</td>
<td>CT 402.05 BG 3</td>
<td>$105,253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Point Association</td>
<td>CT 402.05 BG 2, BG 3</td>
<td>$163,973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoll Ridge</td>
<td>CT 403 BG 3</td>
<td>$168,495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montego Bay Townhomes</td>
<td>CT 402.04</td>
<td>$68,015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Royale Master Association</td>
<td>CT 402.04</td>
<td>$135,125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Colony Club Condominiums</td>
<td>CT 402.04</td>
<td>$312,285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Colony</td>
<td>CT 402.04</td>
<td>$140,323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Golf Estates</td>
<td>CT 402.03</td>
<td>$78,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Estates Improvement Assoc.</td>
<td>CT 402.03</td>
<td>$140,323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Renter Affordability Gaps/Surplus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Neighborhood District</th>
<th>Housing Area</th>
<th>Bed Group</th>
<th>Affordability Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Park Isles</td>
<td>CT 402.05</td>
<td>BG 3 shared with Coral Ridge</td>
<td>$342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Ridge Isles Association</td>
<td>CT 402.05</td>
<td>BG 3 shared with Boulevard Park</td>
<td>$114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 403</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Point Association</td>
<td>CT 402.05</td>
<td>BG 2, BG 3</td>
<td>$114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 402.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoll Ridge</td>
<td>CT 403</td>
<td>BG 3</td>
<td>$585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montego Bay Townhomes</td>
<td>CT 402.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>$412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Royale Master Association</td>
<td>CT 402.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Colony Club Condominiums</td>
<td>CT 402.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Colony</td>
<td>CT 402.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Golf Estates</td>
<td>CT 402.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>$437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Estates Improvement Association</td>
<td>CT 402.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landings Residential Association</td>
<td>CT 402.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>$617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 402.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Ridge Country Club Estates</td>
<td>CT 404.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>$211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 404.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda Riviera Association</td>
<td>CT 405.03</td>
<td>One BG shared with Galt Mile</td>
<td>$198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt Mile Community Association</td>
<td>CT 405.03</td>
<td>One BG shared with Bermuda Riviera</td>
<td>$198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

### Housing and Transportation Affordability Index

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, the H+T Index is well above the H&T benchmark in all of the neighborhoods in the Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The H&T ranges from 66.0 in Boulevard Park Isles to 92.0 in Imperial Point Association.
Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the
Neighborhoods of Coral Shores Civic Association, Coral Ridge Association Incorporated, Central Beach
Alliance, Lauderdale Beach HOA, Dolphin Isles HOA and Birch Park Finger Streets Association. The
District is bordered by the City of Oakland Park on the northwest corner; the Coral Ridge Country Club
Estate on the north; the Atlantic Ocean on the east; Sunrise Boulevard on the south; and the
Intracoastal Waterway on the west. The District has a population of 10,492 and a total of 7,564 housing
units.
Population Characteristics

The population of the Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District is primarily White Alone (93.8 percent) followed by Two or More Races (3.1 percent). An estimated 92.5 percent of its population identify as not Hispanic or Latino. Of the population 25 years and over, 54.6 percent has completed a Bachelor’s Degree or higher, while only 3.4 percent are without a High School Diploma.

An estimated 86.1 percent (9,036 residents) of the District’s population is over 18 years of age with 21.4 percent (2,248 residents) 65 and over.

Table 2.31: Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>10,492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>9,839</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>9,702</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>3,436</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>4,042</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>9,036</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>2,841</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
**Economic Characteristics**

There is a total of 5,389 households in the Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The median household income ranges from a low of $69,188 (eastern portion of the Coral Ridge Association Incorporated Neighborhood) to $91,964 to the west which also includes the Coral Shores Civic Association Neighborhood. The estimated median household income for the remaining neighborhoods in the District is approximately $72,071.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 11.8 percent of families and people had an income in the past 12 months below the poverty level. An estimated 86.4 percent of workers age 16 and over driving to work alone or carpooling in a car, truck, or van, while a low 0.6 percent was reported as commuting via public transit.

**Table 2.32: Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Economic Characteristics**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>10,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
<td>5,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level</strong></td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage in Labor Force</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population 16+</strong></td>
<td>9,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population in Labor Force</strong></td>
<td>5,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Civilian employed population 16+</strong></td>
<td>5,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</td>
<td>2,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>1,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commute to Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over</td>
<td>5,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>4,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*
The 2009-2013 ACS estimates reported that 62.8 percent of the population 16 years and over in the District are in the labor force. Out of the total civilian employed population age 16 and over, 47.7 percent (921) are employed in management, business, science, and arts occupations, and 29.7 percent are in sales and office occupations. According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science and art occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607). The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

**Housing Supply and Demand**

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 47.0 percent (1,255 units) of the Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District’s 7,564 unit housing supply are within structures of 20 or more units, with 38.9 percent in 1-unit detached or attached structures.

An estimated 69.8 percent of the occupied housing units in the District are owner-occupied with an estimated 30.2 percent renter-occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, 14.7 percent are vacant, of which, 76.0 percent are “seasonal, recreational, or occasional use” housing units and 12.3 percent are vacant due to “other” reasons.

The median value of housing units varies within the district from a low of $320,500 for the neighborhoods including Lauderdale Beach HOA, Central Beach Alliance, Dolphins Isles HOA, and Birch Park Finger Streets Association, to a high of $615,200 in the eastern portion of Coral Ridge Association Incorporated. The median gross monthly rents for the District vary from $971 in the western portion of Coral Ridge Association Incorporated and Coral Shores Civic Association to $1,764 in the east side of Coral Ridge Association Incorporated. Census Tract 405.02, which covers the neighborhoods of Lauderdale Beach HOA, Central Beach Alliance, Dolphins Isles HOA, and Birch Park Finger Streets Association has an estimated median gross rent of $1,591.
Table 2.34: Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Cost-Burdened Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Occupied Households</td>
<td>1,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Owner Occupied Households (with a mortgage)</td>
<td>2,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>1,195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

As previously noted, the standard most used by various units of government is that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing. According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 51.5 percent (1,195 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units are cost-burdened and 56.8 percent (924) of renter-occupied units.

The housing affordability analysis found substantial homeowner gaps within each neighborhood in the District. Owner affordability gaps range from a low of $213,615 in the neighborhoods of Coral Shores Civic Association and Coral Ridge Association to a high of $442,230 in the neighborhoods of Central Beach Alliance, Lauderdale Beach and Dolphin Isles.

The housing affordability analysis found a significant renter affordability surplus in most neighborhoods within the District. However, there exists a small rent affordability gap of $34 in the neighborhoods of Central Beach Alliance, Lauderdale Beach and Dolphin Isles.
### Table 2.35: Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Affordability Analysis

#### Owner Affordability Gaps/Surplus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Neighborhood District</th>
<th>CT 406.02</th>
<th>BG3</th>
<th>$213,615</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coral Shores Civic Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Ridge Association</td>
<td>CT 406.02</td>
<td>BG 4, BG 2, BG 1</td>
<td>$213,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Beach Alliance</td>
<td>CT 405.02</td>
<td>BG 2, BG 1</td>
<td>$442,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale Beach</td>
<td>CT 405.02</td>
<td>BG2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphin Isles</td>
<td>CT 405.02</td>
<td>BG2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Park Finger Streets</td>
<td>CT 405.02</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal Harbor</td>
<td>CT 407.02</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudergate Isles Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 407.02</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Renter Affordability Gaps/Surplus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Neighborhood District</th>
<th>CT 406.02</th>
<th>BG3</th>
<th>$378</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coral Shores Civic Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Ridge Association</td>
<td>CT 406.02</td>
<td>BG 4, BG 2, BG 1</td>
<td>$378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Beach Alliance</td>
<td>CT 405.02</td>
<td>BG 2, BG 1</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale Beach</td>
<td>CT 405.02</td>
<td>BG2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphin Isles</td>
<td>CT 405.02</td>
<td>BG2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Park Finger Streets</td>
<td>CT 405.02</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal Harbor</td>
<td>CT 407.02</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudergate Isles Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 407.02</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

### Housing and Transportation Affordability Index

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, all of the neighborhoods in the Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach Neighborhood Analysis District have an H+T Index well above the 45 percent benchmark. The H+T Index ranges from 72.0 in Lauderdale Beach to 92.0 in the Coral Ridge Association.
The Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Area Analysis District is composed of Poinsettia Heights Civic Association, Lake Ridge Residents Association, Victoria Park Civic Association, Sunrise Key Civic Association, Beverly Heights, and Colee Hammock HOA. The boundaries of the District include the municipal boundary of the City of Fort Lauderdale to the north; the Intracoastal Waterway to the east; New River to the south and South Federal Highway to west. The District has a total population of 13,712 and 9,653 housing units.
**Population Characteristics**

The vast majority (86.7 percent) of the population in the Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Area Analysis District is White Alone with 84.4 percent of the total population identifying as not Hispanic or Latino. Of the population age 25 and over (11,652), 47.2 percent have a Bachelor’s Degree or higher and 17.6 percent are high school graduates.

**Table 2.36: Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Demographic Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>13,712</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>11,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>11,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>3,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>4,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>4,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>12,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>11,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>2,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>2,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>1,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>3,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>1,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

According to ACS 2009-2013 estimates, 91.5 percent of the District’s population is 18 years and over and 12.9 percent age 65 and over. The age group with the largest population is 35 to 54 (36.1 percent) followed by the 55 and over age group (30.0 percent).
**Economic Characteristics**

There is a total of 7,571 households in the Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Area Analysis District. The median household incomes of the District vary from a high of $77,344 in the Census Tract covering the southern portion of Victoria Park Civic Association, Colee Hammock HOA, and Beverly Heights to a low of $41,588 in the area including the Lake Ridge Residents Association. According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 13.5 percent of families and people in the District (1,023) had incomes in the past 12 months below the poverty level.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 72.8 percent of the population 16+ years of age in the District are in the labor force. The Neighborhood Area District’s employed population 16 years and older is primarily employed in management, business, science, and arts occupations (45.4 percent) followed by sales and office occupations (27.2 percent) and service occupations (14.5 percent). According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science and art occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607). The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 73.4 percent (6,265 workers) of the District’s employed population 16+ years of age commute to work each day by driving alone a car, truck, or van. An estimated 8.2 percent of workers work at home.

**Table 2.37: Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Economic Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>13,712</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>7,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level</td>
<td>1,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in Labor Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 16+</td>
<td>12,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Labor Force</td>
<td>9,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian employed population 16+</td>
<td>8,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</td>
<td>3,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>1,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>2,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over</td>
<td>8,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>6,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- car pooled</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*
**Housing Supply and Demand**

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 33.8 percent (3,261 units) of the Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Area Analysis District’s 9,263 unit housing supply are in 1-unit, detached structures and 20.6 percent (1,984) in structures of 20 or more units.

An estimated 46.5 percent (3,520 units) of the occupied housing units in the District are owner-occupied with an estimated 53.5 percent of occupied units (4,054 units) renter-occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, 21.6 percent (2,052 units) are vacant. An estimated 42.9 percent of the District’s vacancies are for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use.

**Table 2.38: Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Housing Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>9,653</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>3,261 (33.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>1,104 (11.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>510 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>814 (8.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>1,035 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>833 (8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>1,984 (20.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>82 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>- (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>7,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>3,520 (46.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>4,054 (53.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>2,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>178 (8.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>130 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>484 (23.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>53 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>880 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>327 (15.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The median housing values in the District range a low of $266,400 in the Poinsetta Heights Civic Association to $365,100 in the eastern sections of the Victoria Park Civic Association and Sunrise Key Civic Association. The median gross rents in the District range from a low of $915 on the east side of Victoria Park Civic Association and Sunrise Key Civic Association to $1,317 in the southern section of the Victoria Park Civic Association, Colee Hammock HOA, and Beverly Heights.

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
Table 2.39: Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Cost- Burdened Households

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 43.6 percent (1,005 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage are cost-burdened and 42.4 percent (1,720) of renter-occupied units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Occupied Households</td>
<td>4,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>1,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Owner Occupied Households</td>
<td>2,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

The housing affordability analysis found significant owner affordability gaps in most areas of the District. The largest affordability gap ($240,165) is found in the Victoria Park Civic Association with the lowest ($93,930) in Poinsetta Heights.

The housing affordability analysis found renter affordability surplus in all the neighborhoods in the District ranging from a low of $37 in the Lake Ridge Residents Association to a high of $783 in Poinsetta Heights.
Table 2.40: Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Affordability Analysis

### Owner Affordability Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poinsetta Heights/ Victoria Park/ Colee Hammock</th>
<th>CT 407.01</th>
<th>$93,930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Ridge Residents Association</td>
<td>BG 2, BG 3</td>
<td>$179,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park Civic Association</td>
<td>BG 1, BG 2, BG3; BG 3 extends to Sunrise Key Civic Association</td>
<td>$199,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Heights</td>
<td>BG 2; Shared with Colee Hammock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colee Hammock</td>
<td>BG 2; Shared with Beverly Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise Key Civic Association</td>
<td>BG3 shared with Victoria Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Renter Affordability Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poinsetta Heights/ Victoria Park/ Colee Hammock</th>
<th>CT 407.01</th>
<th>$783</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Ridge Residents Association</td>
<td>BG 2, BG 3</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park Civic Association</td>
<td>BG 1, BG 2, BG3; BG 3 extends to Sunrise Key Civic Association</td>
<td>$280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Heights</td>
<td>BG 2; Shared with Colee Hammock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colee Hammock</td>
<td>BG 2; Shared with Beverly Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise Key Civic Association</td>
<td>BG3 shared with Victoria Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing and Transportation Affordability Index**

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, the H+T Index in the Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock Neighborhood Area Analysis District are well above the H&T benchmark ranging from 66.0 percent in Colee Hammock to 92.0 percent in Victoria Park Civic Association.

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*
Las Olas Isles/Seven Isles Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Las Olas Isles/Seven Isles Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Navarro Isles Association, Las Olas Isles Homeowners Association, Idlewyld Improvement Association, Hendricks and Venice Isles, Nurmi Isles Homeowners Association, Sunrise Intracoastal HOA and Seven Isles Homeowners Association.

The District is bordered by the Intracoastal Waterway to the north, east and west; and by the New River to the south. The District has a population of 4,426 residents and 3,240 housing units.
Population Characteristics

The Las Olas Isles/Seven Isles Neighborhood Area Analysis District has a population that is primarily White Alone (95.3 percent) with 2.3 percent of the population Black or African American Alone. An estimated 8.0 percent of the population identify as Hispanic or Latino. The District’s population is mostly of age 55 and over (49.4 percent) followed by the 35 to 54 age group (25.9 percent). An estimated 88.6 percent of the total population is reported as being 18 years of age and over with 29.5 percent 65 and over.

An estimated 59.0 percent of the District’s population 25+ years of age has a bachelor’s degree or higher and only 2.3 percent do not have a high school diploma.

Table 2.41: Las Olas / Seven Isles Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>4,426</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>4,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>4,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>2,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>3,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>3,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>1,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
Economic Characteristics

There is a total of 2,308 households in the Las Olas Isles/Seven Isles Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The median household income of the District ranges from a low of $42,115 in the Sunrise Intracoastal HOA to $94,655 in District’s other neighborhoods. According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 11.4 percent of families and people in the District (263) had incomes in the past 12 months below the poverty level.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 55.2 percent of the population 16+ years of age in the District are in the labor force. The Neighborhood District’s employed population 16 years and older is primarily employed in management, business, science and art occupations (60.6 percent) and sales and office occupations (22.8 percent). According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science and art occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607). The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 75.6 percent (1,476 workers) of the District’s employed population 16+ years of age commute to work each day by truck, car, or van and drive alone. An estimated 3.0 percent commute to work by bicycle or by other means.

Housing Supply and Demand

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 44.1 percent (1,430 units) of the Las Olas Isles/Seven Isles Neighborhood Area Analysis District’s 3,240 unit housing supply are in 1-unit detached or attached structures. An estimates 36.2 percent of the total housing units are in structures of 20 or more units.
According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 79.7 percent (1,840 units) of the occupied housing units in the Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point Neighborhood Area Analysis District are owner-occupied with an estimated 20.3 percent of occupied units (468 units) renter-occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, 28.8 percent (932 units) are vacant. The highest vacancy rate in the District (61.4 percent) is for seasonal, recreational or occasional use vacancies followed by “other” vacancies at 17.0 percent.

Table 2.43: Las Olas / Seven Isles Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>3,240</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>1,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>1,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>2,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
As previously noted, the standard most used by various units of government is that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing. According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 66.0 percent (607 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage are cost-burdened, while 51.7 percent (242 units) of renter-occupied units are.

The housing affordability analysis found substantial owner affordability gaps throughout the District as high as $392,162. The analysis found a renter affordability surplus in all neighborhoods ranging from a low of $47 in the Sunrise Intracoastal HOA to a high of $849 in the other District neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Occupied Households</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Owner Occupied Households (with a mortgage)</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
Table 2.45: Las Olas / Seven Isles Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>Navarro Isle Association</th>
<th>Las Olas Isles Homeowners Association</th>
<th>Riviera Isles Improvement Association</th>
<th>Idlewyld Improvement Association</th>
<th>Hendricks and Venice Isles</th>
<th>Nurmi Isles Homeowners Association</th>
<th>Seven Isles Homeowners Association</th>
<th>Sunrise Intracoastal HOA</th>
<th>CT 420</th>
<th>Block Group 2</th>
<th>$392,162</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Olas / Seven Isles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$266,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>Navarro Isle Association</th>
<th>Las Olas Isles Homeowners Association</th>
<th>Riviera Isles Improvement Association</th>
<th>Idlewyld Improvement Association</th>
<th>Hendricks and Venice Isles</th>
<th>Nurmi Isles Homeowners Association</th>
<th>Seven Isles Homeowners Association</th>
<th>Sunrise Intracoastal HOA</th>
<th>CT 406.01</th>
<th>Block Group 2</th>
<th>$859</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Olas / Seven Isles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

**Housing and Transportation Affordability Index**

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, the H+T Index in the Las Olas/Seven Isles Neighborhood Analysis District are far above the H&T benchmark ranging from 97.0 in Sunrise Intracoastal 103.0 percent in Seven Isles Homeowners Association.
Harbor Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Harbor Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Central Beach Alliance, Harbor Beach HOA, Harbor Inlet Association, Breakwater Surf Homes, Harbor Drive Association, and Harbor Isles of Fort Lauderdale. The District is bordered by the Intracoastal Waterway on the north and south; the Atlantic Ocean to the east; and South Federal Highway to the west. The total population of the District is 6,096 with a total of 5,782 housing units.

Population Characteristics

The population of the Harbor Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District is primarily White Alone (95.4 percent) and a small Asian Alone population (1.6 percent). An estimated 7.91 percent of the District’s population identify as Hispanic or Latino. An estimated 90.4 percent (5,511 residents) of the District’s population is over 18 years of age with 31.9 percent (1,947 residents) 65 and over.

Of the population 25 years and over, 51.0 percent hold a Bachelor’s, Graduate, or Professional Degree and only 3.8 percent have less than a high school diploma.
### Table 2.46: Haror Beach Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>6,096</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>5,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>5,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>1,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>3,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>5,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>5,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>1,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>1,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

### Economic Characteristics

There is a total of 3,229 households in the Harbor Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The median household income ranges from a low of $30,000 to a high of $93,939 in the neighborhoods of Harbor Beach HOA, Harbor Inlet Association, Breakwater Surf Homes, Harbor Drive Association, and Harbor Isles of Fort Lauderdale.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 10.4 percent of families and individuals in the District had an income in the past 12 months below the poverty level with an estimated 50.7 percent from Central Beach Alliance. Of the population of workers 16 years and over (2,531 workers), an estimated 74.9
percent drove a car, truck, or van alone to commute to work, while only 2.3 percent reported taking public transportation.

Table 2.47: Harbor Beach Economic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.47: Harbor Beach Economic Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong> 6,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong> 3,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level 335 10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage in Labor Force</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population 16+</strong> 5,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Labor Force 2,989 53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian employed population 16+ 2,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations 1,247 47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations 380 14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations 732 27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations 45 1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations 219 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commute to Work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over 2,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone 1,896 74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled 36 1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab) 58 2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked 122 4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means 137 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home 282 11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
**Housing Supply and Demand**

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 68.7 percent (3,973 units) of the Harbor Beach Neighborhood Area Analysis District’s 5,782 unit housing supply are in structures of 20 or more units with 14.0 percent in 1-unit detached or attached structures.

An estimated 71.1 percent of the occupied housing units in the District are owner-occupied, and 28.9 percent renter occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, 44.2 percent are vacant, of which, 76.7 percent are “seasonal, recreational, or occasional use” vacancies.

**Table 2.48: Harbor Beach Housing Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>5,782</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>3,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>3,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>2,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>2,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>1,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*
The median owner value in the District ranges from a low of $275,600 to a high of $558,800. The median gross rent ranges from a low of $1,161 to a high of $1,601.

As previously noted, the standard most used by various units of government is that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing. According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 48.5 percent (431 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units are cost-burdened and 43.3 percent (404) of renter-occupied units.

The housing affordability analysis found substantial owner affordability gaps throughout the District as high as $323,953. The analysis found a renter affordability surplus in all neighborhoods ranging from a low of $329 in the Sunrise Intracoastal HOA to a high of $746 in the other District neighborhoods.

Table 2.49: Harbor Beach Cost-Burdened Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Occupied Households</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Owner Occupied Households (with a mortgage)</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
### Table 2.50: Harbor Beach Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>Harbor Beach</th>
<th>Central Beach Alliance</th>
<th>421</th>
<th>$126,570</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Inlet Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Breakwater Surf Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Drive Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Isles of Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>Harbor Beach</th>
<th>Central Beach Alliance</th>
<th>421</th>
<th>$329</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Inlet Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Breakwater Surf Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Drive Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Isles of Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harbor Beach</th>
<th>422</th>
<th>$323,953</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Affordability Gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Affordability Gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

#### Housing and Transportation Affordability Index

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, all of the neighborhoods in the Harbor Beach Neighborhood Analysis District have an H+T Index far above the 45 percent benchmark. The H+T Index for all the District’s neighborhoods is 112.0 percent.
Poinciana Park/Croissant/River Oaks/Rio Vista Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Poinciana Park/Croissant/River Oaks/Rio Vista Neighborhood Area Analysis District is composed of Rio Vista Civic Association, Harbordale Civic Association, Lauderdale Harbours Association, Croissant Park Civic Association, Poinciana Park Civic Association, Edgewood Civic Association, River Oaks Civic Association, and Shady Banks Civic Association. The District boundaries are Davie Boulevard and the New River to the north; the Intracoastal Waterway and South Federal Highway to the east; the municipal boundary of Fort Lauderdale to the south; and Interstate 95 to the west. The District has a population of 16,822 and 9,351 housing units.
Population Characteristics

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 83.5 percent of the population of the Poinciana Park/Croissant/River Oaks/Rio Vista Neighborhood Area Analysis District is White Alone followed by 10.4 percent Black or African American Alone. An estimated 18.9 percent of the District’s population are Hispanic or Latino.

Table 2.51: The Poinciana Park/Croissant/River Oaks/Rio Vista Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>16,822</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>14,051</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>13,638</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>5,288</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>4,726</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>13,881</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>14,447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
**Economic Characteristics**

There is a total of 7,574 households in the Poinciana Park/Croissant/River Oaks/Rio Vista Area Analysis District. The median household incomes of the Neighborhood District show dramatic differences ranging from a low of $27,353 in the northeastern area of Poinciana Park Civic Association and the southwestern portion of Harbordale Civic Association to $127,500 in the western portion of the Rio Vista Civic Association. According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 16.8 percent of families and people in the District (1,269) had incomes in the past 12 months below the poverty level.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 69.1 percent of the population 16+ years of age in the District are in the labor force. The Neighborhood Area District’s employed population 16 years and older is primarily employed in management, business, science, and arts occupations (31.8 percent) followed by sales and office occupations (24.1 percent) and service occupations (23.4 percent). According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science and art occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607). The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 79.3 percent (7,001 workers) of the District’s employed population 16+ years of age commute to work each day by driving alone or carpooling in a car, truck, or van.

### Table 2.52: Poinciana Park / Croissant / River Oaks / Rio Vista Economic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>16,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level</td>
<td>1,269 (16.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage in Labor Force</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 16+</td>
<td>16,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Labor Force</td>
<td>11,324 (69.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian employed population 16+</td>
<td>10,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</td>
<td>3,188 (31.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>2,344 (23.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>2,414 (24.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>1,239 (12.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>827 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commute to Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over</td>
<td>8,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>6,266 (71.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</td>
<td>735 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>273 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>386 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>596 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>571 (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*
**Housing Supply and Demand**

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 52.7 percent (4,930 units) of the Poinciana Park/Croissant/River Oaks/Rio Vista Area Analysis District’s 9,351 unit housing supply are 1-unit, attached or detached structures and 12.8 percent (1,201 units) are in structures of 20 or more units. An estimated 49.5 percent of the occupied housing units in the District are owner occupied with an estimated 50.5 percent of occupied units (3,824 units) renter-occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, 19.0 percent (1,777 units) are vacant. An estimated 28.0 percent of vacancies are “for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use.”

**Table 2.53: Poinciana Park/Croissant/River Oaks/Rio Vista Housing Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>9,351</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>4,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>1,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>7,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>3,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>1,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The median owner values in the District range from a low of $110,600 in for the western section of the Edgewood Civic Association to $701,100 in the western portion of Rio Vista Civic Association which borders on the west with the Downtown Fort Lauderdale Civic Association. The lowest median gross rent value $800, is found in the northeastern section of Poinciana Park Civic Association and the southwest of Harbordale Civic Association, while the District’s highest median gross rent $1,628 is in the Shady Banks Civic Association Neighborhood.
According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 46.4 percent (1,157 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage are cost-burdened and 58.6 percent (2,241 units) of renter-occupied units.

The housing affordability analysis found substantial owner affordability gaps in many of District’s neighborhoods including Rio Vista Civic Association ($389,225) and Harbordale Civic Association ($322,515). A small owner affordability surplus of $2,568 exists in the River Oaks Civic Association. The analysis found a renter affordability surplus in the majority of neighborhoods but significant affordability gaps in several including Poinciana Park Civic Association ($227) and Harbordale Civic Association ($116).
### Table 2.55: Poinciana Park/Croissant/River Oaks/Rio Vista Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>CT 424</th>
<th>One BG</th>
<th>CT 424</th>
<th>$389,225</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rio Vista Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 423.01</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td>CT 423.01</td>
<td>$198,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale Harbours Association</td>
<td>CT 423.01</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td>CT 423.01</td>
<td>$322,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbordale Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 423.02</td>
<td>BG 1,2,3</td>
<td>CT 423.02</td>
<td>$66,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croissant Park Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 433.01</td>
<td>BG 2,3,4,5,</td>
<td>CT 433.01</td>
<td>$128,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poinciana Park Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 433.02</td>
<td>BG 2,3</td>
<td>CT 433.02</td>
<td>$51,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 433.02</td>
<td>BG 4</td>
<td>CT 1106, 1</td>
<td>$2,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Oaks Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 433.01</td>
<td>BG 1,4</td>
<td>CT 427, 2</td>
<td>$31,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady banks Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 427</td>
<td>BG 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Renter Affordability Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbors</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rio Vista Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 424</td>
<td>One BG</td>
<td>CT 424</td>
<td>$2,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 423.01</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale Harbours Association</td>
<td>CT 423.01</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td>CT 423.01</td>
<td>$414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 423.01</td>
<td>BG 1,2,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbordale Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 433.02</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td>CT 423.02</td>
<td>$116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 423.02</td>
<td>BG 1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croissant Park Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 433.01</td>
<td>BG 2,3,4,5</td>
<td>CT 433.01</td>
<td>$382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 433.01</td>
<td>BG 1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poinciana Park Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 433.02</td>
<td>BG 1,2</td>
<td>CT 433.02</td>
<td>$227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 433.02</td>
<td>BG 2,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 433.01</td>
<td>BG 1</td>
<td>CT 1106, 1</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT 1106</td>
<td>BG 2</td>
<td>CT 1106, 2</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Oaks Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 433.01</td>
<td>BG 1,4</td>
<td>CT 427, 2</td>
<td>$74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady banks Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 427</td>
<td>BG 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*

### Housing and Transportation Affordability Index

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, the H+T Index in the Poinciana Park/Croissant/River Oaks/Rio Vista Neighborhood Area Analysis District is well above the H&T Index. All of the neighborhoods in the District have a H&T Index of 66.0 percent.
Sunset / Lauderdale Isles / Flamingo Park Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Sunset/Lauderdale Isles/Flamingo Park Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Lauderdale West Association, Sunset Civic Association, Riverland Village, River Run Civic Association, Chula Vista, Flamingo Park Civic Association, Oak River Homeowners Association, Lauderdale Isles, Riverland Manors HOA, Riverland Woods, and River Landings. The District is bordered by Davie Boulevard on the north; Interstate 95 on the east; the southern municipal boundary of the City of Fort Lauderdale on the south; and the southwest municipal boundary of the City of Fort Lauderdale along SR 7 on the west. The District has a population of 13,877 residents and has 4,995 housing units.

Population Characteristics

According to 209-2013 ACS estimates, 82.0 percent of the population of the Sunset/Lauderdale Isles/Flamingo Park Neighborhood Area Analysis District is White Alone with 11.1 percent of the
population Black of African American Alone. An estimated 36.3 percent of the population identify as Hispanic or Latino. An estimated 75.1 percent of the District’s population is between 20-55 years of age.

An estimated 18.0 percent (1,700 people) of the District’s population have a Bachelor’s Degree or higher and 20.6 percent (1,948) have less than a high school diploma.

### Table 2.56 Sunset/ Lauderdale Isles / Flamingo Park Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>13,877</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>11,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>1,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>8,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>5,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>1,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>2,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>2,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>4,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>3,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>10,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>9,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>2,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>2,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>1,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

An estimated 78.6 percent of the Black or African American Alone population reside in Lauderdale West Association, Sunset Civic Association, and Riverland Village. Likewise, the majority of the residents who identify as Hispanic or Latino (3,325 people) live in the Lauderdale West Association, Sunset Civic Association, and Riverland Village Neighborhoods.
An estimated 52.7 percent of the total population age 18 and over (10,782 people) reside in Lauderdale West Association, Sunset Civic Association, and Riverland Village. The majority of the District’s population age 65 and over (1,525) reside in the River Run Association, Chula Vista, Riverland Manors HOA, Riverland Woods, River Landings, Oak River Homeowners Association and Flamingo Park Civic Association.

**Economic Characteristics**

There is a total of 8,894 households in the Sunset/Lauderdale Isles/Flamingo Park Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The median household incomes in the District range from a low of $41,837 in the Lauderdale West Association, Sunset Civic Association, and Riverland Village to a high of $79,605 in the Lauderdale Isles Neighborhood. According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 16.6 percent of families and people in the District had incomes in the past 12 months below the poverty level.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 68.4 percent of the population 16+ years of age in the District are in the labor force. The Neighborhood District’s employed population 16 years and older is primarily employed in service occupations (27.7 percent), followed by management, business, science, and arts occupations (25.0 percent). According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science and arts occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607). The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.57: Sunset / Lauderdale Isles / Flamingo Park Economic Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage in Labor Force</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population 16+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population in Labor Force</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Civilian employed population 16+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service occupations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales and office occupations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commute to Work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workers 16 years and over</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walked</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other means</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worked at home</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An estimated 79.7 percent (5,012 workers) of the District’s employed population 16+ years of age commute to work each day by truck, car, or van and drive alone.
Housing Supply and Demand

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 81.3 percent (4,063 units) of the Sunset/Lauderdale Isles/Flamingo Park Neighborhood Area Analysis District’s 4,995 unit housing supply are in 1-unit detached structures. An estimated 70.7 percent (3,281 units) of the occupied housing units in the District are owner-occupied and 29.3 percent of occupied units (1,360 units) are renter-occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, 7.1 percent (354 units) are vacant. The highest vacancy rate in the District (29.9 percent) is “for seasonal, recreational or occasional use” vacancies followed by those that are “not rented yet” at 29.9 percent.

Table 2.58: Sunset / Lauderdale Isles / Flamingo Park Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>4,995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>4,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>4,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>3,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

The median housing value in the District ranges from a low of $168,900 in the Lauderdale West Association, Sunset Civic Association, and Riverland Village to a high of $325,900 in Lauderdale Isles.

The median gross rent values in the District varies from $1,029 in the Lauderdale West Association, Sunset Civic Association and Riverland Village to a high of $1,861 in Lauderdale Isles.
As previously noted, the standard most used by various units of government is that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing. Thus, according to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 52.6 percent (1,256 units) of the District’s owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage are cost-burdened and 63.3 percent (861 units) of all renter-occupied units.

The housing affordability analysis found a significant owner affordability gap of $126,888 in Lauderdale Isles and smaller gaps ($38,073-$64,308) in the other neighborhoods within the District. The analysis found a renter affordability surplus in all of the District’s neighborhoods.

### Table 2.59: Sunset / Lauderdale Isles / Flamingo Park Burdened Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Occupied Households</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Owner Occupied Households (with a mortgage)</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
### Table 2.60: Sunset / Lauderdale Isles / Flamingo Park Affordability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>Lauderdale West Assoc</th>
<th>CT 430.02</th>
<th>$64,308</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunset Civic Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverland Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Run Civic Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flamingo Park Civic Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oak River Homeowners Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverland Manors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverland Woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Landings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lauderdale Isles</td>
<td>CT 430.01</td>
<td>$126,888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>Lauderdale West Assoc</th>
<th>CT 430.02</th>
<th>$17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunset Civic Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverland Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Run Civic Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flamingo Park Civic Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oak River Homeowners Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverland Manors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverland Woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Landings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lauderdale Isles</td>
<td>CT 430.01</td>
<td>$129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*

### Housing and Transportation Affordability Index

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, the H+T Index in the Sunset/Lauderdale Isles/Flamingo Park Neighborhood Area Analysis District is well above the H&T Index ranging from a low of 65.0 percent in Lauderdale West Association to 70.0 percent in the Flamingo Park Civic Association.
Melrose / Riverland Neighborhood Area Analysis District

The Melrose/Riverland Neighborhood Area Analysis District includes the Neighborhoods of Melrose Park, Melrose Manors HOA, and Riverland Civic Association. The District is bordered by the municipal boundaries of the City of Fort Lauderdale on the north and west, Interstate 95 on the east; and Davie boulevard on the south. The District has a total population of 15,636 people and 4,623 housing units.

Population Characteristics

The population of the Melrose/ Riverland Neighborhood Area Analysis District are mostly Black or African American Alone (70.4 percent) followed by White Alone (24.8 percent). An estimated 16.3 percent (15,636 persons) of the District’s population identify as Hispanic or Latino.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 77.6 percent of the District’s residents are of age 18 and over with 11.2 of age 65 and over. An estimated 51.9 percent of the District’s residents (8,122 people) are of the age bracket of 20 to 54. Of the District’s population age 25 years and over, 34.6 percent have a high school diploma or its equivalent, while only 18.3 percent have a Bachelor’s Degree or higher.
### Table 2.61: Melrose / Riverland Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>15,636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>11,003</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>13,092</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>3,884</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>4,238</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>3,487</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>12,140</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>10,258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>3,554</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
Economic Characteristics

There is a total of 4,253 households in the Melrose/Riverland Neighborhood Area Analysis District. The median household incomes in the District range from a low of $42,232 in Melrose Park to $43,496 in Melrose Manors and Riverland Civic Association.

According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 20.9 percent of families and people had an income in the past 12 months below the poverty level. An estimated 71.2 percent of the District’s workers (5,048) age 16 and over drive to work alone while 11.2 percent commute via public transportation.

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 66.1 percent of the population 16 years and over in the District are in the labor force. Out of the total civilian employed population age 16 and over, 35.5 percent are employed in service occupations, with a lowest occupation reported being natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations at 10.0 percent. According to the U.S. Census, “occupation” describes the kind of work a person does on the job. The highest median earnings are in management, business, science, and art occupations ($47,637) with the lowest in service occupations ($16,607). The median earnings for sales and office occupations is $28,020.

### Table 2.62: Melrose / Riverland Economic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>15,636</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>4,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in Labor Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 16+</td>
<td>12,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Labor Force</td>
<td>8,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian employed population 16+</td>
<td>7,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</td>
<td>1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>2,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over</td>
<td>7,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>5,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates
Housing Supply and Demand

According to 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 74.0 percent (3,423 units) of the Melrose/Riverland Neighborhood Area Analysis District’s 4,623 unit housing supply are comprised of 1-unit detached structures and 4.2 percent are mobile homes.

An estimated 62.9 percent (2,675 units) of the occupied housing units in the District are owner-occupied with 37.1 percent (1,578) renter occupied. Of the District’s total housing units, 8.0 percent are vacant, of which, 40.5 percent are rental vacancy estimates. The median value of housing units varies within the District ranging from a low of $135,400 in Melrose Park to a high of $152,300 in the Melrose Manors HOA and Riverland Civic Association. The median gross rents in the District range from a low of $999 in the Melrose Manors HOA and Riverland Civic Association to $1,385 in Melrose Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Inventory</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Renter Households</th>
<th>1,578</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Burdened Owner Households</th>
<th>2,077</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>1,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.64: Melrose/ Riverland Cost-Burdened Households

As previously stated, the standard most used by various units of government is that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing. According to the 2009-2013 ACS estimates, 54.1 percent of the District’s owner-occupied housing units are cost-burdened and 65.2 percent of renter-occupied units.
The housing affordability analysis found significant owner affordability gaps ranging from $29,820-$43,560 in each of District neighborhoods. The analysis found a substantial renter affordability gap of $329 in the Melrose Park Neighborhood and small renter affordability surplus in the Melrose Manor and Riverland Civic Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>Melrose Manors</th>
<th>CT 428</th>
<th>$43,560</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverland Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 429</td>
<td>$29,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Park</td>
<td>CT 429</td>
<td>$29,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter Affordability Gaps</th>
<th>Melrose Manors</th>
<th>CT 428</th>
<th>$88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverland Civic Association</td>
<td>CT 429</td>
<td>$329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Park</td>
<td>CT 429</td>
<td>$329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates

**Housing and Transportation Affordability Index**

The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index (H+T Index) developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) offers an expanded view of affordability, one that combines housing and transportation costs and sets the benchmark at no more than 45 percent of household income. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, all of the neighborhoods in the Melrose/Riverland Neighborhood Analysis Area have an H+T Index above the 45 percent benchmark ranging from 65.0 percent in Melrose Manors to 70.0 percent in Riverland Civic Association.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Neighborhood Association</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Neighborhood Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bay Colony Club Condominium</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Galt Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lofts of Palm Aire Village</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Lauderdale Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lake Estates Improvement</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Coral Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Knoll Ridge</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Coral Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Golf Estates</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lauderdale Manors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dolphin Isles</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Poinsettia Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bal Harbour</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Middle River Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Birch Park Finger Sts.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Dillard Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lauderdale Isles</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Central Beach Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lake Ridge</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Sunrise Intracoastal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Golden Heights</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Sunrise Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Durrs</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Hendricks and Venice Isles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Home Beautiful Park</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dorsey-Riverbend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>City View</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Riverside Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Seven Isles</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Melrose Manors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nurmi Isle</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Melrose Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Riverland</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Las Olas Isles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Idlewyld</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Rio Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Riviera Isles</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Sunset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Harbor Beach</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Harbour Isles of Fort Lauderdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lauderdale Harbours</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Lauderdale Isles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Croissant Park</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>River Oaks</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Navarrea Isle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Shady Banks</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>River Garden Sweeting Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Flamingo Park</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Twin Lakes North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lauderdale West</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Harbordale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>River Run</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Bermuda Riviera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Poinciana Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Riverland Village</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Downtown Fort Lauderdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Harbour Inlet</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Tarpon River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Oak River</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Sailboat Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>River Landings</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Flagler Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>South Middle River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Riverland Woods</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Progresso Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Breakwater Surf</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Rock Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Harbor Drive</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Lake Aire Palm View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Riverland Manors</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Landings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Imperial Point</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Bay Colony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Palm-Aire Village East</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Beverly Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Palm Aire Village West</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Colee Hammock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Boulevard Park Isles</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Port Royale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Coral Ridge Isles</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Montego Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>South Middle River</td>
<td>Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Village</td>
<td>Downtown Tarpon River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>20,059</td>
<td>15,455</td>
<td>13,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>4,428</td>
<td>3,061</td>
<td>9,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>14,480</td>
<td>11,033</td>
<td>3,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>18,531</td>
<td>13,680</td>
<td>11,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>1,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>1,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,695</td>
<td>3,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>5,622</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>4,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>3,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>15,083</td>
<td>11,527</td>
<td>11,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td>9,860</td>
<td>10,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (incl. equivalency)</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>2,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>2,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>2,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>1,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Palm Aire</td>
<td>Twinlakes</td>
<td>Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>5,478</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>24,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>68.10%</td>
<td>72.10%</td>
<td>93.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>22.40%</td>
<td>27.30%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>82.70%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>87.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>17.30%</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>12.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 years</td>
<td>15.30%</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34</td>
<td>20.50%</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54 years</td>
<td>38.60%</td>
<td>36.30%</td>
<td>28.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
<td>25.10%</td>
<td>48.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>77.10%</td>
<td>81.80%</td>
<td>89.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>30.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Palm Aire</th>
<th>Twinlakes</th>
<th>Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point</th>
<th>Coral Ridge South-Lauderdale Beach</th>
<th>Poinsetta Heights/Victoria Park/Colee Hammock</th>
<th>Las Olas Isles/Seven Isles</th>
<th>Harbor Beach</th>
<th>Poinciana Park/Croissant/River Oaks/Rio Vista</th>
<th>Sunset Isles / Flamingo Park</th>
<th>Melrose / Riverland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>3,918</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>21,126</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>11,652</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>5,131</td>
<td>14,447</td>
<td>9,453</td>
<td>10,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>14.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th, no diploma</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (incl. equivalency)</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>42.40%</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>23.70%</td>
<td>29.60%</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>28.10%</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
<td>19.10%</td>
<td>16.50%</td>
<td>19.10%</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>21.70%</td>
<td>23.30%</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>18.40%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>26.60%</td>
<td>33.60%</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
<td>30.20%</td>
<td>30.60%</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td>11.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
<td>21.00%</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
<td>28.80%</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*
### Economic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>South Middle River</th>
<th>Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Village</th>
<th>Downtown Tarpon River</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>20,059</td>
<td>15,455</td>
<td>13,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>6,513</td>
<td>5,720</td>
<td>6,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level</td>
<td>1,786 (27.4%)</td>
<td>1,816 (31.7%)</td>
<td>1,265 (19.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage in Labor Force</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 16+</td>
<td>15,762</td>
<td>12,045</td>
<td>14,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Labor Force</td>
<td>10,642 (67.5%)</td>
<td>7,990 (66.3%)</td>
<td>9,974 (68.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian employed population 16+</td>
<td>8,329</td>
<td>6,305</td>
<td>6,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</td>
<td>1,655 (19.9%)</td>
<td>1,668 (26.5%)</td>
<td>3,351 (48.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>2,971 (35.7%)</td>
<td>1,834 (29.1%)</td>
<td>972 (14.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>2,279 (27.4%)</td>
<td>1,434 (22.7%)</td>
<td>1,305 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>561 (6.7%)</td>
<td>766 (12.1%)</td>
<td>778 (11.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>863 (10.4%)</td>
<td>603 (9.6%)</td>
<td>519 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commute to Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over</td>
<td>8,102</td>
<td>6,181</td>
<td>6,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>5,469 (67.5%)</td>
<td>3,588 (58.0%)</td>
<td>4,764 (70.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</td>
<td>923 (11.4%)</td>
<td>1,489 (24.1%)</td>
<td>516 (7.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>883 (10.9%)</td>
<td>609 (9.9%)</td>
<td>307 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>102 (1.3%)</td>
<td>110 (1.8%)</td>
<td>356 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>453 (5.6%)</td>
<td>241 (3.9%)</td>
<td>179 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>272 (3.4%)</td>
<td>144 (2.3%)</td>
<td>651 (9.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Aire</td>
<td>Twinlakes</td>
<td>Coral Ridge North-Imperia Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>5,478</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>24,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; people whose income in the past 12 months is below the poverty level</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population 16+</strong></td>
<td>4,321</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>22,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Labor Force</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Civilian employed population 16+</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>12,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, science, and arts occupations</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to Work</td>
<td>Palm Aire</td>
<td>Twinlakes</td>
<td>Coral Ridge North-Imperia Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers 16 years and over</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>11,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- drove alone</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck, or van -- carpooled</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (excluding taxicab)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>South Middle River</td>
<td>Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Village</td>
<td>Downtown Tarpon River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>7,888</td>
<td>6,892</td>
<td>7,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>3,804 (48.2%)</td>
<td>1,181 (17.1%)</td>
<td>1,513 (19.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>446 (5.7%)</td>
<td>361 (5.2%)</td>
<td>502 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>1,162 (14.7%)</td>
<td>466 (6.8%)</td>
<td>554 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>1,043 (13.2%)</td>
<td>1,798 (26.1%)</td>
<td>1,192 (14.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>361 (4.6%)</td>
<td>961 (13.9%)</td>
<td>259 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>395 (5.0%)</td>
<td>735 (10.7%)</td>
<td>415 (5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>651 (8.3%)</td>
<td>1,351 (19.6%)</td>
<td>3,493 (43.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>26 (0.3%)</td>
<td>39 (0.6%)</td>
<td>14 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>- (0.0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>6,607</td>
<td>5,720</td>
<td>6,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>2,645 (40.0%)</td>
<td>919 (16.1%)</td>
<td>2,498 (38.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>3,962 (60.0%)</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>4,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>211 (16.5%)</td>
<td>103 (8.8%)</td>
<td>94 (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>32 (2.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>290 (22.6%)</td>
<td>587 (50.1%)</td>
<td>347 (24.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>37 (2.9%)</td>
<td>85 (7.3%)</td>
<td>- (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>220 (17.2%)</td>
<td>98 (8.4%)</td>
<td>786 (55.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>491 (38.3%)</td>
<td>299 (25.5%)</td>
<td>113 (7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Aire</td>
<td>Twinlakes</td>
<td>Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Units</strong></td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>19,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, detached</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 units</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 units</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupied housing units</strong></td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>13,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacant housing units</strong></td>
<td>420</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy estimates</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy estimates</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Not Occupied</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*

The Metropolitan Center, Florida International University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>South Middle River</th>
<th>Dorsey-Riverbend, Progresso/Flagler Village</th>
<th>Downtown Tarpon River</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Burdened Renter Households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Occupied Households</td>
<td>3,962</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>5,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>2,609 65.9%</td>
<td>3,011 62.7%</td>
<td>523 10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Burdened Owner Households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Owner Occupied Households</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>2,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>1,129 42.7%</td>
<td>541 58.9%</td>
<td>1,483 59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Palm Aire</td>
<td>Twinlakes</td>
<td>Coral Ridge North-Imperial Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Burdened Renter Households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Renter Occupied Households</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>4,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total renter occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on rent</td>
<td>73.90%</td>
<td>73.90%</td>
<td>60.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Burdened Owner Households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Owner Occupied Households (with a mortgage)</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>4,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total owner occupied housing units that pay 30% or more of their household income on mortgage payments</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
<td>49.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS 2013 5-year estimates*
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The affordable housing policy will assist local leaders discuss the modern realities of the affordable housing market. The policy document identifies resources and the regulatory framework available to facilitate affordable housing development opportunities within the City of Fort Lauderdale.
Affordable Housing Policy

City of Fort Lauderdale

Introduction

Fort Lauderdale’s neighborhoods offer residents an opportunity to live near the region's significant cultural facilities, and enjoy a variety of people, architecture, and a sense of community. Neighborhood revitalization of deteriorated elements, and preservation of positive characteristics, is a major policy emphasis because it has a direct impact on the quality of life for Fort Lauderdale’s residents. Neighborhood quality includes many factors, including the condition and the cost of the City's housing supply, the quality of the environment and the provision of facilities and services such as parks, street improvements, fire and police protection, and health, education and welfare facilities.

The City of Fort Lauderdale is currently seeking an amendment to the Broward County land use plan to build more housing units in the Downtown Fort Lauderdale area. The purpose of the amendment is to increase the residential development allowed in the Downtown Regional Activity Center (RAC) by 5,000 dwelling units, which would bring the total allowable number of dwelling units in the Downtown RAC to 16,060.

To assist with the requested amendment to the land use plan, the Broward County Planning Council asked the City of Fort Lauderdale to adopt an affordable housing policy. Furthermore, the City Manager directed staff to hire a consultant to perform an affordable housing study for the entire city. In order to prepare an affordable housing policy, an affordable housing study was considered to be the necessary first step in understanding the location of affordable housing inventory. The city hired the Florida International University Metropolitan Center to prepare an affordable housing study; the scope of study focused on understanding how housing and transportation costs both play a role in truly determining housing affordability in Fort Lauderdale.

The Affordable Housing Advisory Committee commonly referred to as the AHAC, have also presented affordable housing policy discussion materials on the topic of affordable housing to the City Commission. The AHAC is a standing committee, required by state statute because the city receives funding through the State Housing Initiatives Partnership (SHIP) program. The AHAC works with city staff to review established policies and procedures, ordinances, land development regulations, and the housing element of the adopted comprehensive plan for the City of Fort Lauderdale. Occasionally, the AHAC may recommend specific actions or initiatives to encourage or facilitate affordable housing opportunities throughout the city. In the recent past, the AHAC has also offered policy recommendations for development of affordable housing within the city.

At the administrative level, the Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) of the Department of Sustainable Development primarily manage the preservation and creation of affordable housing. The affordable housing policy included herein was prepared by City staff to inform the City Commission and administration of the existing resources, local ordinances, and policies in place related to affordable housing. The document also includes several recommended policy enhancement and consolidates the existing and recommended items into one comprehensive policy document.
The affordable housing policy document is organized into the following topic areas:

**Article I. Affordable Housing Definition and Terms**
- Definition and Determining Affordability
- Income Categories
- Affordability Methodologies / Indexes

**Article II. Affordable Housing Trust Fund**
- Establishing an Affordable Housing Trust Fund

**Article III. Tools to Incentivize Development**
- Expedited Permitting
- Development Fee Offset Program
- Northwest Regional Activity Center (NWRAC)
- Transit Oriented Development (T.O.D.)
- Land Write Down
- No-Cost Conveyance
- Land Contribution as Equity

**Article IV. Infill Strategies**
- City Owned Property
- Public Private Partnerships
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Article I. Affordable Housing Definition and Terms

Section 1.01 Definition and Determining Affordability

Housing affordability is the capacity of households to consume housing services and, specifically the relationship between household incomes and prevailing prices and rents. Two entities that use empirical data to determine affordability are the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Florida Housing Finance Corporation (FHFC), both define affordability by household based on income categories, in relation to the Area Median Income (AMI).

HUD uses the median income for families in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas to calculate income limits for eligibility in a variety of housing programs. HUD estimates the median family income for an area in the current year and adjusts that amount for different family sizes so that family incomes are expressed as a percentage of the area median income. The median divides the income distribution into two equal parts: one-half of the cases falling below the median income and one-half above the median.

Additionally, when evaluating housing as a whole, there are some standard affordability methodologies available. Some methodologies base affordability solely on monthly housing costs, while other combine monthly housing costs with monthly transportation costs.

The standard HUD and FHFC income category definitions are below in Section 1.02:

Section 1.02 Income Eligibility Categories:

- 30% or below AMI - Extremely Low Income
- 30.01% to 50% of AMI - Very Low Income
- 50.01% to 80% of AMI - Low Income
- 80.01% to 140% of AMI - Moderate Income

Housing Affordability is a universal term that is defined as a measure of a population’s ability to purchase and own a particular item, such as a home, based on their household income. The term affordability is not solely applicable to households that qualify under the FHFC and HUD guidelines; affordability includes an individual/family’s ability to afford a home regardless of household size and income.

Typically, the term Affordable Housing is focused on providing housing opportunities to households that are 30% - 80% of the Area Median Income. For individuals and families that do not qualify under the income categories issued by HUD or FHFC, other methodologies / indexes can also be used to determine affordability based on issues such as location, transportation, and available inventory.
Section 1.03 Affordability Methodologies / Indexes:

In accordance with the City’s Affordable Housing Programs, “affordable” means that monthly rents or mortgage payments including taxes and insurance do not exceed 30% of monthly income. However, it is not the intent to limit an individual household’s ability to devote more than 30% of its income for housing, particular if a housing program allows for a higher percentage.

The commercial lending industry defines affordability based on a housing front-end ratio. This ratio consists of the following monthly housing expenses: mortgage payment, interest payment, property tax payment, homeowner's insurance payment, and mortgage insurance payment and association / condominium fees. For lenders, a typical front-end ratio should not exceed 35% of a household’s monthly income is considered eligible for affordable housing.

Affordable housing professionals use a similar affordability methodology, but states that a monthly housing or lease payment should not exceed 30% of a household’s monthly income.

The Affordable Housing and Economic Analysis report prepared by the Metropolitan Center at Florida International University (FIU) provides a more detailed overview of a number of the traditional housing affordability indexes. The report also highlights and applies citywide a new approach to measure housing affordability referred to as the Housing + Transportation Affordability index, or H+T. The H+T Affordability index developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) to offer an expanded view of affordability; one that combines traditional housing costs (as listed above) and transportation costs. Monthly transportation costs can include your car payment, car insurance, fuel, and any other form of transportation costs incurred on a monthly basis.

In measuring affordability using the H+T Index, sets the benchmark or common measuring point of household expenses at no more than 45% of household income. The City of Fort Lauderdale hired FIU to conduct an analysis of the entire city applying traditional housing affordability analysis and the H+T Index to measure overall affordability where possible by area or neighborhood. The city will continue to use the affordability guidelines as defined by FHFC and HUD as the primary indexes for those households eligible for city-sponsored housing programs. According to CNT’s 2015 estimates, both Broward County (65%) and the City of Fort Lauderdale (66%) have an H+T Index above the 45% benchmark and therefore can be categorized as being significantly cost burdened when including transportation costs to the traditional view of affordability.

Article II. Affordable Housing Trust Fund

It is recommended that the City of Fort Lauderdale establish an Affordable Housing Trust Fund by adopting an ordinance. The trust fund will be initially funded with funds deposited in an account set up in 2005 for the delivery of more affordable housing units. To date that account has a balance of approximately $300,000. Moving forward affordable housing will continue to be funded from the net sales proceeds from the sale of eligible residential surplus lots. One hundred percent of the funds received from the sale of eligible residential lots shall be deposited into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Eligibility for residential property to be sold will also include analysis of any deed restrictions or encumbrances that may need to be evaluated to determine if a property can be developed free of title issues or restrictions.
Affordable Housing Policy

Article III. Tools to Incentivize Development

Section 3.01 Expedited Permitting

The processing of approvals of development orders or permits, as defined in s. 163.3164(15) and (16), Florida Statutes, for affordable housing projects is expedited to a greater degree than other projects.

The City of Fort Lauderdale adopted Ordinance C-98-64 on December 8, 1998 to provide for an expedited permitting process to assist developers of affordable housing in getting through the development review process. It is recommended that the City continue to work to implement this ordinance by dedicating the necessary resources to facilitate the development of affordable housing. The City has identified the Assistant Building Official as the expeditor that will have the responsibility for expediting applications. The following expedited review processes may include, but shall not be limited to the following:

- Identify zoning regulations applicable to the proposed development.
- Oversight of the development will be conducted from application to certificate of occupancy.
- Referral to the appropriate Broward County government and Broward County School Board affordable housing expeditors who have jurisdiction over proposed developments in the City.
- Assist the applicant with any incomplete portions of the development application.
- Identify resources, which may assist the applicant in meeting the requirement for development permit approval.

Developers and Contractors can access this incentive by advising the Building Division of the Department of Sustainable Development that they are constructing affordable housing at the time of applying for a building permit. If the Developer or Contractor is working with the Housing & Community Development Division (HCD), HCD staff will assist to get their permit expedited.

Section 3.02 NWRAC-MU Special Regulations (City Ordinance C-14-51)

It is recommended that the City promote affordable housing development within the Northwest Regional Activity Center, specifically the area identified within the new mixed-used regulations. On February 17, 2015 the City Commission adopted ordinance C-14-51 to establish performance standards and criteria for development projects in the Northwest Progresso Flagler Heights Community Redevelopment Area an Affordable Housing height bonus incentive within the for properties fronting the Sistrunk Boulevard corridor from the Florida East Coast Railway to NW 24th Avenue.

Section 3.03 Transit Oriented Development (Resolution 14-19)

It is recommended that the City promote affordable housing within a defined transit-oriented development district or a new transit-oriented development project. On February 4, 2014, the City of Fort Lauderdale adopted a resolution approving an update to the Downtown Master Plan by incorporating Transit Oriented Development (TOD) guidelines. The proximity of affordable housing to existing and future transit corridors, hubs, and large employment centers is a logical solution to traffic congestion, parking constraints, and affordability.
Section 3.04 Development Fee Offset Program

Under the Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinances, Section 9-341, the City may offset a portion of the development fees incurred in connection with the development of affordable housing. It is recommended that the City of Fort Lauderdale identify and budget annually a source of funds to promote the development of more affordable housing. In order for a project to be eligible for funding under this ordinance a project shall meet the following requirements:

1. An application for the proposed development is submitted on or after the effective date of the ordinance from which this article is derived.
2. The development consists of one or more single-family or multifamily dwellings as defined in the ULDR.
3. The development qualifies as affordable housing as defined in this article.
4. The purchaser or lessee of the development is an eligible person or eligible household as defined in this article.
5. A restrictive covenant is executed and recorded in the public records of Broward County, Florida, restricting the ownership of an owner-qualified development to an eligible person for five (5) years and lease of multifamily dwellings to a qualified lease development to an eligible person for fifteen (15) years.
6. Single-family standard development must meet the standards established for an infill housing project approved by the city commission on July 6, 1994.

Section 3.05 Land Write Down

The City should negotiate a real property land write down when appropriate to support the development of affordable housing. The land write down process would involve City of Fort Lauderdale disposing of land available for the construction of affordable housing at a price below the fair market value.

Section 3.06 No-Cost Conveyance

The City should convey property at no cost when negotiating with developers for affordable housing projects. The no-cost conveyance would also include the city covering closing costs and other applicable fees, through non-general fund sources.

Section 3.07 Land Contribution as Equity

The City should utilize city-owned property as equity when negotiating to develop an affordable housing project. The incentive would involve the conveyance of title with a deed restriction that would be recorded to prohibit the sale, transfer, or refinance of the property within 15 years. If the deed restriction were violated before the restriction is in effect, then the seller would owe the City a pro rata share of the value of the equity invested from the sales proceeds of a transaction.

Article IV. Infill Strategies

Section 4.01 City-Owned Property

The City should develop a comprehensive city-owned property disposal strategy for residential properties. In accordance with State requirements, the City of Fort Lauderdale is obligated to review all residential lots in the City to determine if they are suitable for affordable housing. Each eligible residential lot will be carefully analyzed to
determine its suitability for affordable housing. The conveyance of residential properties (that are free of encumbrances and restrictions) that are donated, discounted, funded, or incentivized by the City shall be used to provide affordable housing for households earning less than 140% of the median income and shall remain affordable for a minimum of 15 years.

Section 4.02 – Public-Private Partnerships
The City should actively seek public-private partnerships for the development of affordable housing. The optimal City partnerships, where possible, will be with experienced affordable housing developers. All developers, particularly those that focus on affordable housing shall be considered for this type of partnership. Affordable housing developers are generally focused on projects that create housing opportunities for low and very low-income households.

Section 4.03 – Residential Renovation, Infill and Townhomes
The City should encourage the renovation of existing housing stock, construct on available infill properties and promote a mixture of single family and townhome developments based on project feasibility and neighborhood character. The City has a number of residential lots that are suitable for affordable housing. The City will utilize a competitive process, to select developers to collaborate with to develop larger parcels and may offer property as equity to the developer to help reduce costs and make the projects financially feasible. All housing units constructed or rehabilitated shall include “sustainable” construction practices. Some examples of “sustainable” construction practices include, but are not limited to the following:

- **Landscape**: Incorporates “Florida Friendly” landscape principles,
- **Attic Insulation**: R-38 fiberglass batt or blown in borax treated (no ammonium sulfate permitted), and
- **Paints/primers and coatings for Exterior & Interior**: Must be Zero or Low V.O.C. (Volatile Organic Compounds) and must meet Green Seal G-11 Environmental standard.

**Article V. Federal, State and Local Housing Policy Documents**

The Housing and Community Development (HCD) Division is responsible for administering the City’s programs for the Florida Housing Finance Corporation (FHFC) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Both agencies have policy documents such as the Local Housing Assistance Plan, the Consolidated Plan, and Annual Action Plan that must be adopted by the City Commission and are used to govern the programmatic use of the funding. All of these policy documents have an impact on the city’s ability to support the development of affordable housing.

**Section 5.01 – Consolidated Plan (CP)**

Every five years, the City of Fort Lauderdale is required to submit its Consolidated Plan to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in order to continue receiving funding for the City’s Entitlement Grant Programs through HUD. The purpose of the Consolidated Plan is to identify community, economic and housing development needs, and to develop strategies and goals to address those needs.

All entitlement jurisdictions receiving federal housing funds from HUD are required to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH) by identifying impediments to fair housing choice in their communities and to develop action plans to address those impediments. The AFFH report identifies current impediments to fair housing choice and provides recommendations to diminish them. The analysis includes illegal actions in direct violation of fair housing laws and
actions, omissions or decisions that may be legal but ultimately restrict fair housing choice.

Section 5.02 Annual Action Plan (AAP)

Each year a Consolidated Plan is developed, with it the City outlines how federal funds will be spent in accordance with rules and regulations outlined by HUD. The HUD funded programs include the HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), and Housing Opportunities for Persons with HIV/AIDS (HOPWA).

Section 5.03 Local Housing Assistance Plan (LHAP)

The City receives funds from the State of Florida for the State Housing Initiatives Partnership (SHIP) Program. Every three years, the City is required to submit its Local Housing Assistance Plan (LHAP) to the State for final approval of programs to be administered by the City. SHIP dollars may be used to fund emergency repairs, new construction, rehabilitation, down payment and closing cost assistance, impact fees, construction and gap financing, mortgage buy-downs, acquisition of property for affordable housing, matching dollars for federal housing grants and programs, and homeownership counseling.

Section 5.04 Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan

An adopted Affordable Housing Policy will be used to update, amend, or supplement the information contained in the Comprehensive Plan to provide insight and direction on future housing needs for the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Article VI. Appendix

- Expedited Permitting Ordinance C-98-64
AN ORDINANCE CREATING A NEW ARTICLE VIII OF CHAPTER 9, "BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION", OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE ENTITLED THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAM; PROVIDING A PROGRAM AND FUNDS TO OFFSET PERMIT, DEVELOPMENT AND INSPECTION FEES FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND PROVIDING FOR AN EXPEDITED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PROCESS.

WHEREAS, as part of the William E. Sadowski Affordable Housing Act passed by the Florida Legislature in 1992, the State Housing Initiatives Partnership Act ("SHIP") was enacted as Section 420.907-420.9079 of the Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, SHIP authorizes the allocation of tax revenues authorized under Chapter 201, Florida Statutes, and allocates such funds to counties and eligible municipalities for use in an affordable housing program; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Ordinance No. C-93-20, adopted at its meeting of February 18, 1993, the City Commission authorized the City to participate in SHIP; and

WHEREAS, it is a requirement of SHIP that the eligible municipality adopt an ordinance which includes adopting an affordable housing incentive plan; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 94-27, adopted at its meeting of February 15, 1994, the City Commission adopted the Local Affordable Housing Incentive Plan of the City of Fort Lauderdale ("Plan"); and

WHEREAS, the Plan provided as part of its incentive strategies that the City would adopt an affordable housing ordinance which will provide the mechanism to expedite the process for development of affordable housing and reduce the cost of development; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Plan, at least five workshops have been held where members of the community, planning professionals and other interested persons, in conjunction with the SHIP Affordable Housing Advisory Committee, discussed proposed incentives; and

WHEREAS, the City finds that it is in the best interest of the public to adopt the affordable housing incentives provided herein;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF 
THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. That a new Article VIII of Chapter 9, "Buildings and 
Construction", entitled "Affordable Housing Program" of the 
Code of Ordinances of the City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, is hereby 
created to read as follows:

Chapter 9

ARTICLE VIII. AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAM

Sec. 9-320. Definitions of words and phrases.

The following words, terms and phrases, when used in 
this chapter, shall for the purposes of this chapter have 
the following meanings, except where the context clearly 
indicates a different meaning:

(1) Affordable means that monthly rents or monthly 
mortgage payments including taxes and insurance do not 
exceed thirty (30) percent of that amount which represents 
the percentage of the median annual gross income for 
households as indicated in subsection 8, or subsection 12. 
However, it is not the intent to limit an individual 
household's ability to devote more than thirty (30) percent 
of its income for housing, and housing for which a 
household devotes more than thirty (30) percent of its 
income shall be deemed affordable if the first 
institutional mortgage lender is satisfied that the 
household can afford mortgage payments in excess of the 
three (30) percent benchmark.

(2) Affordable Housing means housing which at the time 
of sale or rental is determined by the department to be 
"Affordable" as defined herein.

(3) Annual gross income means annual income as defined 
under the Section 8 housing assistance payments programs in 
24 C.F.R., part 813; annual income as reported under the 
census long form for the recent available decennial census; 
or adjusted gross income as defined for purposes of 
reporting under Internal Revenue Service Form 1040 for
individual federal annual income tax purposes. Counties and eligible municipalities shall calculate income by projecting the prevailing annual rate of income for all adults in the household as the amount of income to be received in a household during the twelve (12) months following the effective date of the determination.

(4) Department means the Planning and Economic Development Department of the City of Fort Lauderdale or such other department as designated by the City Manager to administer the program described in this section.

(5) Development means one or more single-family or multi-family dwellings as defined in the ULDR.

(6) Development fees mean those fees established by city and charged in connection with development including, but not limited to building permit, impact, development permit and utility connection fees.

(7) Eligible Person or eligible household means one or more natural persons or a family determined by the City to be of very low income or low income according to the income limits adjusted to family size published annually by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development based upon the annual gross income of the household. When used herein, Eligible Person shall mean and include eligible household.

(8) Low-income person or low-income household means one or more natural persons or a family that has a total annual gross household income that does not exceed eighty (80) percent of the median annual income adjusted for family size for households within the metropolitan statistical area, the county, or the nonmetropolitan median for the state, whichever amount is greatest. With respect to rental units, the low-income household's annual income at the time of initial occupancy may not exceed eighty (80) percent of the area's median income adjusted for family size. While occupying the rental unit, a low-income household's annual income may increase to an amount not to exceed one hundred forty (140) percent of eighty (80) percent of the area's median income adjusted for family
size. When used herein, low-income person shall mean and include low-income household.

(9) Qualified Development means a development which has been determined by the department to meet the provisions of this article and fees will or have been offset. Lease qualified means qualified multi-family dwelling available for lease. Owner qualified means single-family dwelling qualifying for sale.

(10) SHIP means the State Housing Initiatives Partnership Act enacted as Sections 420.907 - 420.9079 of the Florida Statutes.

(11) ULDR means the Unified Land Development Regulations of the City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida "ULDR".

(12) Very-low income person or very-low-income household means one or more natural persons or a family that has a total annual gross household income that does not exceed fifty (50) percent of the median annual income adjusted for family size for households within the metropolitan statistical area, the county, or the nonmetropolitan median for the state, whichever is greatest. With respect to rental units, the very-low-income household's annual income at the time of initial occupancy may not exceed fifty (50) percent of the area's median income adjusted for family size. While occupying the rental unit, a very-low-income household's annual income may increase to an amount not to exceed one hundred forty (140) percent of fifty (50) percent of the area's median income adjusted for family size. When used herein, very-low income person shall mean and include very-low income household.

Sec. 29-2. Applicability.

Funds shall be made available to offset a portion of the development fees incurred in connection with the development of affordable housing. In order to be eligible for funding under this section the following requirements must be met:
(1) An application for the proposed development is submitted on or after the effective date of this ordinance.

(2) The development consists of one or more single-family or multi-family dwellings as defined in the ULDR.

(3) The development qualifies as Affordable Housing as defined in this article.

(4) The purchaser or lessee of the development is an Eligible Person or Eligible Household as defined in this article.

(5) A restrictive covenant is executed and recorded in the Public Records of Broward County, Florida restricting the ownership of an owner-qualified development to an Eligible Person for five (5) years and lease of multi-family dwellings to a qualified lease development to an Eligible Person for fifteen (15) years.

(6) Single-family standard development must meet the standards established for an infill housing project approved by the City Commission on July 6, 1994.

Sec. 29-3. Qualification process.

The process for qualifying to receive an offset of development fees is as follows:

(1) Prior to issuance of a building permit for a proposed qualified development an owner shall submit an application to the department. The application form shall be provided by the Community Development Division.

(2) A preliminary qualification approval will be issued by the department if it is determined that the proposal meets the requirements of this article.
(3) Prior to final qualification of a development, a buyer or lessee must be identified and determined to be an Eligible Person by the Department. The buyer or lessee shall apply to the department for a determination of eligibility.

(4) A contract for sale and purchase for an owner qualified development or a lease for a lease qualified development shall be delivered to the department and be added to the application.

(5) The seller shall provide evidence of payment of development fees to the City.

(6) If a development is determined to be an owner qualified development, a check for the offset amount shall be issued by City and be made payable to the entity disbursing the closing proceeds. The check will be delivered on or before the date of closing and disbursement shall be made simultaneous with the transfer of title from the qualified seller to a qualified buyer. For a lease qualified development, a check for that portion of the offset amount representing the part of the multi-family dwelling being leased shall be made available on the date a lease executed by an Eligible Person is delivered to the department.

Sec. 29-4. Available funds.

(1) For a qualified development, fees will be reduced by one hundred (100) percent when the units are sold or leased to very low-income persons or households and seventy-five (75) percent for low-income persons or households. In order to encourage mixed income development, reductions shall apply to the entire development when at least twenty (20) percent of the dwelling units within a development are set aside for affordable housing.

(2) In order to encourage single-family home ownership development, a single-family development may qualify for up to a Five thousand dollar ($5,000) offset for each unit.
Multi-family development may qualify for up to Five thousand dollars ($5,000) for the entire development.

(3) SHIP funds will generally be utilized to cover fee reductions provided herein, but other funds may be utilized as they become available. Funds will be available on a first come, first serve basis.

Sec. 29-5. Expedited review process.

An application for development permit for development which has received a preliminary qualification by the department as described in Section 29-3 shall be identified for expedited development review processing. Expedited processing may include, but shall not be limited to the following:

(1) Identify zoning regulations applicable to the proposed development.

(2) Oversight of the development will be conducted from application to certificate of occupancy.

(3) Referral to the appropriate Broward County Government and Broward County School Board affordable housing expeditors who have jurisdiction over proposed developments in the city.

(4) Assist the applicant with any incomplete portions of the development application.

(5) Identify resources which may assist the applicant in meeting the requirement for development permit approval.

The city has identified a position in the Planning and Economic Development Department as the Economic Development Expeditor who will have the responsibility for expediting applications in accordance with this section.

Sec. 29-6. Monitoring compliance.

The owner shall be required to submit on an annual basis an affidavit, as prepared by the Division certifying that
the dwelling unit(s) is owned by or leased to an Eligible Person.

SECTION 2. That if any clause, section or other part of this Ordinance shall be held invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this Ordinance shall not be affected thereby, but shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 3. That all ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith, be and the same are hereby repealed.

SECTION 4. That this Ordinance shall be in full force and effect ten days from the date of final passage.

PASSED FIRST READING this the 17th day of November, 1998.
PASSED SECOND READING this the 8th day of December, 1998.

Mayor
JIM NAUGLE

ATTEST:

City Clerk
LUCY MASLIAH
MEETINGS TO DATE

• City Commission and PZB Joint Workshop  June 14, 2017
• PZB and AHAC Joint Workshop  July 19, 2017
• Meeting with The Broward MPO Staff  October 10, 2017
• Meeting with Broward County Planning Council Staff  October 13, 2017
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations from the Joint Workshop between Planning and Zoning Board and Affordable Housing Advisory Committee:

- Provide funding options including in lieu of fee for rehabilitation of existing housing;
- Sale of surplus City-owned commercial or industrial properties should go into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund; Consider reduced parking requirements for affordable housing projects;
- Consider location of affordable housing to reduce concentration in areas;
- Require mixed-use development to provide housing for those employed in the same mixed-use project or be subject to a linkage fee;
- Provide for a dedicated revenue stream for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund
- Incorporate any policies to include and require non-residential development to support affordable housing effort; and
- Some affordable housing should be located in proximity to the barrier island.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Create a citywide affordable housing policy that focuses on the City’s Regional Activity Centers (except Central Beach) and major corridors:

- Adopt new Unified Flex Strategy, collapsing flex zones into citywide pool:
  - Allocation of new flex units permitted in RACs (except Central Beach) and along major corridors;
  - Determine appropriate amount / percentage for affordable or moderate housing for projects in RACs and major corridors when flex units are applied;
  - Adopt a new Mixed-Use Zoning Category with form-based design standards to ensure appropriate type and scale of development along major corridors when applying flex units;

- Provide for In-Lieu of Fee as an option to developing affordable housing;

- Create a Buy-Down Program to utilize monies from the affordable housing trust fund for potential partnerships with developers to reduce cost of unit.
UNIFIED FLEX STRATEGY

• Prepare Unified Flex Policy Strategy Document for approval by Broward County Planning Council

• Combine existing available flex and reserve units into one unified pool

• Maintain nonresidential flex acreage for commercial projects

• Identify Receiving Areas
  • Activity Centers (except Central Beach)
  • Major transit corridors
## Existing Flex Unit Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Assigned To Date</th>
<th>Base Availability For Unification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Flex Units</td>
<td>20,623</td>
<td>6,904</td>
<td>13,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Reserve Units</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Units</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Base availability for unification is calculated as the total number of units minus the number assigned to date.*
## AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS
### STATUS IN DOWNTOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVIOUS ALLOCATION POOLS</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing and Approved AFH Projects</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing and Approved Market Rate Rent meeting Moderate Income Projects (Collier’s Report)</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>914</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW 5,000 UNIT POOL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pending AFH Projects</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved and Pending Market Rate Rent anticipated to meet Moderate Income Projects (Collier’s Report)</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>775</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown AFH TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,689</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BROWARD COUNTY FUNDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- County intends to dedicate 50% of savings from expiring CRAs for affordable housing beginning FY18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing &amp; Potential Funding Source</th>
<th>FY18 - FY22</th>
<th>FY23 - FY27</th>
<th>FY28 - FY32</th>
<th>FY33 - FY37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Grants - Broward</td>
<td>14,580,000</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>14,580,000</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,580,000</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,580,000</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Grants - Cities</td>
<td>61,968,000</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>61,968,000</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61,968,000</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61,968,000</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 9% Tax Credit</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA Bond Issuance</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Units Added with Existing Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>1,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50% of Savings from Expired Tax Increment Financing Payments to CRAs</strong></td>
<td>8,010,000</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>22,965,000</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112,420,000</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141,850,000</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Reserves</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Units Added with Potential Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: Units Added with All Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>2,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units Added Over 20 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEXT STEPS

- City Commission identifies which affordable housing recommendations presented staff should develop specific affordable housing strategies: Yes/No
  - Affordable Housing Provision tied to Flex Units
  - Mixed Use Zoning Category
  - In Lieu of Fee
  - Buy Down Policy

- Joint PZB/AHAC workshop recommendations: Yes/No
  - In lieu of fee for rehabilitation;
  - Sale of surplus City-owned commercial or industrial properties should go into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund;
  - Consider reduced parking requirements for affordable housing projects;
  - Reduce concentrations of affordable housing;
  - Require mixed-use development to provide housing for those employed in the same mixed-use project Dedicated revenue stream for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund;
  - Require non-residential development to support affordable housing effort; and
  - Affordable housing in proximity to the barrier island.

- City Commission direction on Unified Flex Strategy document submission to Broward County Planning Council
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Executive Summary

Overview

Lambert Advisory (Lambert) was engaged by HNTB (Prime Consultant to the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority) to provide the economic and market analysis associated with the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Master Plan (herein referred to as Cypress Creek Mobility Hub). The Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site is a 3.5 acre parcel (not including the drainage area to the south) situated along Northwest 59th Court and Northwest 6th Way and immediately west of the Cypress Creek Tri-rail Station.

Figure 1: Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Site Location/Boundary Map

A primary objective of the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub master planning process is to identify the opportunity for a transit oriented development connected to the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail Station. The economic and market analysis completed herein is intended to help guide the planning team with an understanding of market-driven development opportunities for the site, including a mix of uses such as residential, retail, office, and hotel. Based upon the potential development opportunities and findings derived in this report, the planning team will prepare alternative conceptual site plans and provide an understanding of any physical and/or regulatory challenges associated with the site concepts. Lastly, the planning team will then conduct a preliminary financial evaluation for each of the concepts in the effort to establish potential joint development opportunities.
As the SFRTA recognizes, demographic and lifestyle changes are fueling the revitalization of Downtowns, neighborhoods and corridors across the nation; particularly, as it pertains to transit-oriented development. The Cypress Creek market area surrounding the subject site has a unique opportunity to realize its own revitalization. This is in fact what many community stakeholders are preparing for, and they have set this in motion with Envision Uptown, Inc. – a non-profit organization comprised of landowners, businesses, and public officials. Envision Uptown has already embarked on a process to develop a physical plan intended to guide subsequent regulatory initiatives aimed at transforming the area known as Uptown Village into a walkable, transit-ready urban neighborhood. Envision Uptown’s first major step was a visioning process conducted by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) in August 2014 and titled: The Uptown Urban Village – Technical Assistance Panel (referred to as the ULI TAP). While the ULI TAP can certainly be regarded as a beneficial start to Envision Uptown, the process was completed in the absence of an economic and market analysis, consideration for regulatory policy, property ownership/control, and other relevant factors that must be considered when preparing a comprehensive master plan. All the while, FDOT is currently moving forward with a roadway master plan for Cypress Creed Road (and its connectivity to I-95) which is independent of the Uptown Envision effort. Though we are confident the goals and objectives of Envision Uptown and FDOT will be aligned over time, there is considerable uncertainty as to how the overall physical plan will impact access and visibility to key properties adjoining and/or surrounding the Mobility Hub site.

Therefore, while we recognize Envision Uptown’s effort to this point, it must be stated that the scope of service for the economic/market component of the Mobility Hub master plan is specifically focused on identifying opportunities for the Mobility Hub site considering the existing regulatory environment (ie. land use, zoning), existing land uses, and land availability within the surrounding market area. We clearly understand that the Mobility Hub’s potential site development must contemplate the broader planning efforts; however, the methodology for analyzing potential housing and commercial development at the Mobility Hub site herein is primarily based upon population, employment, and related economic/demographic projections that are predicated upon the existing conditions. Should alternative regulatory policies (ie. land use, zoning change) be implemented to encourage broader redevelopment opportunities for the Uptown Village area, than the opportunity for population and economic growth within the area may be significantly enhanced beyond that which is projected herein. Regardless, and in consideration of the fact that the Uptown Envision planning process is in the very early stages, the implementation of any substantive regulatory modifications will likely be long term in nature.

The body of this report details our research and analysis of market conditions and trends which we believe will impact development of the Mobility Hub site. The economic and market analysis is based upon demand within the subject property’s Study Area – which is discussed in detail in Section 1 of this report and illustrated in the Figure below.
Therefore, the recommendations and findings for the conceptual site planning process will be derived from the Mobility Hub site’s potential capture of Study Area demand (by use). Trends within the Study Area will also provide the basis for determining estimates of performance (by use) that will be used for subsequent financial evaluations and joint development opportunities. Notably, any financial feasibility and/or land evaluation prepared on the basis of this analysis is subject to design, building cost, parking and regulatory requirements that have not been made a part of this analysis. Furthermore, the analysis herein does not consider alternative joint development opportunities with adjoining properties (which are not owned or controlled by a public entity). These joint development options, however, may be pursued as subsequent phases of the master plan progress.

Findings and Recommendations

The following provides a summary of findings and conclusions related to the economic and market analysis, including program recommendations by use. These recommendations provide the basis for evaluating program densities for the subject site as part of the subsequent planning phases. Furthermore, for purposes of this analysis, it is presumed that regulatory and/or land use policy will allow for the uses proposed herein – some of which may require a land use change. Lastly, it is important to recognize that the subject site on its own has certain challenges associated with its ability to support housing and/or commercial development given either its relatively remote positioning (or lack of direct access and/or visibility to major thoroughfares), and/or the condition and use of surrounding properties which may or may not be fully compatible with the uses proposed herein. Nonetheless, we provide an overview of potential development programs (by use), as well as the opportunities and constraints, that will be used to guide the conceptual site plan process.
Population, Income and Employment Trends (Section 2): The Study Area comprises portions of three municipalities including Fort Lauderdale, Oakland Park, and Pompano Beach. The City of Oakland Park and City of Fort Lauderdale experienced relatively strong population growth from 2000 to 2010 (2.9 percent average annually and 2.5 percent average annually, respectively) compared to Broward County (0.7 percent average annually) and Pompano Beach (0.8 percent average annually). The Study Area’s population, however, actually declined during the decade (-0.5 percent average annually) – most of which occurred around Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport. According to the Broward County projections, the Study Area’s population is projected to increase by 114 persons average annually (or a 0.4 percent average annual growth rate) through 2040. As noted above, we believe that activity associated with a successful implementation of the Uptown Envision strategy would likely improve the area’s chances of exceeding County projections.

The Study Area has an estimated median household income of $43,282, compared to $51,250 for Broward County. This is relatively similar to the Pompano Beach ($40,500) and Oakland Park ($45,000), and lower than Fort Lauderdale ($49,200).

While roughly 66,456+ persons are employed within the Study Area, very few people can claim they both live and work within the Study Area. According to data from the US Census Center for Economic Studies (2011) 96.5 percent, or 64,126 of the persons employed in the Study Area lived outside of it. Only 2,330 people, or 3.5 percent of persons employed in the Study Area also lived there. It is also worth noting that there are 15,622 people who live in the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Study Area and must travel outside the Study Area for work. The Study Area and Mobility Hub site should be in a position to capitalize on this existing base of economic activity.

Residential (Section 3): Following several years of decline and bottoming out of the housing market following the national/global economic crisis in 2007, there are clear signs of sustain growth in Broward County’s housing market. In terms of condominium activity within the Study Area, sales volumes continue to increase from a low of 257 sales in 2008 to approximately 780 in 2014. Sale prices continue to increase as well, though the average sale price in 2014 ($114,000) remains well below peak periods in 2007 ($190,000). The Study Area’s rental market is performing relatively well, with occupancy in the 95 percent range and rental rates within the premium properties achieving average monthly rental rates (among all unit types) between $1,500 and $1,600 (or roughly $1.40 to $1.50 per square foot). In spite of the Study Area’s relatively stable rental market over the past several years, there have been no new market rate rental units built since 2000; the only new development has been four affordable housing developments totaling 869 units. However, rental rates among the upper tier of the market rate apartments within (or immediately surrounding) the Study Area are beginning to push near the thresholds of supporting new market rate development. This is substantiated by recent development plans for 350+ residential units at the FDOT site, though the plan was subsequently terminated during the negotiation process.

From a broader perspective, there has been a fundamental shift in housing demand over the past five to six years that has led to increased demand for rental housing, while demand for for-sale housing has been flat.
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and only improving marginally over the past two to three years. The shift has been facilitated by a combination of factors including:

- The recession and collapse of the housing market in 2008, which has contributed to an increase in the rental of single family homes and other traditional for-sale housing, mostly by three and 4+ person family households;

- The advent of the Millennial population (“Gen Y”), which is among the strongest cohorts for renter household years; and,

- Increase in the popularity of urban style rental communities in urban and some suburban locations with consumers/renters attracted to a lifestyle that these projects provide including, walkable services, shopping and entertainment and/or shortened commute time to employment centers.

Section 3 provides a detailed profile of the methodology for evaluating demand for market rate multifamily housing within the Study Area and considers historical and projected population for the broader region, combined with demand capture rates. There is estimated demand for between 400 and 600 multifamily (market rate) housing units within the Study Area solely from resident growth (and limited pent up demand) during the next 5+ year period.

That said, economic and market conditions affecting apartment rental development indicate an opportunity to develop market rate rental housing at the Mobility Hub site. This is particularly in light of the potential of incorporating rail transit into the subject property. That said, the site does lack direct access and/or visibility to major thoroughfares which can be important to the marketability of higher density housing developments. Furthermore, the current condition of surrounding properties (and particularly the industrial buildings to the south and west) along with the condition of the entrance along N.W. 59th Court is not conducive to supporting higher quality housing product. However, some of these issues can be mitigated through infrastructure improvements, certain building design and signage. While further conceptual planning is required, we believe a prototypical market rate rental development program would include:

- 200 to 250 rental apartment units comprising one bedroom units (40 to 45 percent of unit mix), two bedroom units (40 to 45 percent of unit mix) and three bedroom units (10-15 percent of unit mix). Average unit sizes is recommended to be between 950 to 1,100 square feet;

- Stabilized occupancy of 95 percent, with year one (lease up) occupancy of 70 percent; and,

- Average rental rate of $1.55+ per square foot (in 2015 $’s), which is slightly above the range of the comparable/competitive market for new, quality rental product which takes into account the national trend of transit oriented residential development beginning to perform better than their peers.
Based upon the program outlined herein, amenities, lobby finishes, and unit features need to be consistent with the market for similar higher end units in the comparable/competitive submarket. Accordingly, adequate dedicated and available on-site parking will be required and, for planning purposes at this stage, we estimate a minimum on-site parking requirement of 1.0 space per available unit. Furthermore, the design and construction of the development would need to ensure that noise from Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport and the rail station are mitigated to every extent possible.

There is an additional consideration for the rental housing opportunity at the Mobility Hub site, which is a mixed income housing development; or, development that would have market rate units, with 20 to 40 percent of the units set aside for affordable housing. It is well documented that affordable housing is undersupplied in Broward County and a transit-oriented development presents a tremendous opportunity for this type of housing. Additionally, the financial subsidies obtained for affordable housing development (ie. low income housing tax credits) may prove essential to any development of critical mass built on the Mobility Hub site. This is due to the fact that building to a density of 200 to 250 units would require garage parking that is very costly to a project of this size. The fact is, market rental rates of $1.55+ per square foot are likely not high enough to support this density of development cost from a financial perspective. However, the financing incentives obtained through the development of a mixed income development may help to achieve financial feasibility.

Office (Section 4): As of December 2014, Broward County had an unemployment rate of 4.5 percent. According to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (FDEO), Broward County is projected to add more than 33,000 total office related jobs from 2014 to 2022 (3,580 per year), a growth rate of 1.4 percent average annually. While the County’s strong employment growth forecast is presumed to represent a trend to steady economic growth, there still remains a small amount of uncertainty within the regional, national and global economy that may naturally impact the timing and/or pace of employment recovery. Regardless, the County has successfully implemented economic initiatives to encourage growth and positive trends are forecast over the next several years.

In the 1980’s and 1990’s, the Cypress Creek office submarket (and collectively the Study Area) was one of the fastest growing and strongest submarkets in Broward County. Cypress Creek is now the 4th largest in Broward County and it is home to some of the largest private companies in the County, along with serving as a local office to numerous national/multinational corporations. The total inventory of office space in the Cypress Creek office submarket is estimated at 8.1+ million square feet (including public and private office users). Nearly 77 percent (6.2+ million square feet) of the submarket’s office space was built before 1990. While there was virtually no new development delivered to the market between 1990 and 2000, the market has delivered roughly 1.0 million square feet in the past 14 years.

As of the 4Q 2014, the vacancy rate for all office space in the Cypress Creek submarket was 17.2 percent, with the average quoted full service rent at $22.25 per square foot. Comparisons by Class of space show that
the vacancy rate among Class A buildings is 14.7 percent, with the average quoted full service rent at $28.26. The vacancy rate for Class B buildings is 21.3 percent, with average quoted full service rent at $20.12. The overall vacancy rate for Class C buildings is the lowest at 6.7 percent, with the average quoted full service rent also the lowest at $18.72. As discussed in detail in Section 4, current occupancy and lease rates are below the County average, and well off of the submarket’s historical performance levels. From 1999 to 2014 the Cypress Creek office market captured a little more than 5 percent of office demand (net absorption) in Broward County (or 339,000 square feet average annually). However, over the past five years, from 1Q 2009 to 4Q 2014, the Cypress Creek office submarket had negative net absorption and therefore, a negative net market share of county demand.

Based upon broader office market and local submarket office development trends, and based upon projections of office employment, office demand for the Study Area is estimated to be between 185,000 and 420,000 square feet during the next five years. It is very important to note that this does not represent demand that solely supports new future office development because absorption of existing space needs to be considered. There is nearly 1.6 million square feet of vacant office space within the Cypress Creek submarket. However, Class A office space is much less at 350,000 square feet. As a matter of fact, the Class A market is not particularly far from stabilized levels, which is considered to be around 90 percent occupancy; or, 240,000 square feet of vacant space (2.41 million square feet x 10 percent vacancy). Therefore, assuming that a measurable portion of the net new demand is positioned for Class A space, then we believe there may be an opportunity to deliver 150,000 to 250,000 square feet to the Study Area over the next four to five years, which means planning can begin in earnest within 12 to 24 months.

Importantly, we recognize that the Study Area may have the opportunity to exceed this level of demand by capturing a major tenant that is not yet in the Broward County market but may enter the regional market during the next few years with continued corporate relocation efforts of the County. The Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site should be in a strong position to compete for a portion of the new demand within the Study Area given that it is readily available land that is connected to transit. However, the site does lack direct access to major thoroughfares and, therefore, infrastructure improvements along N.W. 59th Court along with adequate building signage is highly recommended as part of the conceptual planning process. Considering this, the opportunity for office development as a mid-term option (4 to 5 years) suggests a prototypical program as follows:

- An office program of 150,000+ square feet;
- Average lease rates (full service) estimated to be in the range of $30 to $32 (in 2015 $’s);
- An 18 to 24 month lease-up with 92 percent stabilized occupancy; and,
- Adequate dedicated and available on-site parking for office users will need to be provided or roughly 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet of space.
As noted in the residential section above, the financial viability of the supporting this level of office development at the Mobility Hub site will require further evaluation; particularly, if garage parking is required since the current level of lease rates are likely below those needed to support overall development costs.

Retail (Section 5): As it relates specifically to the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site, stand-alone retail own is not considered to be viable from a market perspective given its lack of access and visibility to any major roadway – a key requirement for retail site location. Comparatively, the FDOT site is far better suited for retail given its access and exposure to Cypress Creek Road and I-95. However, demand for limited retail at the subject site may be driven by the rail station, along with an opportunity to incorporate retail within a mixed use development on the site; although, this would require a development of critical mass (or large in scale) that can provide a substantive retail expenditure base. Nonetheless, Section 5 provides a comprehensive retail supply and demand analysis for the Study Area, which may be beneficial to potential joint development with adjacent sites and/or longer-term planning initiatives.

According to CoStar, the total inventory of retail space in the Study Area is estimated at 1.4+ million square feet, which is supported by a sizable resident population and significant employment base. Interestingly, though, Cypress Creek Road is a major thoroughfare that is largely underserved by retail that directly fronts the street (50,000 square feet), when comparing parcels directly fronting Atlantic Boulevard to the north (190,000+ square feet and Commercial Boulevard (135,000+ square feet) to the south.

From 2008 to 2014, average quoted triple net (NNN) rental rates for retail space in the Study Area ranged from a low of $10.25 per square foot in 2013, to a high of $14.90 per square foot as of the 4Q 2014. This is due in part to the relatively strong rates within Cypress Creek Station and the newly built Uptown Center, which is reportedly achieving rates of nearly $40 per square foot. In spite of the overall area’s strong recent lease rate growth, these rates remain well below that of the County’s average $19.50 per square foot lease rate. Occupancy within the Study Area remains at a fairly stable level of 91 percent, though below the County average of nearly 94 percent.

The demand potential for retail demand within the Study Area comes from three primary demand generators, including: primary area resident (and visitors); non-resident workers; and rail ridership. Based upon Lambert’s retail trade model, net new retail demand growth within the entire Study Area from primary residents alone is estimated to be 90,000 square feet between 2015 and 2020, with additional retail demand of 60,000 square feet from non-resident workers. While the transit component is a key piece to the Mobility Hub site’s redevelopment, the fact is that projected daily (station) ridership of 1,200 persons provides limited support for retail demand (or less than 4,000 square feet). In all, the resident, worker, and limited ridership demand represents the “universe” of retail demand from which the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site may capture. However, as noted, stand-alone retail at the site is not recommended given its current lack of access and exposure to major thoroughfares. Therefore, at this point, retail may be considered a marginal use within a potential mixed use development at the subject property.
Hotel: Despite economic instability during the past several years, South Florida’s visitor market is as robust as ever. There are approximately 2,900 rooms among 21 hotel properties in the Study Area, of which nearly 2,300 rooms (80 percent) of the hotel inventory was built before 1990 and essentially no new hotel supply added after 2000. For this analysis, we profiled seven select properties within the Study Area including: Extended Stay; Holiday Inn Express; Courtyard; Sheraton Suites; Westin; Marriott; and Hampton Inn. These seven hotels with a total 1,296 rooms are considered to represent a solid benchmark for a three- to four-star limited service hotel for the Study Area and subject site. The select hotels were able to achieve a very solid ADR of $115 in 2008, though occupancy was a modest 65 percent. Following the recession, ADR’s dropped to $91 in 2010, while occupancy actually ticked up to 68 percent. Since that time, both occupancy and rate have been on an upward trend to reach 77 percent and $108, respectively in 2014. The Study Area’s hotel market benefits greatly from the surrounding business demand segmentation, but is also becoming slightly more balanced with the leisure sector.

Although difficult to ascertain at this stage of the process (in the absence of design, building and land cost assumptions) there is consensus that as the comparable/competitive market steadily approaches an ADR of $125+ and occupancy remains above 75+ percent, the addition to supply within the Study Area is potentially warranted. Therefore, assuming that broader economic conditions continue to strengthen and the comparable/competitive hotel market continues a steady climb toward the thresholds identified above, then we believe there is an opportunity for a select service hotel development within the Study Area in a 3 to 5 year time frame. And, given its location, the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site should compete very well for this demand; however, issues associated with access and exposure to surrounding major thoroughfares will need to be addressed. A few key development and performance assumptions for a prototypical hotel include: a 150+ key limited (or select) service, branded hotel; and, with a quality product, and strong brand recognition, we estimate ADR at $130+ (2015 $’s) with stabilized occupancy of 75 percent. As with residential and office above, the ability to support garage parking on the site significantly challenges financial feasibility at these performance thresholds. Furthermore, the lack of access/visibility to major thoroughfares along with the condition of surrounding industrial uses presents challenges to a hotel’s marketability which will need to be addressed through planning and design.

Based upon the analysis above, the near to mid-term term potential development options for the Study Area primarily targets residential (rental) housing, office and/or hotel development. To that, the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site is well positioned to capture a portion of this demand given the transit connection. As noted above, any financial feasibility and/or land evaluation prepared on the basis of the analysis herein is subject to design, cost and regulatory requirements that have not been made a part of this analysis. Furthermore, adequate dedicated and available on-site parking will be required for all uses, and the structure of which can ultimately be determined upon subsequent phases of the planning process (ie. shared parking with transit use, and/or neighboring properties). The following is a summary of demand by use for the Study Area, along with a preliminary conceptual programming for the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site.
Figure 3: Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Site – Summary of Estimated Demand by Use and Conceptual Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Study Area Demand</th>
<th>Mobility Hub Site Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>400-600 Rental Units Near-term (1-5 years)</td>
<td>200-250 Rental Apartments (Market Rate at $1.55+ per sq.ft.; or, Mixed Income)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>150,000 to 250,000+ square feet Mid-term (4 to 6 years)</td>
<td>125,000 to 150,000 square feet ($30-$32 per sq.ft., 92% Stabilized Occ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>150 room select service, branded Mid-term (3 to 5 years)</td>
<td>150 room select service, branded (ADR - $130+; 75% Stabilized Occupancy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>125,000 to 175,000 square feet Near-term (1 to 5 years)</td>
<td>Supporting use within Mixed Use Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1: Study Boundaries and Definitions

As the basis for evaluating the market potential and real estate development opportunities for the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site, Lambert examined demographic, economic, and real estate market trends and forecasts (both residential and commercial) for several geographic areas including Broward County at the broadest of range, narrowing into small geographies/submarkets; and, specifically, our Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Study Area (which is referred to as Study Area in this report). The geographic boundaries of the Study Area, as illustrated in the map below are as follows: Located in central Broward County, Florida, Atlantic Boulevard forms the northern boundary of the Study Area, running east to west from Dixie Highway to the Florida Turnpike. The Florida Turnpike acts as the western boundary of the Study Area, running south from Atlantic Boulevard until a point where the Turnpike and US 441 intersect; at this point the western boundary runs south along US 441 to Commercial Boulevard. The Study Area boundary then runs east along Commercial Boulevard until the intersection with Prospect Road; at this intersection, the southern boundary of the Study Area continues east along Prospect Road until reaching the intersection with Dixie Highway. Serving as the eastern boundary of the Study Area, Dixie Highway runs south from Prospect Road north to Atlantic Boulevard. The Study Area boundaries fall between four Broward County municipalities: City of Fort Lauderdale, City of Oakland Park (generally the southeastern portion of the Study Area), the City of Pompano Beach (generally the northern portion of the Study Area), and the City of Tamarac (small sections in the southwest portion of the Study Area).

Figure 4: Study Area Boundary Map

The Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Site is located within the Study Area south of Cypress Creek Road, on the southeast corner of the intersection between NW 59th Court and NW 6th Way, as shown in the figure below.
The Mobility Hub Site is located centrally with the Study Area, as demonstrated by the following drive time map, which is a key factor to defining the subject property’s trade area (discussed further below).

Additionally, historic data, estimates, and projections for the broad range of information in this market study – demographics, income, residential and commercial real estate, among others – are available based on varying
geographies. Demographic information, for instance, is most widely available for the set hierarchy of US Census geographies. Residential real estate and property valuation data, on the other hand, is available from the Broward County Property Appraiser’s (BCPA) data. Commercial real estate data (office and retail) is available from CoStar and hotel data from STR – both resources are globally recognized industry research firms. Importantly, the research and data collection for rental housing, office, retail and hotel is further supported by Lambert’s independent field research.

For these reasons, different sections of this study refer to multiple an/or different geographic areas (e.g. County, Study Area, Cypress Creek Office Submarket) based on different geographic definitions. These areas are listed below, by section of this report, and shown graphically and defined in more detail in each respective section.

- **Section 2, Demographic and Economic Profile**, refers to a variety of different areas, based on political boundaries and Census geographies: Broward County, City of Fort Lauderdale, City of Oakland Park, City of Pompano Beach, Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Study Area (Study Area), as data permits. For the purposes of demographic and economic analysis, the Study Area is defined by 26 Census Block Groups.

- **Section 3, Residential Market Analysis**, utilizes data for residential rental and sales data for Broward County based upon data gathered from BCPA, housing industry reports for the region, and a survey of rental properties within (and immediately) surrounding the Study Area.

- **Section 4, Office Market Analysis**, considers office market trends in Broward County, but focuses intently on the supply and demand activity within CoStar’s defined Cypress Creek Office Submarket, which is one of the larger office submarkets in Broward County.

- **Section 5, Retail Market Analysis**, represents retail supply and demand trends within Broward County with a specific focus on the Study Area. This area is the primary area from which the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub will draw resident, visitor and worker expenditure. It is important to note that the Study Area is regarded as a primary area for expenditure capture; however, the Lambert Advisory Retail Trade Model takes into account expenditures by residents outside of the Study Area (or commonly referred to as secondary and/or tertiary Trade Areas) by utilizing inflow factors – discussed in detail within this section.

- **Section 6, Hotel Market Analysis**, refers to the Greater Fort Lauderdale area (as defined by the Convention and Visitor’s Bureau), and narrows the focus to hotel performance trends within a select set of comparable/competitive properties to the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site.
Section 2: Economic and Demographic Profile

As basis for evaluating market potential and opportunities for the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Site, Lambert examined population, household and economic trends and forecasts for several geographic areas — Broward County, City of Fort Lauderdale, and the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Study Area (Study Area). We also analyzed these trends for the cities of Oakland Park and Pompano Beach, as the Study Area falls within the boundaries of the City of Fort Lauderdale, as well as the City of Oakland Park and the City of Pompano Beach. Though there is a very small section of the Study Area that includes the City of Tamarac, it was not profiled herein given its marginal area. The demographic and economic profile herein focuses on those variables that “drive” demand for residential, retail, hotel and office uses within the Study Area (and estimates of which are found in the following sections of this report). The demand drivers include population and household growth trends, household income growth, employment trends and real estate market trends.

2A: Population

Based upon 2010 US Census data, Broward County grew from 1.25 million residents in 1990 to 1.62 million residents in 2000, or an average 38,600 persons per annum and 2.6 percent average annual growth rate. From 2000 to 2010, population increased to 1.75 million residents, or an average of 12,505 residents per year and 0.7 percent annual growth. According to the Broward Metropolitan Origination (Broward MPO), the County’s growth rate is projected to be 0.4 percent on an average annual basis, or a slight increase to 1.81 million residents by 2020, roughly 6,816 residents per annum.

The cities of Fort Lauderdale, Oakland Park and Pompano Beach also went through a period of population increase between 1990 and 2010, though at varying rates. Between 1990 and 2010, Fort Lauderdale increase 0.2 percent, Oakland Park at 1.6 percent and Pompano Beach at 0.8 percent. This compares to the County which increased 2.4 percent. Unlike the growth rate of Broward County overall, the cities of Fort Lauderdale, Oakland Park and Pompano Beach achieved increases in their respective average annual population growth rates for the period between 2000 and 2010. The City of Fort Lauderdale’s population grew by 0.8 percent on an average annual basis during this time period, while the City of Oakland Park saw substantial growth, increasing by an average of 2.9 percent annually, while the City of Pompano Beach increased by 2.5 percent on an average annual basis during the same period. During this period, Broward County’s population grew at a modest 0.7 percent. The following figure illustrates the average annual growth rate for each of the three municipalities along with Broward County, for 1990 to 2000 and 2000 to 2010.

Figure 7: Average Annual Population Growth Rate (1990-2000; 2000 to 2010)
In comparison, the population of that of the Study Area increased from a population of 34,862 persons in 1990 to 43,300 persons in 2000, which translates to an average annual growth rate of 2.2 percent per year, higher than that of the growth achieved by the three municipalities during this period, and slightly less than the average annual growth rate for the County. Between 2000 and 2010 however, the population of the Study Area actually declined to 41,381 persons according to 2010 US Census figures, or a loss of 0.5 percent per year during the period. The following map highlights the areas of the population trend between 2000 and 2010 for the Census Block Groups in the Study Area.

**Figure 8: Average Annual Population Growth Map: Study Area 2000-2010**
Sources: US Census
Based on Broward MPO TAZ projections, the Study Area is projected to grow at the same rate as the County, or 0.4 percent on an average annual basis for the foreseeable future. The following graph illustrates the Study Area’s population trend from 1990 to 2010, along with projected population growth through 2030.

**Figure 9: Study Area Historical Population Growth and Population Projection**

Sources: US Census, Broward MPO

![Population Graph]

2B: Population Characteristics

**Figure 10: Study Area Demographic Profile**

Sources: US Census, American Community Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Broward County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 Population</strong></td>
<td>43,300</td>
<td>1,623,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010 Population</strong></td>
<td>41,381</td>
<td>1,748,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000-2010 CAGR</strong></td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 Households</strong></td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>654,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010 Households</strong></td>
<td>18,347</td>
<td>686,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner/Renter</strong></td>
<td>56.6%/43.4%</td>
<td>66.6%/33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010 Avg. Household Size</strong></td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Age</strong></td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Under 19</strong></td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20 to 39</strong></td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40 to 64</strong></td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>65+</strong></td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009-2013 ACS Median Household Income</strong></td>
<td>$43,282</td>
<td>$51,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009-2013 ACS Per Capita Income</strong></td>
<td>$23,060</td>
<td>$28,205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information from the 2010 Census indicates that the Study Area had a median age of 42.5 years old in 2010, which is slightly higher than the median age of Broward County overall at 39.7 years old. This is mainly due to
the fact that the Study Area has a lower percentage of its population of persons under age 19 in comparison to
the County as well as possession a higher percentage of persons aged 65 or over living in the Study Area than
the County overall.

Between the years 2000 and 2010, the household growth trend in the Study Area mirrored that of the
population trend. The number of total households in the Study Area declined from 19,200 total households in
2000, to 18,347 households in 2010. It is important to note that between 1990 and 2000, the number of total
households in the Study Area increased, from 15,881 in 1990 to 19,200 by 2000.

The household tenure for the Study Area according to US Census 2010 figures expresses that 56.6 percent of all
households in the Study Area are owner occupied, as opposed to 43.4 percent of the households being renter
occupied. The rate of homeownership in the Study Area falls below that of the County overall, which reports a
homeownership rate of 66.6 percent, leaving 33.4 percent of all households in Broward County as renter
occupied.

As part of our demographic and economic profile, Lambert analyzed household and per capita income, which
represents a critical element of retail and housing demand as it indicates the amount and nature of expenditure
potential in a given market.

As detailed in the Figure on the previous page, the Study Area reported a median household income of $43,282
according to the latest figures from the American Community Survey (ACS). This is lower than the median
household income of Broward County overall ($51,251). We must note that while the median household
income for the Study Area is lower than that of the County, the Study Area does have a higher median
household income than the City of Pompano Beach ($40,221), a slightly lower household income than the City of
Oakland Park ($44,971) while the median household income of the City of Fort Lauderdale ($49,119) is higher
and close to that of Broward County than the other geographies.

In terms of per capita income, the Study Area has a per capita income of $23,060 according to the 2009-2013
ACS, which is lower than the per capita income of Broward County ($28,205) and of the City of Fort Lauderdale
($35,605), City of Oakland Park ($24,971) and the City of Pompano Beach ($25,559).

2C: Employment Overview

Development strategies rely heavily upon employment and employment growth. From a broad perspective,
labor trends among certain employment sectors in Broward County, including employment and unemployment,
have a notable impact on office demand.

As highlighted below unemployment locally, regionally and nationally experienced a sharp rise during the period
following the recession, but are now starting to show signs of a steady sustained decline. Broward County has
historically maintained lower unemployment rates than the US, State and MSA. As of December 2014, Broward County had an unemployment rate of 4.5 percent.

**Figure 11: Historical Unemployment Statistics**
Sources: Florida Department of Economic Opportunity, Bureau of Labor Statistics

In terms of labor force, Broward County experienced relatively strong employment growth from 2001 to 2007. The County’s non-agricultural and mining labor force increased from 652,000 in 2001 to 751,000 in 2007; or, an average annual growth of more than 16,000 jobs (2.4 percent growth per annum)\(^1\). However, following the recession in 2007, Broward County’s employment base fell significantly in both 2008 (to 726,000) and 2009 (to 686,000). In 2010, the decline continued, but at a notably slower pace (to 676,000). However, by the end of the second quarter of 2014 (the latest employment data available), Broward County’s employment actually ticked up to 737,000, which hopefully signifies that a low-point has been reached and a turn to positive job growth is underway.

According to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (FDEO), Broward County is projected to add more than 95,422 jobs from 2014 to 2022 (11,900 per year), a growth rate of 1.4 percent average annually. While the County’s strong employment growth forecast is presumed to represent a trend to steady economic growth from a current low point, there still remains some uncertainty within the regional, national and global economy that may naturally impact the timing and/or pace of employment recovery. Regardless, the County has successfully implemented economic initiatives to encourage growth and positive trends are forecast over the next several years.

Specific to office employment, which is a key factor in determining office space demand within the Mobility Hub Site, the County is projected to add 33,000 office jobs between 2014 and 2022. The following table summarizes the estimated office employment growth for the Broward County.

**Figure 12: Broward County Office Employment Projections (2014-2022)**
Sources: Florida Department of Economic Opportunity

---

\(^1\) Based upon FDEO and represents average monthly employment during the respective year.
According to the most recent from the US Census Center for Economic Studies (2011), there are 66,456 persons privately employed and working within the Study Area. The largest employment sectors in the Study Area include Administration and Support (16.3 percent), Health Care and Social Assistance (10.7 percent) Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services (8.9 percent) and Wholesale Trade (8.5 percent). According to the Greater Fort Lauderdale Alliance, Kaplan is the largest employer in the Study Area with 2,000 employees followed by Citrix (1,802), Randstad (1,208), Aviall (842) and American Changer Corp (590). It is important to note that the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport, located within the Study Area, employs approximately 5,178 persons.

While roughly 66,456+ persons are employed within the Study Area, very few people can claim they both live and work within the Study Area. According to data from the US Census Center for Economic Studies (2011) 96.5 percent, or 64,126 of the persons employed in the Study Area lived outside of it. Only 2,330 people, or 3.5 percent of persons employed in the Study Area also lived there. It is also worth noting that there are 15,622 people who live in the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Study Area and must travel outside the Study Area for work. The following table summarizes the inflow/outflow of private job employees for the Study Area. These are all very important factors in evaluating the potential redevelopment strategy for the area both short term and long term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Industry Sector</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Support Activities for Ag. &amp; Forestry</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Support Activities for Mining</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42, 428, 488</td>
<td>Wholesale Trade, Support Transportation</td>
<td>51,823</td>
<td>55,151</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515, 517, 518, 519, 52, 53, 54, 55, 561</td>
<td>Telecom, Data, Info Serv., FIRE, Management</td>
<td>198,268</td>
<td>221,976</td>
<td>23,708</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Education Services</td>
<td>21,256</td>
<td>25,622</td>
<td>4,366</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>Membership Associations</td>
<td>13,006</td>
<td>14,701</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>284,503</strong></td>
<td><strong>317,514</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,011</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Excludes retail and hospitality companies unless headquarters is in Greater Fort Lauderdale.
Figure 13: Inflow/Outflow of Private Job Employees, Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Study Area, 2011
Source: US Census OnTheMap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worker Totals and Flows</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed in the Study Area</td>
<td>66,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in Study Area but Living Outside</td>
<td>64,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed and Living in Study Area</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in the Study Area</td>
<td>15,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in the Study Area but Employed Outside</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living and Employed in the Study Area</td>
<td>66,456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2D: Transportation Overview

The Cypress Creek Mobility Sub Site is located across the tracks of the Cypress Creek Tri Rail Station, and currently serves as a parking lot for Tri Rail passengers. The station itself is located on North Andrews Way just south of West Cypress Creek Road. Via the Tri Rail station at Cypress Creek, one can directly access major international transportation hubs, such as Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport and Miami International Airport. Tri-Rail runs a 70.9 mile long system and provides further connects to the Metrorail system in Miami-Dade County to the south (which provides a direct link to Downtown Miami) with station in other major regional employment centers such as Boca Raton and West Palm Beach in Palm Beach County to the north. Tri Rail connections at stations in Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach counties also connect passengers to Amtrak,
which connects passengers to the national rail network. The Cypress Creek Tri Rail Station is also serviced by Broward County Transit Bus routes 60 and 62.

Locally, traffic within near Mobility Hub site is very steady, as illustrated by the traffic county map of the Study Area in the following figure. Cypress Creek Road averages 44,000 cars per day between Powerline Road on the west and Interstate 95 to the east, which itself has moves anywhere from 235,000 to 290,00 vehicles on average a day through the Study Area. The following map highlights the traffics counts for the area immediately surrounding the Mobility Hub Site.

**Figure 14: Average Daily Traffic Counts**  
Source: Florida Department of Transportation

**2E: Economic and Demographic Conclusions**

Based upon the economic and demographic profile above, following is a summary of key findings for the Study Area:

- Population in the Study Area decreased between the years 2000 and 2010, after witnessing strong growth between 1990 and 2000.
• The Study Area has a slightly older population the Broward County overall in terms of median age; this is most likely attributed to the Study Area having a smaller percentage of persons under age 19 and a larger percentage of persons over 65 than Broward County overall.

• Households, like population, witnessed a decrease in total number between 2000 and 2010 after achieving growth between 1990 and 2000.

• Both the median household and per capita incomes of the Study Area are lower than that of Broward County overall.

• The Study Area employs a large number of people, benefitted by the presence of large employers and the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport.

• Employment growth is expected to continue during the next several years and provide solid demand for on-going office development throughout the broader region.

• The Study Area and more specifically the Mobility Hub Site provide great transportation connections, through major roadways, highways and public transportation connections.
Section 3: Residential Supply and Demand Analysis

The Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Study Area comprises a diverse mix of single family and multi-family housing. The focus of the Mobility Hub site will be on mid- to higher-density housing, therefore, Lambert completed an overview of the local condominium and rental housing (multi-family) market in the Study Area and surrounding areas. The following provides an analysis of the condominium and rental markets, including estimates of demand for housing within the Trade Area.

At the outset, we profile the housing composition within the Study Area and Broward County. As shown below, the composition of housing within the study area represents nearly 70 percent multi-family housing (defined herein as two units or more). This compares to nearly 50 percent multi-family housing for Broward County as a whole.

**Figure 15: Broward County and Study Area – Number of Housing Units by Housing Units in Structure**
Source: ACS 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units in Structure/ Type of Unit</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Of Units</td>
<td>% of Total Units</td>
<td>Number Of Units</td>
<td>% of Total Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, detached</td>
<td>6,008</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>332,959</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, attached</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>65,003</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>22,420</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>35,645</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>46,889</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>56,842</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more</td>
<td>11,218</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>227,835</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>22,080</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>24,573</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>810,210</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a very broader perspective, single family housing trends within the Study Area reached peak average pricing in 2006 ($261,000) before plummeting to $116,000 in 2011. Since that time, pricing has been on a steady increase, though 2014 levels ($164,000) are still well below peak periods.
As evidenced within the analysis of broader single family housing trends, there are strong indications that the region’s housing market in general is beginning to achieve sustained (albeit modest) positive growth. Given its location, the potential transit linkage, and prospective housing market stabilization, the opportunity for multi-family housing is considered relatively strong for the TOD site. The following provides a profile of multi-family housing conditions for both for-sale and rental product.

The following is a detailed profile of the Study Area’s multi-family market analysis.

3A: For-Sale (Condominium) Market Overview

According to RPW, in the few years leading up to the peak of the housing boom in 2006/7, new condominium sales in all of Broward County generally ranged between roughly 1,500 and 3,500. From 2004 to 2006, new condominium sales skyrocketed from 3,700 to more than 14,000. By 2009, and after the regional/national housing collapse, new condominium sales dropped to 635, and steadily declined to 84 total sales in 2013. Based upon partial year data, 2014 is estimated to tick up slightly to 125+ new sales. In terms of pricing, new condominium sales in Broward County peaked at an average $399,360, before reaching a low of approximately $190,000 in 2012, the decline of which is in large part due to foreclosure activity during the period. During the past two to three years, new condominium values have inched up to just under $225,000.

For condominium re-sales, Broward County reached peak levels in 2003 at more than 29,000 sales, before going through a steady decline to 9,900 sales in 2008. The decline in re-sale activity correlates to the increase in new condominium inventory during that period. Since 2008, the re-sale market has picked up and is estimated to reach roughly 15,000 sales in 2014. Accordingly, pricing has dropped from more than $150,000 during peak periods prior in 2007/8, to a low of $75,000 in 2010. Since 2010, condominium re-sales pricing have steadily increased to an estimated $105,000, which indicates sustained growth, but levels that remain well below historic activity.
As of the 3rd Quarter 2014, there were only 7 active condominium development in Broward County, and none of which are in, or in close proximity to, the Trade Area. According to BCPA, there are approximately 15,100 total condominium units within the Trade Area, and the majority of which were built more than 20 years ago. Based upon an evaluation of condominium sales within the Trade Area from the BCPA database\(^3\), there were 354 total sales in 2004 and 460 sales in 2005. Sales activity dropped to 250 to 300 sales during the following two to three years, before steadily escalating from 302 in 2008 to 780 sales in 2014. The Trade Area benefitted greatly from the regional/national housing boom, with a combination of unprecedented economic growth, advantageous lending environment and, particularly in South Florida, a strong second home, retiree and investor market. During this time, average condominium pricing within the Trade Area jumped from $140,000 to nearly $190,000 from 2004 to 2005, remaining at that level through 2007.

**Figure 17: Cypress Creek TOD Trade Area – Condominium Sales Trends (2004 – Forecast 2014)**

Source: Lambert Advisory; BCPA

However, as a result of the US recession, average pricing dropped by more than 50 percent by 2010 to reach a low of less than $80,000. Since that time, condominium pricing within the Trade Area has been on a steady increase to reach roughly $115,000 by 2014. Again, sale activity during the past few years was heavily impacted by the foreclosure market which is still exists today – although at a more modest level. Nonetheless, pricing remains well below pre-recession levels, and levels well below that of the cost of new construction.

3B: Rental Market Overview

In terms of rental housing opportunity, we focus on market rate rental housing and it begins with a broad overview of the local and regional rental housing market, then narrowing into the comparable/competitive market. The rental housing market analysis is based upon BCPA data, as well as, rental housing market industry resources such as Reinhold P. Wolff (RPW), and key support from our discussion with select rental housing developments within the surrounding market area.

\(^3\) Sales activity represents Lambert evaluation of “arm’s length” transactions and does not account for units with Quick Claim Deeds or recorded with sales price below $25,000; 2012 represents forecast based on sales activity through June 2012
According to RPW data, Broward County’s annual multi-family housing permit activity reached 4,539 units in 2004, but experienced a relatively steady decline to only 228 units in 2010 – regarded as a period near the bottom of the region’s housing market. However, from 2011 to 2013, permit activity picked up pace to reach 2,835 units, much of it driven by increased rental development as a result of the tight lending environment for homeownership.

Figure 18: Broward County Multifamily Permit Trends 2003 to Forecast 2014
Source: RPW

From 2011 to 2013, there were 4,085 rental units introduced to the Broward County market. The majority of rental development activity occurred within the western sectors of the County, including Pembroke Pines, Miramar, Davie, Weston, and Sunrise. There have been approximately 836 rental apartment units introduced within the subject’s Study Area since 2000; however, none of which are market rate developments (and further discussed below).

The Broward County rental market overall has had steady growth in rental rates, with corresponding decrease in vacancy.

Figure 19: Broward County Apartment Market - Rental Rate and Vacancy Trends
Source: RPW
The Study Area is enveloped by two major apartment submarkets: Pompano Beach and North Lauderdale/Tamarac. Both of these submarkets are stable in terms of occupancy which was 95 percent collectively as of Q2 2014; however, Pompano Beach reported occupancy of 94 percent, which is the only submarket in Broward County below 95 percent. In terms of rental rates, the Pompano Beach submarket is outperforms the County as a whole, and largely the result of premium pricing for inventory near the coast. The North Lauderdale/Tamarac submarket performs slightly below that of the County. A comparison of the broader submarkets and Broward County follows:

**Figure 20: Pompano Beach, North Lauderdale/Tamarac Submarket and Broward County Apartment Rental Rates (Q2 2014)** Source: RPW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submarket</th>
<th>Unit Mix by Percent</th>
<th>Average Monthly Rent</th>
<th>Average Rent per SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>3 BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompano Beach</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lauderdale/Tamarac</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward County Overall</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mid-2000’s ushered in a period of strong demand toward homeownership, as the speculative environment was fueled by the lending industry. After the economic downturn in 2007, the housing market overall took a major hit among both homeownership and rental product. While the homeownership market has been on a long and slow recovery pattern, the rental market overall has experienced a much stronger recovery. There are a number of perceived reasons the rental market has tightened this much during the past few years, including but not limited to: people being forced out of foreclosure homes; an increasing preference to rent versus own given uncertainty in the housing market, a desire for no/low maintenance housing, and stringent lender requirements for homeownership compared to previous years.
Relative to the Study Area’s rental market, BCPA data indicates there are approximately 25 rental communities with more than 10 units per complex, and only 8 of those complexes have more than 100 apartment units. There have been four rental developments built within the Study Area since 2000; however, all of these projects are affordable (mixed income) developments financed through low income housing tax credits (LIHTC). The most recent market-rate development within the Study Area was in 1998 (Lakeview Apartments). However, there was one newer development (Avana at Cypress Creek built in 2009) which sits just outside of the area’s boundary to the west. For this analysis, we focus on operating trends within the select market rate developments (including Avana). The table below provides an aggregated summary of the select comparable/competitive rental housing set.

**Figure 22: Study Area Market Rate Rental Housing Snapshot**  
Source: Lambert Advisory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>1,052</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Est. Unit Mix</td>
<td>1’s: 40-45%; 2’s: 40-45%; 3’s: 15-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupancy</td>
<td>95+%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. $ - 1 BDR Unit (825+ sf)</td>
<td>$1,150-$1,250 ($1.40-$1.50/sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. $ - 2 BDR Unit (1,050+ sf)</td>
<td>$1,300-$1,450 ($1.25-$1.45/sf)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As summarized above, the unit mix for the select properties comprises roughly 40 to 45 percent one bedroom units, 40 to 45 percent two bedroom units, and 15 to 20 percent three bedroom units. This unit mix is generally in line with most suburban rental markets in Broward County. Based upon a survey of select properties, the market overall is estimated to be 95 percent occupied. Average rental rates for one bedroom units are in the range of $1,200 per month (or nearly $1.45 per square foot based on an average unit size of roughly 825 square feet square feet). Two bedroom units average approximately $1,375 per month (or roughly $1.35 per square foot based on an average 1,050 square foot unit). Only two of the five properties have three bedroom units have been estimated to average more than $1,700 per month, or $1.30+ per square foot. Importantly, St. Andrews at Palm Aire, built in 1996 and located along the golf course in St. Andrew's at Palm Aire, has the highest rental in the market, including: one bedroom units that average roughly $1,325+ ($1.60+ per square foot); two bedroom units that average roughly $1,600 ($1.55+ per square foot); and three bedroom units that average roughly $2,100. The performance of the competitive set as a whole, as well as performance among the premium properties, will help to define the estimates of performance for the subject site.

3C: Residential Demand Analysis

From a broader perspective, there has been a fundamental shift in housing demand over the past five to six years that has led to increased demand for rental housing, while demand for for-sale housing has been flat and only improving marginally over the past two years. The shift has been facilitated by a combination of factors including:

- The recession and collapse of the housing market in 2008, which has contributed to an increase in the rental of single family homes and other traditional for-sale housing, mostly by three and 4+ person family households.

- The advent of the Millennial population (“Gen Y”), which nationally is estimated at 75-80 million, rivaling the size of the “baby boom” generation. The Millennial population generally coincides with the 15-34 year old age group born between 1984 and 2002. As of the 2010 Census there were 41.06 million people in the U.S. between 25 and 34 years old, the prime renter household years. This number is expected to increase by 8.4 percent to 44.5 million over the next ten years as the 15-24 year old age group moves into the prime renter household years.

- There has been an increase in the popularity of urban style rental communities in urban and some suburban locations with consumers/renters attracted to a lifestyle that these projects provide including, walkable services, shopping and entertainment and/or shortened commute time to employment centers. This new urban style product is typically three to six stories with elevators and includes a full complement of state-of-the-art amenities and upgraded interior unit finishes. Units are generally smaller and higher priced than traditional garden style walk-up rental apartments. The new
urban style product is popular among the Millennial population, but has also attracted a cross section of middle and higher income renters in all age groups.

In the effort to identify the level of demand for residential development expected to occur during the next few years within the Study Area, we consider the economic, demographic, and overall housing market and economic conditions as outlined in this section as well as in preceding sections. The demand analysis methodology herein is used to identify the broader parameters of residential demand that support potential housing demand within broader region and locally, and has been prepared in the effort to provide order of magnitude estimates of future housing demand.

The methodology for evaluating demand considers growth historical population trends and projections for the Study Area, surrounding municipalities, and Broward County. However, household growth activity in north Broward County is a very important part of this analysis considering it is the broader market from which the City and Study Area will draw demand; particularly upper income households.

The details of the housing demand analysis (model) is included in the Appendix, with a summary of the key assumptions provided as follows:

*Household Growth:* Based upon 2010 Census, and MPO population projections, we estimate approximately 18,500 households in 2014. The area’s household growth is projected to grow at slightly less than 1.0 percent per annum for the next five to ten year period.

*Household Income:* Based upon US Census data, approximately 48 percent of all households in the Study Area have annual household income greater than $45,000, a minimum threshold considered to adequately support monthly payments required to underwrite new, market rate multi-family/condominium housing development; or, minimum average monthly housing payment estimated to be in the range of $1,400 to $1,600.

*Multi-family Units:* The housing demand for the Study Area considers propensity of demand for mid- to higher density multi-family housing that provides the critical mass needed to encourage a dynamic, mixed use area. Based upon US Census housing data for Broward County, roughly 65 percent of all dwelling units are multifamily. Importantly, for this analysis, we assume that the proportion of multifamily development will continue to outpace single family development given current and near term trends and therefore we apply a modest increase to the model.

Based upon the assumptions above, and detailed in the housing demand model in the Appendix, there is estimated to be approximately 400 new households with incomes greater than $45,000 within the Study Area during the next 5+ years from population growth alone; or, demand for 400. However, as noted, we also assume that the propensity for Study Area households with income greater than $45,000 seeking to live in quality multifamily housing in the area will increase modestly – as opposed to single family home. Therefore,
the model indicates demand for roughly 400 to 500 multifamily (market rate) housing units within the next 5+ year period.

**Figure 23: Summary of Multifamily (Market Rate) Housing Demand – Study Area (2015 to 2020)**

Source: US Census; Lambert Advisory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>41,266</td>
<td>41,596</td>
<td>43,287</td>
<td>2,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>18,291</td>
<td>18,437</td>
<td>19,187</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per HH</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Study Area HH w/Income &gt; $45K (Future Demand)</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. HH with Income &gt; $45,000</td>
<td>8,780</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td>9,210</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% MF Dwelling</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Demand for New MF Dwelling Units</td>
<td>5,707</td>
<td>5,752</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential HH Demand: 5,707 5,752 6,170

Net New HH Annual Demand: 0 46 140 464

In addition to the demand from new household growth within the area, we believe that proposed housing at the Cypress Creek TOD station could enhance demand for housing beyond that of natural resident growth (and termed “pent up” demand) within the Study Area. This implies that transit-oriented development could be a strong draw for residents outside of the Study Area. While it is difficult to assess how much additional demand is created, quality transit-oriented housing (and potentially mixed use) development at the TOD site helps to ensure its fair share (or more than its fair share) of near term housing demand within the Study Area. It is important to note that in the determination of prospective multi-family housing demand for the Study Area, we do not make a definitive distinction between homeownership (condominium) and rental product. This is due to the likelihood that multi-family demand in the Study Area could represent a mix of condominium and rental as is currently the case. However, in light of the site’s location, along with the homeownership lending environment that remains relatively tight, we believe the subject site is best suited for rental development.

Lastly, and as set forth in the Executive Summary, the methodology for analyzing of housing demand herein is primarily based upon on population/household growth trends within the Study Area as set forth by current population growth projections from Broward County (at the TAZ level). As such, it is presumed that the County’s growth projections are largely predicated upon the existing regulatory environment (ie. land use, zoning) and land availability within the Study Area. However, as part of the broader long term planning for the Cypress Creek corridor as envisioned by Envision Uptown, the goal is to revise the regulatory environment within parts of the Study Area. The regulatory change contemplated by the community stakeholders is to allow for more housing, commercial, and mixed use opportunities through land use, height, and other related zoning policies. Should these regulatory policies be successfully implemented, than the opportunity for population and economic growth within the area may be significantly enhanced.
Section 4: Office Supply and Demand Analysis

The Cypress Creek Office submarket is situated in the northeast sector of Broward County. The submarket is approximately ±12 square miles and extends west from Old Dixie Highway (HWY 811) to the Florida Turnpike, follows the turnpike southwest for approximately one mile, before extending south on US Hwy 441/SR 7 to HWY 870/Commercial Boulevard. From that point the submarket’s southern boundary extends east ±5 miles back to Old Dixie Highway.

The following map displays the Cypress Creek Office submarket, which is generally represented by the Study Area. The map also shows the location of significant office parks/buildings in the submarket greater than 125,000 square feet. Accordingly, there are ten (10) such office parks/buildings greater than 125,000 square feet in the submarket. Six (6) of the ten (10) are located along the Cypress Creek Road (62nd Street) corridor including, Bank Atlantic Corporate Center, Cambridge Executive Center II, Cypress Executive Center, Cypress Financial Center, Pinnacle Corporate Park and Trade Centre South. Of this six (6), four (4), including, Cambridge Executive Center II, Cypress Financial Center, Pinnacle Corporate Park and Trade Centre South, are located less than one-mile due north of the subject site.

Figure 24: Cypress Creek Office Sub-Market Map (Buildings > 125,000 square feet)
Source: Costar; Lambert Advisory

The following sections provide a comprehensive profile of local and regional office supply and demand trends, as well as estimates of office demand for the Study Area.
4A: Office Supply Overview

According to CoStar\(^4\), the inventory of office space in Broward County is estimated at 68 million square feet. CoStar estimates that that the Broward County market constructed roughly 23 million square feet of new office space (all office space) between 1990 and 2010, equal to an average 1.2 million square feet of new office space per year during that time.

**Figure 25: Broward County Office Supply Delivery Trend (1982-2014)**

Source: Costar

Estimates from Costar also show that between 2007 and 2014, the Broward market delivered 3.7 million square feet of new office space, or 528,500 square feet per year, with almost no new office added between 2010 and mid-year 2012. In conjunction with the notable slowdown in office development during the past few years, the economic downturn of the past few years moderated leasing activity as well as vacancy climbed from 7.4 percent in 2006 to 12.7 percent by the end of Q2 2012. Accordingly, office full service lease rates Countywide fell from nearly $26 per square foot in 2007 to less than $24 per square foot in Q2 2012. However, during the past 18 to 24 months, Broward County’s office vacancy rate has decreased, while lease rates have increased. Currently, there are four new office developments under-construction which are located in Plantation, Pompano Beach and the Southwest Broward submarkets.

According to CoStar, the Cypress Creek office submarket is the 4th largest in Broward County. As noted, it is home to some of the largest private companies in the County, along with serving as a local office to numerous national/multinational corporations. The total inventory of office space in the Cypress Creek office submarket is estimated at 8.1+ million square feet (including public and private office users), which is slightly less than the downtown Fort Lauderdale office market 9.2 million square feet). There are 242 total buildings in the Cypress Creek office submarket, comprising an average 33,300 square feet of space per building. As shown below, nearly 77 percent (6.2+ million square feet) of the submarket’s office space was built before 1990. While there was virtually no new development delivered to the market between 1990 and 2000, the market has delivered

---

\(^4\) CoStar is an internationally recognized as an industry leading real estate data service provider.
roughly 1.0 million square feet in the past 14 years, equal to approximately 70,000 square feet per year on average.

**Figure 26: Cypress Creek Office Sub-market Delivery by Year**  
Source: Costar

Of the 8.1+ million square feet of office space in the submarket: 2.41 million square feet (29.9%) is considered to be Class A space; 4.45 million square feet (55.2%) is Class B space; and, 1.2 million square feet is Class C space.

**Figure 27: Cypress Creek Office Market (Space by Class)**  
Source: Costar

As noted, the average size office building in the submarket is 33,299 square feet. Class A buildings are the largest, averaging 120,596 square feet and Class C buildings the smallest, averaging 11,081 square feet. As of
the 4Q 2014, the vacancy rate for all office space in the Cypress Creek submarket was 17.2 percent, with the average quoted full service rent at $22.25 per square foot. Comparisons by Class of space show that the vacancy rate among Class A buildings is 14.7 percent, with the average quoted full service rent at $28.26. The vacancy rate for Class B buildings is 21.3 percent, with average quoted full service rent at $20.12. The overall vacancy rate for Class C buildings is the lowest at 6.7 percent, with the average quoted full service rent also the lowest at $18.72.

As of the 4Q 2014, there was approximately 1.6 million square feet of vacant office in the Cypress Creek submarket. However, there is approximately +350,000 square feet was Class A space, which is somewhat encouraging from the context of potential planning for new development during the next few years (as discussed further below). Over the past five years, from 1Q 2009 to 4Q 2014, the Cypress Creek office submarket experienced a net negative absorption 339,215 square feet of office space. This impacted the office vacancy rate, which trended upward from +13 percent in 2009 to +17 percent as of the 4Q 2014.

Figure 28: Cypress Creek Submarket Office Absorption and Vacancy Trend
Source: Costar

As a result of rising vacancy rates and negative net absorption, quoted rental rates for office in the Cypress Creek submarket declined from +$23.25 per square foot full service as of the 1Q 2010, to +$21.40 per square foot as of the 1Q 2014; or about +8 percent. However, from the 1Q 2014 to the 4Q of 2014, quoted rental rates increased by 4.4% to just over $22.35 per square foot in less than a year, perhaps a sign that the market is beginning to improve.

Figure 29: Cypress Creek Submarket Office Vacancy and Rent Trends
The discussion of office supply trends above will provide the basis for establishing performance parameters for the subject site’s potential development as discussed further below.

4B: Office Demand Analysis

The figure below presents estimates of office demand (absorption) market capture for the Cypress Creek office submarket as a share of Broward County since 1999, over the past 10 years and over the past five years. Accordingly, Cypress Creek captured a little more than 5 percent of office demand (net absorption) in Broward County from 1999 to the 4Q 2014 and more than 6 percent from 1Q 2005 to 4Q 2014. However, over the past five years, from 1Q 2009 to 4Q 2014, the Cypress Creek office submarket had negative net absorption and therefore, a negative net market share of county demand.

Figure 30: Cypress Creek Office Submarket Percent Capture of County’s Office Demand (Net Absorption)
Source: Costar
To get a basic understanding of future office market demand that will drive the need for new office development in the Cypress Creek submarket, Lambert applied an office demand model that examines projected office demand related employment growth set against an office demand per employee ratio derived from the Building Managers and Owners Association (BOMA). The analysis commences with projected office employment growth. As previously noted, office demand related employment in Broward County is estimated to increase by roughly 3,850 average annually during next several years; or an estimated 16,000 to 18,000 office jobs from 2015 to 2020.

According to BOMA, among other industry benchmark indicators, the office space per employee ratio in Broward County is in the range if 230+ square feet per employee. Based upon the 16,000 to 18,000 office employment demand over a five-year projection period, then multiplying this range by 230 square feet per employee, results in net demand for new office space in Broward County estimated to range between 3.7 and 4.2 million square feet over the next 5+ years.

Referencing the historic capture rate and trends above for Cypress Creek as it relates to Broward County, and applying a capture rate ranging between 5 and 10 percent of the County’s total demand over the projection period, the Cypress Creek office submarket is forecast to have demand for roughly 185,000 to 420,000 square feet during the next 5+ years.

Figure 31: Cypress Creek Submarket (Study Area) Office Demand Projections
Source: Costar; Lambert Advisory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated County Office Job Growth (2015 to 2020)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated County Office Job Growth (2015 to 2020)</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq.Ft. Office Net Demand @ 230+ sf per employee</td>
<td>3,700,000</td>
<td>4,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Cypress Creek Submarket/Study Area Capture</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submarket Total Potential - Office Demand (Sq.Ft.)</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be noted, though, that as discussed in Section 4a above, there is nearly 1.6 million square feet of vacant office space within the Cypress Creek submarket. However, Class A office space is much less at 350,000 square feet. As a matter of fact, the Class A market is not particularly far from stabilized levels, which is considered to be around 90 percent occupancy; or, 240,000 square feet of vacant space (2.41 million square feet x 10 percent vacancy). Therefore, is a portion of the net new demand is positioned for Class A space, then we believe there may be an opportunity to deliver 150,000 to 250,000 square feet to the Study Area over the next four to six years, which means planning can begin in earnest within 12 to 24 months. Importantly, we also must recognize that the Study Area may have the opportunity to exceed this level of demand by capturing a major tenant that is
not yet in the Broward County market but may enter the market during the next few years should economic conditions continue to strengthen. Furthermore, the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site should be in a strong position to compete for a portion of the new demand within the Study Area given it has readily available land and location/proximity to transit.
Section 5: Retail Supply and Demand Analysis

As it relates specifically to the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site, stand-alone retail development is not considered viable from a market perspective given its lack of access and visibility to any major roadway – a key determinant to retail site location. However, demand for limited retail may be driven by the rail station, along with an opportunity to incorporate retail within a mixed use development on the site; although, this would require a development of critical mass (or large in scale) that can provide a substantive retail expenditure base. Nonetheless, we have completed a comprehensive retail supply and demand analysis for the Study Area, which may be beneficial to potential joint development with adjacent sites and/or longer-term planning initiatives.

The following figure displays the Study Area’s retail submarket along with the location of significant major shopping centers and retailers. Accordingly, Lambert identified six (6) significant shopping centers/retailers in the Study Area. Two (2) of the shopping centers/retailers are located along the Commercial Boulevard corridor, including BJ’s Wholesale Club and Northridge Plaza, anchored by a Publix Supermarket and Ross Dress for Less clothing store. Another two significant shopping centers/retailers are located along the Cypress Creek Road corridor, including Cypress Creek Station, anchored by Office Depot and Regal Cinemas, and Uptown Centre, anchored by Chipotle and Saladworks restaurants. The other two significant centers are located along the Atlantic Boulevard corridor and include, Palm Aire Marketplace, anchored by Winn-Dixie and CVS drugstore, and a Walmart Supercenter.

Figure 32: Cypress Creek Retail Submarket Map

![Figure 32: Cypress Creek Retail Submarket Map](image-url)
According to CoStar\(^5\), the total inventory of retail space in the Study Area is estimated at 1.4+ million square feet. While this appears to be a considerable amount of retail, in the context of the area’s size, population, and employment, it is relatively modes. Particularly, when considering that Cypress Creek Road is a major thoroughfare that is largely underserved by retail. The following figure is a retail corridor comparison map which shows estimates of square feet of significant retail along Cypress Creek Road with two other major retail corridors: Atlantic Boulevard to the north, and Commercial Boulevard to the south. These three corridors share similar traffic counts (above 40,000 square feet), though Cypress Creek (50,000 square feet) has far less retail than Atlantic Boulevard (190,000+ square feet) and Commercial Boulevard (135,000+ square feet). This is due in large part to the heavy utilization of office development along Cypress Creek Road, but underscores the fact that retail may be underserved since the most traveled thoroughfare in the Study Area has limited retail development.

**Figure 33: Cypress Creek Retail Corridor Comparison Map**

Source: CoStar

Specific to the Study Area’s retail, approximately 640,000+ square feet (+46%) was built before 1980 and another 420,000+ square feet (+30%) built from 1980 to 1989. Thus, +76% of the retail space in Cypress Creek was built prior to 1990. Since 1990 another 340,000+ square feet of retail has been delivered to the Cypress Creek

---

\(^5\) CoStar is an internationally recognized as an industry leading real estate data service provider.
market, including 110,000+ square feet from 1990 to 1999 (11,000+ per year, on average), 200,000+ square feet from 2000 to 2009 (20,000+ annual average) and approximately 40,000+ square feet from 2010 to the 4Q 2014 (4,000+ square feet per year, on average).

**Figure 34: Cypress Creek/Study Area Retail - Supply Delivery Trend (1990-2014)**
Source: Costar

The figure below compares occupancy rate trends for retail in Broward County and the Study Area from 2008 to 2014. As depicted in the graph, the occupancy rate for retail in the Study Area, which was above 93 percent in 2008, declined precipitously to less than 86 percent in 2012. The occupancy rate jumped up to 91 percent in 2013, where it is currently. By comparison, the occupancy rate for retail in Broward County was at 94 percent in 2008, declined to 92 in 2009 and has since trended upward, estimated at 94 percent as of the 4Q 2014.

**Figure 35: Cypress Creek VS Broward County Retail Occupancy Trends, 2008-2014**
Source: Costar; Lambert Advisory

Based on estimates from CoStar, from 2008 to 2014, average quoted triple net (NNN) rental rates for retail space in Broward County ranged from a low of $18.00 per square foot in 2010, to a high of $19.90 per square...
foot as of the 4Q 2014. The average quoted rental rate for retail space in Broward County was at $19.75 per square foot NNN in 2008. The county’s retail rental rate dipped to $18.00 per square foot in 2010, but has increased every year since then, estimated at $19.90 per square foot as of the 4Q 2014. This average is only slightly higher than the average quoted rental rate of $19.75 in the county in 2008.

By comparison, from 2008 to 2014, average quoted triple net (NNN) rental rates for retail space in the Study Area ranged from a low of $10.25 per square foot in 2013, to a high of $14.90 per square foot as of the 4Q 2014. The quoted average rental rate for retail space in the Study Area was at $14.75 per square foot NNN in 2008, before trending down to a low point of $10.25 per square foot NNN in 2013. Over the past year, however, the average quoted rental rate for retail in Cypress Creek spiked up 45 percent to $14.95 per square foot NNN. Importantly, this is due in part to the relatively strong rates within Cypress Creek Station and, notably, the newer Uptown Center which is reportedly achieving rates of nearly $40 per square foot.

**Figure 36: Study Area/Broward County Retail Asking NNN Rental Rates 2008-2014**
Source: Costar; Lambert Advisory

5B: Retail Demand Analysis

In the effort to assess the retail opportunity for the Study Area and Hub Mobility site, Lambert applied a retail demand model based on three retail demand generators. The three demand generators include: Residents living in the Study Area, Workers working in the Study Area and thirdly, demand generated from the Cypress Creek Station Ridership, which is a unique demand driver relative to the subject site.

Utilizing a variety of data sources, Lambert built a series of models that estimates expenditures by each of these groups and translates it into demanded square feet of retail space by merchandise category.

Demand for retail in the Study Area is for the five-year projection period 2015-2020. A summary of our analysis for each demand group is presented as follow. The detailed models can be found in the Attachment section.
The Study Area is considered to represent the area from which business in the Cypress Creek submarket will draw patrons on a regular basis for convenience goods stores such as groceries and drug stores, shoppers goods, including clothing stores, furniture, electronics and other general merchandise stores, and food and beverage establishments. Additionally, the model accounts for expenditure inflow potential from demand outside of the Study Area, as well as outflow (or leakage) from demand within the Study Area as discussed further below.

1.) Study Area Retail Demand from Residents

Local residents’ expenditures are a key potential driver of demand for retailers within the Cypress Creek trade area. Although utilizing large amounts of data from a variety of sources, the way the retail trade model derives the estimated space demand is based on the methodology described below.

- **Total Personal Income** – The projected total population in the Cypress Creek submarket in 2015 is estimated at approximately 41,600, and is projected to increase to nearly 42,200 by 2020. Per capita income in the submarket is estimated at $23,500 in 2015 and projected to increase to $25,566 in 2020. Total personal income in 2015 then is equal to $978 million (41,611 X $23,500), increasing to $1.08 billion in 2020.

- **Total Retail Expenditure** – An estimate of total retail expenditures (also referred to as Total Non-Auto Retail Expenditures) for the trade area is calculated by multiplying the Total Personal Income by the percent of income that is spent on non-auto retail purchases in a given year. The percent of household income spent on non-auto retail purchases was derived from the Department of Commerce 2009-2010 Consumer Expenditure Survey (Southern Region), which is both region- and income cohort-specific based upon data from the Department of Commerce. Applying this to the Study Area, residents are estimated to spend nearly 27 percent of their income on non-auto related retail goods.

- **Expenditure by Store Type** – Non-auto expenditure by store type for the market area is estimated using the percentage of total non-auto store sales by store type from the Census of Retail Trade. For this analysis, we combined subcategories into three main categories including, Convenience Goods, Shoppers Goods and Food Service and Drinking Establishments.

- **Primary Market Area Retention** – This is estimated based upon fieldwork and experience, and is an estimate of the degree of leakage which may occur from primary Cypress Creek trade area. Most merchandise categories have relatively low retention rates due to the size of the trade area and the fact that surrounding retail nodes have considerable retail development including for example, regional malls, power centers and other “big box” retail.
• **Percent Sales Inflow from Secondary Market** – While there is resident expenditure leakage from the Study Area there is also inflow from residents that live outside the bounds of the trade area; particularly, for the Wal-Mart Supercenter located on the northern edge of the Study Area. This is accounted for in the resident model. However, a large portion of inflow demand will come from non-resident daytime workers in the County, which has been separated out of the resident model and into specific segment models summarized below.

• **Sales per Square Foot** – The sales per square foot figures are estimated for stores in the Study Area based on interviews and other sources of information, including but not limited to the Urban Land Institute’s Dollars & Cents of Shopping Centers.

• **Warranted Square Feet** – Is calculated using the following formula: Net Sales Potential (by category)/ Sales per Square Foot (by category).

• **Non-Retail Space** – Is calculated assuming that there is an additional 10-15 percent of “retail” space demanded in traditional retail space that is utilized for non-retail uses such as doctor’s offices, hair salons, or other personal services.

Based on application of the aforementioned demand model, Total Retail Expenditures in the Cypress Creek Trade Area is projected to increase from $264 million in 2015 to $291 million in 2020. This represents an increase of 10.3 percent (1.9 percent annual average growth) over the five-year projection period, with Total Retail Expenditures increasing by $27.18 million. Of the $27.18 million projected increase in retail expenditures by Cypress Creek residents, 42.5 per cent, equal to $11.55 million, would be Shoppers Goods Retail; 28.6 percent, equal to $7.77 million, would be for Convenience Goods Retail; and 13.9 percent, equal to $3.77 million, would be for Food Services and Drinking Establishments.

The next step included dividing the expenditure potential for each retail category by the estimated sales per square foot factor for each retail category. This step provided an estimate of supportable square feet for each category generated by Study Area resident. For the Food Services and Drinking Establishments, there is current estimated demand for 105,000 square feet of supportable retail space, increasing by 10,800 square feet by 2020. Convenience Goods results in 249,000 square feet of supportable retail space presently, increasing by 25,700 square feet by 2020. Shoppers Goods increases from 450,000 to 497,000 during the five year period, or nearly 47,000 square feet.

The last step included applying a 10 percent factor to the total square feet of supportable retail space to account for non-retail space and adding this to the total supportable square feet for all retail categories. Thus, as summarized in the table below, total supportable retail space in the Cypress Creek Trade Area increases from roughly 885,000 square feet in 2015, to 975,000 square feet in 2020. This represents an increase of nearly 90,000 square feet of additional retail demand that may be supported in the Study Area from resident retail expenditures.
2.) Cypress Creek Trade Area Non-resident Worker Retail Demand

As detailed in Section 2 above, there are approximately 67,000 office (daytime) workers and other employees in the Study Area in 2015, which is estimated to increase to nearly 71,000 in 2020. Of this total it is estimated that approximately 90 percent live outside the trade area.

Periodically, the International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC) conducts a survey of annual spending patterns and expenditures by retail category of office workers in downtown and suburban locations. The results of their latest survey were published in a 2011 report entitled “Office Worker Retail Spending in a Digital Age.” Estimates of annual retail expenditure potential and capture rates by merchandise category for the non-resident workers in the Study Area were derived from the ICSC report. Capture rates of retail spending by merchandise category report were applied to estimates of annual expenditures among non-resident daytime workers, to arrive at estimates of retail spending by non-resident daytime workers within the Study Area in 2015 with projection estimates for 2020.

Based on the applications described above, Total Retail Expenditures among non-resident workers in the Cypress Creek Trade Area is projected to increase from $314 million in 2015 to $333 million in 2020. This
represents an increase of 6.0 percent (1.2 percent annual average growth) over the five-year projection period, with Total Retail Expenditures among the non-resident workers increasing by $18.9 million. Of the $18.9 million projected increase in retail expenditures by non-residents, 42.1 percent, equal to $7.9 million, would be Convenience Goods Retail; 33.9 percent, equal to $6.4 million, would be for Comparison Shoppers Goods Retail; and 24.0 percent, equal to $4.5 million, would be for Food Services and Drinking Establishments.

The next step included dividing the expenditure potential for each retail category, by the estimated sales per square foot factor for each category. This step provided an estimate of supportable square feet for each retail category generated by Non-resident based upon expenditure and retail sales data. Food Services and Drinking Establishments is projected to increase from 188,000 square feet of supportable retail space in 2015 to 199,000 square feet of supportable retail for this category in 2020. Convenience Goods increase from 378,000 square feet of supportable retail space in 2015 to 401,000 square feet in 2020. Shoppers Goods generated by non-resident workers in the Study Area, increases from 328,000 in 2015 to 347,000 in 2020, or nearly square feet over the five-year projection period.

Figure 38: Study Area Retail Demand Projections (Workers)
Source: Lambert Advisory; ISCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Employees</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>71,020</td>
<td>4,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Living in Trade Area</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number living outside trade area</td>
<td>60,300</td>
<td>63,918</td>
<td>3,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchases by Category:</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Service &amp; Drinking Places</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppers Goods</td>
<td>$1,768</td>
<td>$1,768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods</td>
<td>$2,194</td>
<td>$2,194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,212</td>
<td>$5,212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchases by Category:</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Service &amp; Drinking Places</td>
<td>$75,376,688</td>
<td>$79,899,290</td>
<td>$4,522,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppers Goods</td>
<td>$106,616,671</td>
<td>$113,013,671</td>
<td>$6,397,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods</td>
<td>$132,297,235</td>
<td>$140,235,069</td>
<td>$7,937,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$314,290,595</td>
<td>$333,148,030</td>
<td>$18,857,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Retail Purchases       | $314,290,595 | $333,148,030 | $18,857,436 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Sale Per Foot:</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Service &amp; Drinking Places</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppers Goods</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square Feet Demanded</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Service &amp; Drinking Places</td>
<td>188,442</td>
<td>199,748</td>
<td>11,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppers Goods</td>
<td>328,051</td>
<td>347,734</td>
<td>19,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods</td>
<td>377,992</td>
<td>400,672</td>
<td>22,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus: Non-retail (Services)</td>
<td>111,811</td>
<td>118,519</td>
<td>6,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Square Feet</td>
<td>1,006,296</td>
<td>1,066,674</td>
<td>60,378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, total supportable retail space in the Study Area generated from non-resident workers increases from roughly 1.01 million square feet in 2015, to 1.07 million square feet in 2020. This represents an increase of
approximately 60,000 square feet of additional retail space that may be supported in the Cypress Creek Trade Area from non-resident worker retail expenditures.

3.) Study Area Transit Retail Demand

Based upon data provided to Lambert Advisory by HNTB, estimates of demand from Cypress Creek Station ridership is projected to stabilize at approximately 1,200 total riders. Based upon the stabilized ridership, we applied estimates of annual retail expenditure potential by merchandise category against the estimated annual ridership. These estimates were derived from the ICSC worker expenditure report referenced above. Annual expenditures were divided by productivity factors (retail sales per square feet) for each of the selected merchandise categories based on discussion with retail industry professionals and resources including ULI. The result of these applications provided an estimate of square feet of retail that would be supported by merchandise category, from Cypress Creek Station ridership presented below.

Figure 39: Estimated Retail Demand from the Cypress Creek Station Ridership
Source: ICSC; HNTB; Lambert Advisory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Worker Expenditure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Service &amp; Drinking Places</td>
<td>$1,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppers Goods</td>
<td>$1,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods</td>
<td>$2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,792</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Est. Daily Ridership</th>
<th>Annl. Purchases by Category</th>
<th>% Capture Station Site</th>
<th>Total Purchases by Category</th>
<th>Annual Sale Per Sq.Ft.</th>
<th>Estimated Potential Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>$1,389</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$333,360</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service &amp; Drinking Places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppers Goods</td>
<td>$1,965</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$353,700</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods</td>
<td>$2,438</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$731,400</td>
<td>$382</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,792</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,418,460</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the figure above, the demand for retail from a stabilized daily ridership base of 1,200 generates total retail expenditure of $1.42 million per annum, which translate to demand for a marginal 3,700 square feet of retail space. This level of ridership simply does not generate a significant amount of retail demand, even if both the ridership and capture rate for expenditure at the station were doubled. Nonetheless, the ridership does support the demand for small convenience and food/beverage products, which we understand has been expressed by numerous transit riders.

The following provides a summary of supportable square feet as a result of retail expenditures generated from each of the three consumer groups in 2015, with projections to 2020.
As shown above, there is currently an estimated demand for 1.8 million square feet of retail space within the Study Area. This compares to the 1.4 million square feet of retail that actually serves the Study Area at this time. While there is certainly a degree of variability in the direct comparison of supply and demand, there is evidence that the Study Area’s retail is currently underserved. Moreover, based upon potential growth from residents, workers and ridership, there is an estimated demand for an additional 150,000 square feet of retail during the next 5+ years. Importantly, though, a portion of this net new retail demand presumes absorption of existing vacant space, as well as support for repositioning of older retail product within the market area that is well beyond its useful life. Regardless, we believe there is an opportunity for measurable retail development during the next few years.

As noted above, the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site is not a desirable location for retail given its lack of access and visibility. The FDOT site to the east is more appropriate given its access ad exposure to Cypress Creek Road and I-95. However, should the opportunity arise for an expanded joint development opportunity that would allow for the subject property to tie itself into the frontage along Cypress Creek Road, then the opportunity for retail is significantly enhanced.
Section 6: Hotel Supply and Demand Analysis

South Florida in general is an international tourism destination and Broward County gets its fair share of regional visitor demand. According to the Greater Fort Lauderdale Convention and Visitors Bureau (CVB), Broward County has steadily increased its visitor base from 7.5 million in 2000 to 13.3 million in 2013. Total visitor expenditures in the County currently exceed $10 billion. The ratio of domestic visitors to foreign visitors has been for the most part consistently 75/25. The top domestic markets represent Florida (35 percent), New York (10 percent) and New Jersey (5 percent), while the top foreign visitor markets comprise Canada (36 percent), Latin America (28 percent) and Europe (13 percent).

The Study Area is well represented with a mix of hotel development, much of which services the surrounding corporate demand, but also the leisure visitor market. Following is a summary of hotel supply and demand trends locally and regionally, as well as demand and findings for the Study Area and Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site.

6A: Hotel Market/Supply Overview

Broward County’s total hotel inventory comprises more than 34,000 hotel rooms among more than 570 hotel properties. The region’s occupancy from 2000 to 2007 mostly remained in the low- to mid-70 percent range, while average daily rates (ADR) climbed during the same period to $125. Since peak periods, occupancy dropped to the upper 60 percent range, while ADR declined to roughly $106. However, according to GFCVB, occupancy rates reached 72.4 percent in 2012 and increased further to 74.7 percent in 2013. ADR meanwhile has climbed back to $119 in 2013. Based upon preliminary data from GFCVB and other industry resources, the County’s hotel market is expected to further in 2014 albeit modestly. The following chart provides a summary trend of the revenue per available room (RevPar) for Broward County – RevPar is an industry performance metric representing the combination of ADR and occupancy.

Figure 41: Greater Fort Lauderdale Hotel Trends (2004 to 2013)
Source: Greater Fort Lauderdale CVB
According to STR, there are approximately 2,900 rooms among 21 hotel properties in the Study Area. The following chart illustrates the general characteristics of the Study Area hotel market in terms of product type. As shown, more than 50 percent of the hotel development is considered economy class, which is indicative of the fact that nearly 2,300 rooms (80 percent) of the hotel inventory was built before 1990.

**Figure 42: Study Area Hotel Overview**

Source: STR

As a matter of fact, there has essentially been no new hotel development built after 2000, with Extended Stay America (two properties), Comfort Suites and Town Place representing the most recent development and all completed in 1999. Accordingly, the majority of the hotel Study Area is limited service hotel product, which is dominated by mid-scale product (generally 3-star) quality properties. However, there are three larger full-service hotels including Westin, Marriott and Sheraton Suites.

In the effort to better understand the comparable/competitive hotel conditions impacting potential hotel within the Study Area, performance data was purchased from STR providing ADR, occupancy, and room night demand for seven select properties including: Extended Stay; Holiday Inn Express; Courtyard; Sheraton Suites; Westin; Marriott; and Hampton Inn. These seven hotels with a total 1,296 rooms are considered to represent a solid benchmark for a three- to four-star limited service hotel for the Study Area and subject site.
Based upon STR, the select hotels were able to achieve a very solid ADR of $115 in 2008, though occupancy was a modest 65 percent. Following the recession, ADR’s dropped to $91 in 2010, while occupancy actually ticked up to 68 percent. Since that time, both occupancy and rate have been on an upward trend to reach 77 percent and $108, respectively in 2014. The Study Area’s hotel market benefits greatly from the surrounding business demand segmentation, but is also becoming slightly more balanced with the leisure sector.

Overall, the comparable/competitive market is relatively strong and reaching market stabilization in terms of occupancy. However, ADR overall is still considered to be relatively low. Nonetheless, the market continues to strengthen and should this trend be on-going for the next year or two, the opportunity for hotel development within the Study Area becomes more viable.

6B: Hotel Demand Analysis

In the effort to better understand the opportunity for new hotel product within the Study Area and the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site, Lambert frequently speaks with a select group of hotel development companies and industry analysts to identify performance thresholds for new hotel development. Although difficult to ascertain at this stage of the process (in the absence of design, building and land cost assumptions) there is consensus that as the comparable/competitive market steadily approaches an ADR of $125+ and occupancy remains above 75+ percent, the addition to supply is potentially warranted. Therefore, assuming that broader economic conditions continue to strengthen, there is no new supply added within the trade area, and the comparable/competitive hotel market continues a steady climb toward the thresholds identified above, then we believe there is an opportunity for hotel development within the Study Area and, given its location, the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub site should compete very well for this demand. Importantly, the opportunity for hotel product is primarily going to be limited service, as opposed to full-service hotel. A full service hotel would require significantly higher ADR within the area, which would be needed to services such as a full scale restaurant (serving all three meals) which is ordinarily a “loss leader.” Furthermore, a full service hotel typically requires a minimum room count of 200 to 225 rooms, which is not currently feasible at the subject site.
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2015
41,611
$23,500
$977,858,500
27.0%
$264,021,795

Total Population
Per Capita Income
Total Income
% of Total Income Expended on Non-Auto Retail Expenditure
Total Non-Auto Retail Expenditure

2016
41,726
$23,900
$997,230,537
27.0%
$269,252,245

2017
41,841
$24,473
$1,023,978,475
27.0%
$276,474,188

2018
41,956
$24,865
$1,043,221,566
27.0%
$281,669,823

2019
42,071
$25,213
$1,060,726,136
27.0%
$286,396,057

2020
42,186
$25,566
$1,078,516,362
27.0%
$291,199,418

Distribution by Store Type - 2007 Census; Broward County

Expenditure by Store Type - Detail
General merchandise stores
Department stores
Other general merchandise stores
Clothing & clothing accessories stores
Clothing stores
Men's clothing stores
Women's clothing stores
Children's & infants' clothing stores
Family clothing stores
Clothing accessories stores
Other clothing stores
Shoe stores
Jewelry, luggage, & leather goods stores
Jewelry stores
Luggage & leather goods stores
Furniture & home furnishings stores
Furniture stores
Home furnishings stores
Floor covering stores
Other home furnishings stores
Electronics & appliance stores
Appliance, television, & other electronics stores
Computer & software stores
Camera & photographic supplies stores
Sporting goods, hobby, book, & music stores
Sporting goods, hobby, & musical instrument stores
Sporting goods stores
Hobby, toy, & game stores
Sewing, needlework, & piece goods stores
Musical instrument & supplies stores
Book, periodical, & music stores
Book stores & news dealers
Prerecorded tape, compact disc, & record stores
Miscellaneous store retailers
Florists
Office supplies, stationery, & gift stores
Office supplies & stationery stores
Gift, novelty, & souvenir stores
Used merchandise stores
Other miscellaneous store retailers
Pet & pet supplies stores
Art dealers
All other miscellaneous store retailers
Food & beverage stores
Grocery stores
Supermarkets & other grocery (except convenience) stores
Convenience stores
Specialty food stores
Beer, wine, & liquor stores
Food services & drinking places
Full-service restaurants
Limited-service eating places
Drinking places
Health & personal care stores
Pharmacies & drug stores
Cosmetics, beauty supplies, & perfume stores
Optical goods stores
Other health & personal care stores
Home Centers, Paint & wallpaper stores, Hardware Stores
Building material & garden equipment & supplies dealers
Other building material dealers
Lawn & garden equipment & supplies stores
Outdoor power equipment stores
Nursery, garden center, & farm supply stores
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1,288,121
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4,821,844
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2,464,017
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370,019
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1,320,474
1,604,403
2,669,035
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34,119,428
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1,545,026
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### Resident Expenditure Estimate, By Major Retail Category, Cypress Creek Mobility Hub

**Net Sales Potential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General merchandise stores</td>
<td>$46,168,156</td>
<td>$47,032,779</td>
<td>$48,345,644</td>
<td>$49,254,178</td>
<td>$50,080,631</td>
<td>$50,920,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>$37,027,091</td>
<td>$38,271,038</td>
<td>$39,297,553</td>
<td>$40,036,051</td>
<td>$40,707,829</td>
<td>$41,390,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; home furnishings stores</td>
<td>$7,258,043</td>
<td>$7,401,829</td>
<td>$7,600,363</td>
<td>$7,743,193</td>
<td>$7,873,118</td>
<td>$8,005,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; appliance stores</td>
<td>$3,972,044</td>
<td>$4,050,733</td>
<td>$4,159,382</td>
<td>$4,237,548</td>
<td>$4,308,651</td>
<td>$4,380,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting goods, hobby, book, &amp; music stores</td>
<td>$2,010,243</td>
<td>$2,078,033</td>
<td>$2,133,771</td>
<td>$2,175,869</td>
<td>$2,210,324</td>
<td>$2,247,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>$6,790,030</td>
<td>$6,924,545</td>
<td>$7,110,277</td>
<td>$7,243,896</td>
<td>$7,365,444</td>
<td>$7,488,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112,177,093</strong></td>
<td><strong>$114,399,397</strong></td>
<td><strong>$117,467,843</strong></td>
<td><strong>$119,675,354</strong></td>
<td><strong>$121,683,428</strong></td>
<td><strong>$123,724,271</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shoppers Goods Subtotal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General merchandise stores</td>
<td>$46,168,156</td>
<td>$47,032,779</td>
<td>$48,345,644</td>
<td>$49,254,178</td>
<td>$50,080,631</td>
<td>$50,920,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>$37,027,091</td>
<td>$38,271,038</td>
<td>$39,297,553</td>
<td>$40,036,051</td>
<td>$40,707,829</td>
<td>$41,390,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; home furnishings stores</td>
<td>$7,258,043</td>
<td>$7,401,829</td>
<td>$7,600,363</td>
<td>$7,743,193</td>
<td>$7,873,118</td>
<td>$8,005,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; appliance stores</td>
<td>$3,972,044</td>
<td>$4,050,733</td>
<td>$4,159,382</td>
<td>$4,237,548</td>
<td>$4,308,651</td>
<td>$4,380,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting goods, hobby, book, &amp; music stores</td>
<td>$2,010,243</td>
<td>$2,078,033</td>
<td>$2,133,771</td>
<td>$2,175,869</td>
<td>$2,210,324</td>
<td>$2,247,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>$6,790,030</td>
<td>$6,924,545</td>
<td>$7,110,277</td>
<td>$7,243,896</td>
<td>$7,365,444</td>
<td>$7,488,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112,177,093</strong></td>
<td><strong>$114,399,397</strong></td>
<td><strong>$117,467,843</strong></td>
<td><strong>$119,675,354</strong></td>
<td><strong>$121,683,428</strong></td>
<td><strong>$123,724,271</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building material & garden equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building material &amp; garden equipment</td>
<td>$2,010,243</td>
<td>$2,078,033</td>
<td>$2,133,771</td>
<td>$2,173,869</td>
<td>$2,210,346</td>
<td>$2,247,417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Lambert Advisory LLC**
### Resident Expenditure Estimate, By Major Retail Category, Cypress Creek Mobility Hub

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Per Square Foot</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General merchandise stores</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; home furnishings stores</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; appliance stores</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting goods, hobby, book, &amp; music stores</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Centers, Paint &amp; wallpaper stores, Hardware Stores</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoppers Goods Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; beverage stores</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food services &amp; drinking places</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; personal care stores</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convenience Goods Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>$317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material &amp; garden equipment</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Per Square Foot Sales</strong></td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>$281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warranted Square Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General merchandise stores</td>
<td>184,673</td>
<td>188,331</td>
<td>193,383</td>
<td>197,017</td>
<td>200,323</td>
<td>203,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>136,464</td>
<td>139,167</td>
<td>142,900</td>
<td>145,586</td>
<td>148,028</td>
<td>150,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; home furnishings stores</td>
<td>32,258</td>
<td>32,897</td>
<td>33,779</td>
<td>34,414</td>
<td>34,992</td>
<td>35,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; appliance stores</td>
<td>34,571</td>
<td>35,562</td>
<td>36,515</td>
<td>37,202</td>
<td>37,826</td>
<td>38,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting goods, hobby, book, &amp; music stores</td>
<td>17,694</td>
<td>18,063</td>
<td>18,466</td>
<td>18,834</td>
<td>19,190</td>
<td>19,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Centers, Paint &amp; wallpaper stores, Hardware Stores</td>
<td>33,011</td>
<td>33,011</td>
<td>33,896</td>
<td>34,533</td>
<td>35,113</td>
<td>35,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>27,160</td>
<td>27,660</td>
<td>28,441</td>
<td>28,976</td>
<td>29,462</td>
<td>29,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoppers Goods Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>433,079</td>
<td>441,659</td>
<td>453,509</td>
<td>462,507</td>
<td>469,780</td>
<td>477,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; beverage stores</td>
<td>167,299</td>
<td>170,613</td>
<td>175,189</td>
<td>178,482</td>
<td>181,476</td>
<td>184,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food services &amp; drinking places</td>
<td>104,608</td>
<td>106,680</td>
<td>109,542</td>
<td>111,600</td>
<td>113,473</td>
<td>115,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; personal care stores</td>
<td>81,934</td>
<td>83,557</td>
<td>85,798</td>
<td>87,410</td>
<td>88,877</td>
<td>90,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convenience Goods Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>353,841</td>
<td>360,850</td>
<td>370,329</td>
<td>377,492</td>
<td>383,636</td>
<td>390,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material &amp; garden equipment</td>
<td>17,480</td>
<td>18,070</td>
<td>18,555</td>
<td>18,903</td>
<td>19,220</td>
<td>19,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Warranted Retail Space</strong></td>
<td>604,400</td>
<td>620,579</td>
<td>642,589</td>
<td>658,423</td>
<td>672,827</td>
<td>687,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Retail Space (Services)</td>
<td>80,440</td>
<td>82,058</td>
<td>84,259</td>
<td>85,842</td>
<td>87,283</td>
<td>88,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Retail Percent</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>684,840</td>
<td>682,637</td>
<td>726,848</td>
<td>744,265</td>
<td>759,110</td>
<td>776,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Net New Demand</td>
<td>17,797</td>
<td>24,211</td>
<td>17,418</td>
<td>15,844</td>
<td>18,274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Net New Demand</td>
<td>17,797</td>
<td>42,008</td>
<td>59,425</td>
<td>75,289</td>
<td>91,372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Technical Assistance Panels

What Are Technical Assistance Panels (TAPs)?

Since 1947, the Urban Land Institute’s (ULI) Advisory Services Program has been assisting communities by bringing together week-long panels of seasoned real estate, planning, landscape architecture, financing, marketing, and development experts to provide unbiased pragmatic advice on complex land use and development issues. Several years ago, the ULI Southeast Florida/Caribbean District Council began providing panel services of one or two days to address specific local government issues in areas such as housing, parking, redevelopment, and future land use development. The District Council has 750 members spread along the east coast of Florida from Indian River County through the Florida Keys and from the Caribbean.

How Do TAPs Work?

A sponsor requests the services of a TAP with regard to a specific issue that can be addressed by a panel of experts in one or two days. The District Council assists the sponsor in refining the scope of the assignment and convenes a panel to address those specific issues. The sponsor works within ULI guidelines to provide background information to ULI panelists prior to the panel’s convening. When convened, members of the TAP view the subject site, hear from public and private stakeholders, and then deliberate on the assigned issues. At the conclusion of its work, the panel presents an oral report to stakeholders; that is followed by a written report within approximately six weeks. To ensure objectivity, panel members cannot be involved in matters pending before the sponsor, be working for the sponsor, or solicit work from the sponsor during the panel’s assignment period. Panel members volunteer their services to the project.

Who Is ULI?

ULI was founded in 1936 as a non-profit institute to facilitate the open exchange of ideas and information among local, national, and international real estate industry leaders and policy makers dedicated to creating better places. Today it has more than 32,000 members worldwide. The ULI does not lobby or act as an advocate for any single industry. It is committed to providing leadership in the responsible use of land and creating and sustaining thriving communities.
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Panel Process and Agenda

Panel Process

The City of Fort Lauderdale Riverwalk TAP process centered on the following five steps:

- Representatives from the ULI Southeast Florida/Caribbean District Council met with city staff to discuss issues related to developing strategies to drive more intense growth to the Uptown Urban Village area.
- ULI Southeast Florida/Caribbean District Council staff researched the city's goals for the TAP and, based on that research, selected the TAP members who had the expertise most tailored to addressing the issues raised by city staff.
- The TAP received a complete set of pre-meeting briefing materials about the Uptown Urban Village area and its planning history.
- The TAP session extended over two days. Its work sessions and public comment meetings were held at offices of the Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).
- The TAP, under the leadership of the ULI Southeast Florida/Caribbean District Council, prepared a report on its recommendations and conclusions.

Above: The TAP’s tour of the study area ended with experiencing crossing Cypress Creek Road as a pedestrian (Figure 1). The TAP also worked collaboratively to develop its recommendations (Figure 2) and sketch out its ideas through a series of illustrations (Figure 3). Time was also given to hearing from stakeholders and interested citizen, businesses, and community groups (Figure 4).
Panel Agenda

The agenda (included as Appendix A) for the two-day TAP was organized as follows.

On August 12, the panel began its orientation with a lunch meeting and bus tour of the Uptown Urban Village study area. Fort Lauderdale staff used the tour route (Appendix B) to acquaint the panel with the study area. The tour included the experience of trying to walk across Cypress Creek Road (Figure 1). Following the tour, the TAP held an organizational work session. During that time, the TAP learned more about the study area from MPO and city staff. After that, the panel held an organizational discussion (Figures 2 and 3) and met with stakeholders from the area to hear their views (Figure 4). That evening, panel members participated in a working dinner meeting.

On August 13, the panel spent the morning and afternoon working on the issues that the city staff had asked it to address (page 17). Illustrated in Figure 5, the TAP began its work session brainstorming a broad range of ideas. During the day it narrowed and organized those ideas into a meaningful set of priorities. In the late afternoon, the panel members presented their observations and recommendations to an audience of interested citizens and community groups, who also had the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback.

Figure 5: TAP Process Day Two – The timeline reflects the process that managed all ideas converging into a cohesive blend of form and findings.
Background: Creating an Uptown Urban Village as Part of a Long-Term Strategy for Climate Resiliency

The Climate Change Context

The Uptown Urban Village TAP is the second of two Fort Lauderdale TAPs presented by the ULI Southeast Florida/Caribbean District Council. The TAPs are part of the city’s focus on planning for climate resiliency. The TAPs centered on a different location and development type, each of which requires a different approach. The selection was guided by the recommendation to address areas vulnerable to climate change “adaptation action areas” and areas less vulnerable “growth” areas, as defined in the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Action Plan.

The first TAP (held in June 2014) examined how redevelopment over time could be designed to adapt the low-lying Riverwalk to the impacts of sea level rise, coastal flooding, and more extreme weather patterns.

The second TAP concentrated on the strategies that could be put in place to drive growth to the higher elevation Uptown neighborhood which has the existing public and transportation infrastructure to facilitate future growth and is designated in city plans (see page 14) as an employment corridor.

Figure 6: The Uptown TAP investigated strategies that could be used to create a walkable, livable urban village core within the Uptown neighborhood — an area that is located in and around the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport and the Andrews Avenue and Cypress Creek Road intersection. The area’s core is flanked by the C-14 Canal and McNab Road to the north, 57th Street to the south, one block west of Powerline Road to the west, and I-95 to the east. It is also well-served by regional transportation facilities.
The Strategic Importance of Uptown: Location, Location...

The Uptown neighborhood is well-positioned for future investment. It is a dynamic growth area that has excellent access to regional transportation facilities, contains a concentration of higher education institutions, and is the location of major corporate facilities that are key job generators. Important in low-lying Fort Lauderdale, it is also at a higher elevation than much of the surrounding area, making it potentially more resilient to sea level rise.

Transportation Access

In a traffic-congested region where access to a range of transportation options is still a rare commodity, Uptown has the potential framework to becomeis well-connected for arrival by train, plane, car, and bus:

- Train – The well used Cypress Creek Tri-Rail Station is on the eastern edge of the Uptown area and located alongside North Andrews Avenue, just north south of Cypress Creek Road.

- Air – The Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport is one of the busiest general aviation airports in the country, serving over 160,000 aircraft operations per year.

- Road – Uptown is located just west of I-95 and is well-served by major north/south and east/west arterials including Andrews Avenue and Cypress Creek Road. Where the roadways come together creates the economic hub of Uptown.

- Bus – The area is serviced by Broward County Transit bus service. The bus system service for the area recently added a new free midday shuttle bus service for the Uptown Business District. The two routes originate at the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station and run along Cypress Creek Road between Calvary Chapel to the west and the Radica Corporate Park to the east and provide convenient access to restaurants, jobs, educational campuses, and the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport.

Right: Transportation access by train, plane, bus, and car (the predominant mode) is one of the Uptown area’s greatest strengths (Figures 7 through 10). The TAP was asked to look at strategies to provide the missing mode: walkability.
The big transportation gap in the area is travel by foot and bicycle, a major focus of the TAP. Walkability is a significant ingredient in creating the walkable and bikeable urban environment desired by today's knowledge workers and the companies that employ them. Major contributors to the lack of walkability are the existing land use and zoning patterns that are typical of a suburban setting: auto-oriented and disconnected development, separation of uses, and lack of quality urban design elements that contribute to a positive pedestrian experience. The wide, high-speed roads have been designed to move cars rather than accommodate people to safely cross or walk creating are another barrier to walkability.

**Education and Economic Access**

Uptown offers a concentration of post-secondary educational institutions and serves as a regional employment hub.

**Education**

The educational institutions provide Uptown with an important asset in a knowledge-based job market along with the need for continuous learning. The institutions include Broward College, Kaplan University, Keiser University, Phoenix University, and Sanford Brown Institute. An additional asset is CareerSource Broward. Also in the area is Calvary Christian Academy, a K-12 institution located on Cypress Creek Road next to Calvary Chapel Fort Lauderdale.

**Economic**

Located at a mid-point between downtown Miami and West Palm Beach and with direct access to I-95 and Tri-Rail, the Uptown area has evolved into a corporate center that, according to Envision Uptown (described later in this report), employs approximately 70,000 people. Examples of the companies established in the area include Citrix, Microsoft (the Latin American headquarters), Nipro Diagnostic, and other technology oriented companies.

---

Left: The Uptown area is well-served by opportunities for higher education and continuous learning, important to both employers and employees (current and prospective) in today's job market (Figures 11 through 15).
The Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport also is a major economic driver. It provides just over 5,000 jobs and generates more than $815 million annually in total economic activity, with a total payroll of approximately $176 million. The airport is also the hub of Fort Lauderdale Foreign Trade Zone 241, which offers numerous economic incentives to businesses and contains a 200-acre Industrial Airpark that provides more than 1.5 million square feet of office, warehouse, and manufacturing space. It controls much of the vacant land in the area contiguous to the airport.

Above: Uptown is a regional employment hub that has been created by the area’s excellent access to transportation by air, rail, and roads (Figures 16 through 20).
Higher Elevation

Having a higher elevation than much of the surrounding area, the Uptown area is much less vulnerable to the effects of increased water levels, which in turn reduces the risk of property loss due to water level rise. For the city it reduces the costs associated with constructing and operating an infrastructure capable of keeping streets and property drained. The one- and three-foot sea level rise maps (Figures 21 and 22) of Uptown show that it is largely unaffected. Even at five feet (Figure 23) of sea level rise, Uptown shows minimal effect compared to other parts of the county and city.

Although Uptown is not under immediate or as impactful a threat from sea level rise in comparison to other areas of the City, it is subject to the impacts of extreme temperatures because of the presence of urban heat islands (Figure 24) due to its large expanses of impervious surface (office buildings, major roadways, and the airport). An urban heat island is a substantial mass of asphalt, concrete, and buildings (conditions usually found in urban areas) that absorb short wave radiation from the sun and re-radiate it out slowly at night as long wave radiation, reducing the effectiveness of nighttime cooling. A warmer climate magnifies that effect. Tree canopies can help reduce the heat island effect, but trees in Uptown are sparse. The increased heat level makes the HVAC equipment run at a higher capacity and longer than necessary, thereby increasing utility costs. It also makes the ambient spaces less pleasant, thereby reducing the interaction of pedestrians with retail areas and making walkability more difficult.

The Civic Capacity and Planning Context

In addition to its strategic location, Uptown benefits from two essential ingredients for long-term success – strong, committed civic leadership and a supportive public planning environment.

Civic Capacity

The newly formed non-profit organization Envision Uptown, Inc., is in position to serve as the nucleus of civic leadership in the Uptown area. It was established in early 2014 to collaborate with landowners, business and civic leaders, and officials and staffs of local, regional, state, and federal agencies to develop a specific physical vision plan for the transformation of the Uptown area. The goal is take the steps that will turn the current workplace-based and car-dependent development into a walkable, transit-ready urban neighborhood of offices, residences, retail, hospitality, civic buildings, large and small civic spaces and parks, and public plazas.

Envision Uptown is committed to more than creating the vision. In order to implement the vision, the organization will work with all levels of government and quasi-governmental agencies that control and/or could impact vision achievement. The group’s focus is on securing the changes to agencies’ plans and budgets that are requisite to facilitating the implementation, maintenance, and growth of the vision plan. That includes working with the City of Fort Lauderdale to see that the vision plan is adopted as part of the city’s codes including the Unified Land Development Regulations. Envision Uptown is also positioned to promote and help grow Uptown consistent with the City’s vision plan, Fast Forward Fort Lauderdale.

Planning

The development of Uptown as a walkable, transit-accessible, and livable 24-hour urban village center is supported by numerous local and regional plans.

City of Fort Lauderdale

A number of city plans call for the redevelopment of Uptown as the connected, livable urban village center desired by Envision Uptown:

- Fast Forward Fort Lauderdale – the city’s 2035 vision plan that is the culmination of a three-year initiative to develop a shared vision for the future and draws on more than 1,500 ideas submitted by a diverse cross-section of the community. Common themes from the process highlight the public’s desire to create a more resilient and connected city where people move easily and seamlessly through a safe transportation network, cultivate educational excellence, foster economic prosperity, and strengthen innovative partnerships – all themes consistent with the goals of Envision Uptown. The Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport and surrounding business area are specifically mentioned in the plan. Fast Forward Fort Lauderdale Rewind: Year in Review documents progress in achieving the Fast Forward plan. In addition to the creation of Envision Uptown, the report cites the city’s successful grant application for a community bus route (now in service) to provide a mid-day service to link commuters, students, employees, and guests in the area to the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station and surrounding restaurants, shops, educational
Although Uptown is not threatened by sea level rise because of its higher elevation (Figures 21, 22, and 23 above) it is vulnerable to rising temperatures associate with climate change because of the number of heat islands in the area (Figure 24, next page).
Figure 24: Urban Heat Islands are shown in red.
Figure 25: City of Fort Lauderdale staff and local leaders attend an Uptown Fort Lauderdale Focus Group meeting held as part of the Press Play planning process. That focus group led to the creation of Envision Uptown.

campuses, the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport, and other destinations. The goal is to reduce congestion, promote the use of public transit, and encourage business development in the area.

• **Press Play Fort Lauderdale: Our Strategic Plan 2018** – the city's five-year strategic plan that connects the dots between the community’s Fast Forward vision and its day-to-day operations. The plan, which provides city staff with a road map of actions to move the city toward 2035, calls for a pedestrian-friendly, multi-modal city where residents move seamlessly and easily through a safe transportation system where the pedestrian is first. It also recognizes that by making targeted investments in developing the Uptown District and expanding the potential of the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport, the city will be primed for attracting more domestic and international businesses.

• **City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan, Volume I, Future Land Use Element Map** – The underlying land use for the Uptown core is mostly Employment Center (meant to encourage employment-based development) with pockets of Commercial and Industrial. To the west, around the airport, the land use is mostly Transportation and Employment Center.

• **Connecting the Blocks: Creating Options for Moving People** – the city’s 20-year mobility infrastructure plan, Connecting the Blocks examines the degree of connectivity for different areas of the city and identifies enhancements needed to improve connectivity. Uptown did not come out well. It had the second lowest pedestrian and bicycle connectivity of the 11 areas of the city analyzed and received a score of 3 for transit-connectivity, well below a score of 25, the number that indicates an area with good transit connectivity.

• **Complete Streets** – Fort Lauderdale is working to transform itself into a fully connected, pedestrian-friendly, multi-modal city that improves pedestrian, bicyclist, and motorist safety through a Complete Streets approach. That is one of the top priorities outlined in the Vision Plan and Strategic Plan. Consistent with the goals for the Uptown Urban Village, Complete Streets offer safe access for all users, including pedestrians, joggers, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders of all ages and abilities.
Figure 26: The city's land use map for the Uptown Urban Village Core.

Figure 27: The city's zoning map for the Uptown Urban Village Core.
Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

The Broward MPO has designated the TAP study area as the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub (Figure 29) that contains a mix of land uses. The MPO defines a mobility hub as a place where people can make transportation connections within a multi-modal system; it also provides connections to concentrations of activities including housing. It also sponsors a Complete Streets program.

Seven50

Developed through a broad-based regional planning process led by the South Florida and the Treasure Coast regional planning councils, the Seven50 Prosperity Plan presents a regional vision of the future that considers includes a number of key elements, including climate resiliency and transit-oriented design. One of the regional priorities of the plan is to integrate land use and transportation planning and plan more transit-oriented development areas to support transit. To further that goal, Seven50 used the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station as a test case to document the process of creating an attractive transit-oriented development. The results of the test are contained in the report, *Cypress Creek TOD, Seven50 TOD Pilot Project*. The Cypress Creek station was selected because it is one of the busiest stops in the Tri-Rail corridor between West Palm Beach and Miami and is located in a hub of commerce.

Southeast Florida Climate Action Plan

The action plan, *A Region Responds to Changing Climate, Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact Counties, Regional Climate Action Plan*, is the product of an agreement between Palm Beach, Broward, Miami-Dade, and Monroe counties to work collaboratively on regional climate concerns. The City is committed to the active implementation of the plan and overall efforts of the Compact as the first municipal government with representation on the Compact’s Staff Steering Committee. Reinforcing the goals for the Uptown Urban Village, the sustainable communities section of the plan calls for reducing financial and physical losses to the city’s building stock by reshaping where and how the city builds.

A specific action under that goal calls for designating or otherwise recognizing what the plan calls Growth Areas – places outside Adaptation Action Areas, or other areas subject to adaptation planning efforts, where growth is encouraged due to higher topographic elevation and the presence of existing infrastructure, such as transportation and water and sewer infrastructure. Under the plan, Growth Areas should be developed with urban design guidelines that address character of urban place and provide a high quality pedestrian experience through landscaping and the creation of public space. An Adaptation Action Area is an optional designation in local comprehensive plans for those identified areas experiencing coastal flooding and are vulnerable to the related impacts of sea level rise for the purpose of prioritizing funding for infrastructure needs and adaptation planning.

Figure 28: The Regional Climate Action Plan contains recommendations for moving toward a more resilient South Florida.
Figure 30: The Broward MPO has designated the TAP study area as the Cypress Creek Mobility Hub.

Figure 29: WalkScore, the online walkability scorecard, gives a selected address in the Uptown area a walkability score of 66 and transit score of 36. That is in contrast to downtown Fort Lauderdale which has a walkability score of 89 and transit score of 56.
Issues for the TAP: Creating an Uptown Urban Village

Listed below, the questions that the TAP was asked to address focused on how the city could drive more intense growth, including housing, to the area described as the Uptown neighborhood. The questions looked at how the city could build on the area's strong existing employment base and transportation assets and provide solutions to the lack of walkability, multifamily residential housing, and amenities usually found in vibrant urban neighborhoods.

1. What strategies should be employed to retain the energy evident in this high-traffic corridor while making the streets/area workable for a wide range of mobility needs (pedestrians/bikes/cars/transit)?

2. What location is the best starting point for implementing redevelopment and what is the best development strategy to establish the momentum needed to keep the evolution going?

3. What strategies will encourage/achieve the densities needed to make the core a workable neighborhood, while also providing a variety of housing types for those seeking to live in or near Uptown?

4. How can residential at multiple price points, including workforce, be facilitated to serve the very diverse jobs base?

5. How and where should community spaces (civic & green) be created? What governmental services/locations should be located in the core? Schools? P3 incentives? What strategies will encourage cultural and entertainment options that would attract a variety of residents?

6. What climate resilient strategies should be employed for this area? (landscaping, urban heat island reduction, energy diversification, precipitation impacts, etc.)

7. How can the expansion of the existing concentration of “high tech” jobs be facilitated?

8. What restrictions are created by the airport for urban and residential development?

9. How should signage setback, zoning, and noise regulations evolve as part of the strategy for the Uptown Urban Village transformation and create a unique character for the area?

10. How should Uptown redevelopment anticipate and accommodate the expansion of commuter and intercity rail?

11. How should existing residential areas be linked to employment and commercial destinations within the area? What other transit or car sharing options/amenities are needed to complete the last segment of a trip started on transit (“the last mile”)?
The TAP was asked to focus on strategies that could be used to drive real estate and economic growth, particularly residential, to the Uptown neighborhood and use that growth to transform the core of Uptown into a mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly urban village that is easily accessible by all modes of transportation.

The TAP Focus Area: How It Is Viewed by Stakeholders and Existing Conditions

How the Uptown Area Is Viewed by Stakeholders

During the two TAP stakeholder and citizen input sessions, a number of common views emerged about the Uptown area and its future. They are captured in the following descriptions that were taken from the speakers’ comments.

The Type of Area Desired: We want a live/work/play central hub environment that offers a clear point of entry and sense of arrival and creates a reason to visit day or night. That will require a mix of residential uses and increased walkability. It will also require more live/work/play choices that are integral to creating a 24-hour urban environment.

Transportation Connectivity: We want a transportation network that allows people to get to and move around the area without using a car. For instance, travelers on Tri-Rail should be able to bike and walk safely from the Cypress Creek Station to where their jobs are.

Since the city’s leadership and its plans as well as regional plans call for transforming Uptown’s core into a mixed-use, highly connected, and livable urban village means that half the job is already done. The challenge now is to make that future happen through collaborative agreement on an integrated set of strategic actions that build on Uptown’s strategic position and transform it from a place for cars to a place for people.
Jobs: We should build on Uptown’s potential as an incubator for high tech jobs. Attracting and keeping talent will require creating the walkable, mixed-use environment and greater corporate/university connections that millennials will respond to.

Housing: People need a reason to live in the area, but now all they see is a sea of cars. New generation housing products that offer a variety of housing types and prices and convenient access to needed services such as a restaurants, groceries, dry cleaners and a pharmacy.

Implementation: We want the “how-to-do-it” information, including the relevant enabling codes and regulations. West Palm Beach, Miami, and Miami-Dade County’s form-based codes are good examples of such enabling regulations.

Existing Conditions: A Host of Strengths and Big Gap to Fill

Strengths: As outlined in the prior section, Uptown is exceptionally well located for sustained growth. It already has the following features:

- An existing public infrastructure to facilitate future growth. That includes immediate access to I-95 and the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station that can be the catalyst for growth in the form and fabric recommended by the TAP. Transit-oriented development (TOD) is the future of the Uptown Urban Village.

- Major economic generators that include an established and growing urban office market and the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport.

- A concentration of higher education institutions (important in a knowledge-based economy requiring continuous learning and re-learning) and high-tech corporations such as Citrix and Microsoft.

- A higher topographic elevation compared to much of the surrounding area which makes Uptown less vulnerable to the impacts of higher water levels associated with sea level rise and, therefore, a logical area to target for growth. It is also removed from the many low-lying coastal areas of the city.

Most important, the development of Uptown as a highly connected mixed-use, walkable, and transit-oriented urban village and employment center is supported by city and regional plans and by the business community through organizations such as the Uptown Council for the Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber and Envision Uptown, the strong civic leadership organization dedicated to achieving the desired outcome of an urban village.

The Big Gap: Because Uptown was designed and its infrastructure was planned when car-oriented disconnected suburban development patterns predominated, the area lacks walkability and presents a hostile pedestrian environment. It is also missing the compact residential alternatives in an urban village setting that support transit and would be attractive to the future work force (currently the 18-33 year old millennial generation born between 1981 and 1996) who are a significant driving force in the high tech job market. Unlike prior generations who moved to where they could get a job,

Figure 32: The TAP considered a variety of locations and determined that the core area of Cypress Creek Road from I-95 to the east and one block west of Powerline Road was appropriate for an urban village core. The area was further defined as extending to the C-14 Canal and McNab Road to the north to and including the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station to the south.
the millennials choose a location that offers the quality of life they want and then find a job. They look for cities that provide an exciting and interesting urban environment: the connected places where they can live close to work and have convenient access to shopping, dining, transit, education, and places to gather. The same qualities are important to the companies that seek to employ those workers.

Figure 34: To attract today’s knowledge-based employees and companies, the Uptown area needs a make-over. It needs to transform from a disconnected car-oriented daytime only environment (above) to a walkable, connected 24/7 one. The TAP’s vision plan (below) provides a framework for doing that by creating an integrated multi-modal mixed-use urban village environment: that place people want to visit, live, work, or locate a business in.

Figure 33: Cypress Road and its multiple lanes, traffic, and wide street crossings. Image © Google Maps.
The Vision Framework and Description

To develop its recommendations for reinventing Uptown, the TAP first developed a vision of a planning framework (Figure 33) for what Uptown could look like in the future if the TAP’s recommendations are implemented. The plan provides the antidote to the Uptown area’s two greatest deficiencies if it is to be a competitive location: walkability and multiple housing options. The TAP also put the vision into words describing the Uptown Urban Village of the future.

Using the future vision as its organizing mechanism, the TAP grouped its ideas into a series of strategic actions that are outlined in its recommendations.

Uptown of the Future: A Framework for Action Strategies

The Uptown of the future has been transformed from its present workplace-based and car-dependent form of development into a walkable, bikeable, transit-oriented urban neighborhood composed of offices, residences, retail, hospitality, civic, and educational buildings, and both large and small well-defined public gathering spaces and parks.

The critical element in creating that future was enabled by the decision to make it walkable and bikeable, a quality that was achieved not by diverting traffic away from Uptown but by transforming Cypress Creek Road, Andrews Avenue, and Powerline Road within the Uptown core from highways into the multi-way urban boulevards (a type of urban street) established in the latter 19th century. Features include edges that support a main street mix of uses along pedestrian-safe, low-speed access streets with on-street parking and moderate-speed through lanes in the center providing auto mobility.

That transformation from highway to boulevard design for the several blocks of Uptown’s urban core informs drivers that they are entering a pedestrian public realm. The surface parking lots that were predominant are now filled with new, urban form buildings that support walkable sidewalks and streets and a connected system of greenways, parks, and civic spaces are in place. Parking needs are met with on-street spaces and parking structures that are wrapped with liner buildings of residential and commercial uses that support walkability.

The important elements of Uptown’s future were possible because they had already been called for in two city of Fort Lauderdale plans – Fast Forward Fort Lauderdale (a 2035 vision plan) and Press Play Fort Lauderdale: Our Strategic Plan 2018. Those elements were also possible because they were detailed in a specific physical vision plan called a regulating plan that was adopted by the city commission as part of the land development code for the Uptown compact urban core. Applications for development that conform to the regulating plan were approved by city staff, without the need for additional public hearings. The most important attribute that made the Uptown future vision possible was the sustained, committed leadership of Envision Uptown and other stakeholders.
Creating a Climate Resilient Community

As highlighted in the prior section, Uptown’s higher topographic elevation gives it a unique competitive edge in a generally low-lying region and supports its ability to attract new investments and accommodate new growth. Directing growth to the area is consistent with the recommendations of the Southeast Florida Climate Action Plan (described in the background section) to:

- Reshape “where and how we build” in order to reduce financial and business losses.
- Designate Growth Areas where growth is encouraged because of the higher elevation and presence of existing infrastructure.

Action strategies recommended by the TAP include adding shading to reduce the heat island effect and conserve energy.

Shading

The Uptown Urban Village should focus on providing shade, an important feature in a sub-tropical climate and an area that is designed to encourage and facilitate walking. Shade can be provided through built (awnings and arcades, for example) and natural (tree canopy, what the TAP called a Floresta Urbana or urban forest) solutions. Lush shading to avoid direct solar radiation and landscaping should be featured throughout the site. If done with native trees and plants, the area could become an educational arboretum that also serves as a desirable destination. Unlike the open piazzas of Europe that encourage pedestrians to use solar radiation to make the colder temperatures more pleasant, open unshaded areas in South Florida are avoided by locals because of the hot sun. Shading of pathways is essential to encourage pedestrian travel and increase the enjoyment and asset value of a neighborhood.

Carefully planned interactions between people and nature, the TAP noted, allow the greater compactness of an area without compromising the asset value. The practice of planning those interactions is called biophilic urbanism, a modern design philosophy that postulates that people and all living things are
attracted to “life” and living things. In Singapore, for example, over 80 percent of the community lives in multi-family vertical housing, but because they are within close proximity to nature trails, the stress of the community is not overbearing. Tree lined/shaded pathways between buildings and to major gateways like the Tri-Rail station and express bikeways are a step toward achieving the goals of biophilic urbanism that add to the asset value of the community.

Another strategy to reduce the urban heat effect includes incentivizing “cool roofing” that has a minimum solar reflective index (SRI) of 78 in low-slope arrangements and an SRI higher than 29 for high-sloped arrangements. Hardscape elements should also have an SRI higher than 29. Other options would be to encourage vegetated roofing or rooftop photoelectric panels to minimize the urban heat island effect. A green roof, or rooftop garden, is a vegetative layer consisting of trees and other live vegetation that provides shade and absorbs and stores large amounts of heat, reducing the heat island effect.

**Energy Conservation**

A number of other energy conservation measures can be used to reduce the energy expended to create comfort. Those additional strategies can include installing photovoltaic panels and providing electric vehicle charging stations and car sharing (reduces car use and congestion in urban area). Two additional strategies that involve air conditioning and lighting are to:

- Provide central condenser water cooling systems for buildings. In general, water-cooled equipment is 30 percent more efficient than air-cooled equipment, the TAP emphasized. Current technology allows water-cooled heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment to achieve Energy Efficiency Ratios (EER) between 20 and 40, while standard equipment is in the range of 10 to 20. Central water-cooled equipment is almost twice as efficient as older technology. The urban planning element of such equipment is a community condenser water loop with connected loads paying a utility charge, much like a condominium shares condenser water for a fee. The community condenser water system could make use of storm water as a source for the make-up water to reduce water costs and reduce flooding in the area. The storm water to be used as condenser water could be collected in cooling ponds that function as an amenity and a heat sink. Circulation of the water to produce the cooling effect simultaneously decreases water temperature stratification, making the aquatic ecosystem function more effectively. The approach of providing community condenser water has been implemented in the four city-block Miami Design District, a once abandoned area transformed into a community dedicated to art and design near midtown Miami. A utility or community board could possibly serve as the provider of a community water condenser.

- Install light-emitting diode (LED)-based technology street lighting. With an anticipated life expectancy of 15 years (compared to the 6 years for the mercury vapor type), there would be fewer streetlight outages and, therefore, lower labor costs to replace them. LED light provides a truer white light, which leads to better color rendering, and allows colors to seem more natural. LED light by nature has a more direct beam that minimizes the light trespass onto homes and businesses. Secondary optics can be used effectively on LED lights to evenly distribute light along the
roadway at all distances from the pole, creating fewer hot and dark spots. The result of LED street lighting is an approximate 60 percent decrease in energy use and carbon emissions.

**Aligning Land Use With the Vision**

The TAP’s land use recommendations present a number of concepts (Figure 41) that are critical to the overall framework of the Uptown Urban Village. The recommended land use categories include single family (existing inventory) residential, mixed-use residential, airport/trade zone, mixed-use innovation with limited residential, and sports/entertainment. The recommended height, use, and density for the urban village are substantially influenced by the height and distance constraints identified in airport regulations and a desire to protect the long-term prosperity of the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport.

As shown in Figure 41, building heights are limited to 80 feet in the direct flight path and increase as distance from the

**Figure 42, below:** The proposed land use for the Uptown Urban Village is composed of a variety of residential choices including single family and mixed-use residential at different levels of density woven around the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport and Foreign Trade Zone and a proposed innovative district and areas for sports and entertainment. The circled numbers show the proposed building height.
airport runway and separation from the flight path increase. Taller buildings limited to 150 feet in height would be located along Cypress Creek Road and Andrews Avenue. Similarly, the density of residential uses increases with distance from the runway and separation from the flight path. The area in the direct flight path around the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station is recommended for a focus on innovation businesses with limited residential units. (Federal Aviation Administration regulations control land uses and building heights in the air space around airports to ensure that they are compatible with normal airport operations.) The Andrews Avenue and Cypress Creek Road corridors are recommended for a diverse mix of uses and intensities, with residential densities of 150 units per acre. It is important that the mix of uses be flexible and market-driven, with the land development regulations focused on the placement of buildings with active ground floors and building faces (parking structures must be lined with livable spaces/ground floor retail) to create a walkable urban core.

To make its land use concepts work, the TAP recommended the following city actions.

- Modify its Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map to promote a district along Cypress Creek Road and north along Andrews Avenue to the C-14 canal and south to the area identified with the Tri-Rail station. That designation would be a flexible mixed-use (MXD) designation supporting and encouraging MXD for all market sectors.
- Prepare and adopt a form-based code and regulating plan that will become the land development regulations which emphasize the future physical form of the built environment. The approach increases the role of the city commission and stakeholders through a very public process to prepare and adopt in a public hearing the new code that will allow landowners to implement the community’s plan for an urban village. The process also streamlines the project level approval process and places a premium on certainty for all stakeholders. Form-based codes are commonly used as a practical tool for communities that want to grow smarter. As they have evolved over the past 20 years, form-based codes have been used in redevelopment and revitalization planning as well as broader neighborhood or community planning.
In Miami-Dade County to the south, Downtown Kendall chose a bold course of developing a master plan for the area around the Dadeland Mall. In 1999 the Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners approved and implemented a form-based code to implement the plan with both building placement and street designs established in the code. To the north, in 1994 the city of West Palm Beach adopted a form-based code for its entire downtown. Those are just two of the many cities and counties across the country that are replacing parts of their zoning and development regulations for specific areas with tools to allow them to carry out the visionary place-making that form-based codes enable.

The TAP also encouraged the city to go further:

- Establish with community participation a clear regulating plan and form-based code that is approved by the city commission after public hearings and provides staff approval of development applications that conform to the code. Applicants not conforming to the plan must go through the public hearing process.

- The regulating plan should establish street and civic space locations, greenways, build-to lines at the edge of the sidewalks, building placement, minimum and maximum heights, and massing. Other considerations include windows and doors fronting on sidewalks, retail-height first floors, no minimum residential unit size, and very flexible uses.

- Specify preapproved, conceptual thoroughfare cross-sections showing lanes, sidewalks, trees, cycling network, and parking.

- Identify opportunities for larger scale ground up development opportunities for larger mixed-use projects.

- To encourage growth of the Uptown Urban Village, create a pool of entitlements to be allocated in the Uptown Urban Village that are as-of-right for projects conforming with the adopted code.

Another land use consideration includes the linkages between the Uptown Urban Village Center and nearby residential neighborhoods. The TAP recognizes that, although its focus to create an urban core extended one block west of Powerline Road, a long term vision for the area should include the area west of Powerline Road to the Turnpike, both in terms of urbanization and land use intensity. That area, particularly north of Cypress Creek Road, has unique existing residential neighborhood characteristics that should be considered. One approach is to require a transition intensity zone or zones to buffer building intensity at the edge of the neighborhoods. Another technique is to incorporate the greenway system in a buffer zone. First steps in understanding existing neighborhood condition and character would be to conduct an inventory of the housing stock, infrastructure, and public facilities and hold community meetings to understand what the residents perceive as needs and priorities.

Providing for Transportation Choices

The TAP’s transportation recommendations are based on the freedom to choose one’s mode of transportation, whether it is walking and biking or by rail or car. That emphasis on choice is very different from the last century’s key design objective – vehicle mobility supporting the classic suburban style that was built throughout the United States, including Fort Lauderdale and Broward County.

Today’s resurgence of travel diversity is seen as the new freedom for many travelers, including two specific age cohorts: recent graduates and senior citizens (the leading edge of the baby boomer generation). The former has strongly demonstrated a preference for living and working in environments that do not require cars, and the latter faces loss of the driving privileges as aging diminishes vision, motor skills and other capabilities. The return to and demand for increased transportation diversity requires a Complete Streets approach, encouraging more modes of travel on streets.

A national transportation renaissance is underway to provide Americans with much broader freedom of choice in travel options. The Complete Streets, New Urbanism, and Smart Growth Movements are reviving the atrophied modes of walking, biking, and transit ridership, all blended with motor vehicle travel in a new and balanced way. That national trend blends well with the vision articulated above for the Uptown Urban Village.
The new, emerging design vision as recommended by the TAP and the contemporary, broadly accepted vision of transportation are in stark contrast.

- A compact urban context calls for a healthier balance of relative speeds between modes. Slower motor vehicle speeds of 35 mph and lower are preferred on many streets. Good urban design for buildings framing the street is also essential to complete the vision.

- In contrast, a suburban pattern, with a less connected network, calls for more physical separation of modes due to incompatible operating speeds. That separation is achieved spatially, with widening the road and use of curbs and medians, or temporally, with separate traffic signal phases.

The Uptown area of today features roads designed in the suburban pattern, resulting in one of the most significant challenges to walkability and the creation of a balanced mobility vision. The arterials are massive asphalt corridors such as Cypress Creek Road that were created as major high speed thoroughfares between the workplace, residence, and commerce. Over time, those arterial roads such as Cypress Creek Road were widened as traffic volumes increased. Rethinking roadway design to accommodate both the pedestrian and the automobile is a top priority for achieving the vision for the Uptown Urban Village.

Figure 44: The capacity of Cypress Creek Road is currently higher than needed to handle existing and anticipated future demand. For the eight-lane portion of Cypress Creek east of Powerline, the daily profile of traffic counts for each hour shows 1,800 vehicles per hour during the AM and PM peak hour directions. That type of facility has the capacity for over 900 vehicles per hour in a single lane, therefore, current traffic demand requires only two lanes in each direction (four total lanes). Two lanes in each direction would provide a sufficient cushion for growth.
Designing Healthy Walkable Places and Greenways

The Walkable Street Network

Creating a walkable street network is at the heart of the TAP’s recommendations. Continuing and building on its Connecting the Blocks and Complete Streets initiatives, the TAP emphasized that the city should establish a mixed-use, walkable land development pattern with attention to creating a street grid network.

To achieve a successful walkable community, a full set of thoroughfare standards must be developed to realize the following objectives:

- Minimize street width and paved surface area.
- Enhance pedestrian access and safety.
- Maintain vehicle speeds at pedestrian-friendly levels.

Figure 45: By offering more choices, a network of smaller streets provides greater capacity than a disconnected hierarchy of large streets.

Figure 46: Wayfinding signs help pedestrians and drivers find their destination.
Also important to making walking more friendly is the use of:

- Pedestrian linkages and corridors
- Greenways, pathways, and linear parks
- Pocket parks and gathering places
- Shade through extensive tree canopy and building design
- Active ground floor uses
- On-street parking
- Consistent streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, and street furniture)
- Safety and security

To achieve those objectives, the city’s regulating plan should incorporate a community design charrette that leads to comprehensive plan policies and a form-based land development regulation that includes a complete suite of street sections appropriate for walkable areas. The form-based code street sections should incorporate the following key principles:

**The single most significant challenge to the cohesive redevelopment of the Uptown area is the divide created by what would be considered by many transportation engineers as a well-functioning major traffic corridor. That is from the perspective of the car, not people.**

Build for everyone – not just for motor vehicles, but also for bicyclists, pedestrians, children, the elderly, and emergency responders. Streets that are enjoyable for people to live and work along, conducive to neighborly interaction, and beneficial in helping pedestrians feel safe crossing are those that encourage lower vehicular speeds and corresponding low noise levels. In turn, tree-shaded, pedestrian-friendly streets lead to higher levels of bicycling and walking.

Choose the right target speed. According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) and Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU) publication, Recommended Practice Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach, the target speed of a thoroughfare (“the highest speed at which vehicles should operate on a thoroughfare in a specific context”) is directly related to pedestrian safety. Accordingly, minor residential streets should be consciously designed to maintain speeds of 20 miles per hour, while the higher-order thoroughfares should purposely be designed to speeds of 30 to 35 mph. One very effective technique in reducing speeds is to make the pavement no wider than necessary.

Figure 477: The ITE and CNU publication, Recommended Practice Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach, provides guidance for planning and designing major urban thoroughfares for walkable communities. The Federal Highway Administration defines context sensitive solutions (CSS) as “a collaborative, interdisciplinary approach that involves all stakeholders to develop a transportation facility that fits its physical setting and preserves scenic, aesthetic, historic and environmental resources, while maintaining safety and mobility. CSS is an approach that considers the total context within which a transportation improvement project will exist.”
Create a highly connected street network that will provide a multitude of direct routes from one area to the next. For cyclists and pedestrians, a highly connected network creates shorter routes on quieter, more intimately scaled streets. For drivers, that translates into shorter trips on local routes, at lower speeds, while reducing congestion on arterial routes. Travel demand is less concentrated in a finer grained street network, especially during peak periods. That reduces the heavy point loading of the proposed Multiway Boulevard at any one location. A connected network also gives emergency providers multiple options for reaching a destination.

The Multiway Boulevard: A Tested Solution for Cypress Creek Road

Multiway boulevards have a strong history and are increasing in use. Older examples were built at the end of the 19th century in New York, and new multiway boulevards exist in San Francisco and Chico, California, and other locations. That grand multiway thoroughfare style is reemerging in the field of urban design and is successfully being used around the country to blend high vehicle mobility in the center and pedestrian scale design on the edges. The multiway boulevard, the TAP highly recommended, should be the model for recasting the current multi-lane Cypress Creek Road, Powerline Road, and Andrews Avenue. That model will encourage the optimal balance of multimodal usage and capacity for the Cypress Creek corridor.

Use of a multiway boulevard design:

- Will streamline and improve traffic flow along Cypress Creek Road by providing new side medians and access lanes that strictly control future connections to the boulevard.
- Simultaneously permit substantial volumes of through traffic at its center while encouraging the commercial, street-front development pattern appropriate for viable, walkable community design.
In a multiway boulevard design, the central lanes and access lanes are separated by generous side medians. The concept and operating characteristics of multiway boulevards are described most fully by Allen Jacobs, Elizabeth McDonald and Yodan Rofè in *The Boulevard Book* and also in ITE/CNU's *Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares* described earlier. The generic section and plan of a multiway boulevard is illustrated in Figure 50.

Core design features of a multiway boulevard include the following:

- The center of the multiway boulevard is typically four-to-six lanes (current traffic on Cypress Creek can be accommodated with four lanes) that serve the traditional function of an arterial street – to move longer automobile and bicycle trips safely through an area. The center lanes are considered the “vehicular realm,” and design considerations on those lanes place priority on the through movement of motor vehicles, as with contemporary suburban arterial design. Pedestrians are encouraged to cross the center lanes because speeds are managed in the 30-35 miles per hour range (speeds that also create a safe environment for those traveling by bicycle).

- On either side of the existing central through lanes are wide park-like medians with street trees and shared-use paths or sidewalks. At the edge, a single one-way access lane provides access to on-street parking. A wide sidewalk and street-front development complete the boulevard's pedestrian realm.

- The entire area from the edge of the central lanes to the building faces, provide a real sense of place where pedestrians feel comfortable. The one-way access lane is designed for speeds of 15 miles per hour. Within the pedestrian realm, design considerations place priority on pedestrian mobility. The table in Figure 5 summarizes the functional elements of the proposed multiway boulevard. Below that are illustrations (Figures 55

*By maintaining the functionality of the roadway facility with central through lanes and creating through lanes and a pedestrian/on-street parking corridor with shade for the pedestrian, the city will provide a convenient, safe, secure, and enjoyable pedestrian realm and a functioning street. Two important design and land use strategies to achieve such a road require adoption of a form-based code and regulating plan that will result in buildings brought to the sidewalk to further encourage pedestrian movement.*
A first step in pursuing a multiway boulevard design for Cypress Creek Road is to assess the operational performance of the future Cypress Creek Boulevard and resulting operation of the I-95 interchange. The recommended travel study can be conducted using micro-simulation software such as Synchro™. Cross streets should be based on the interconnectivity street network. Travel demand levels are also required to complete the analysis to determine if the roadway could undergo a lane diet (a reduction in vehicle travel lanes). Data from the Florida Department of Transportation and Broward MPO will be necessary to inform the operations analysis.

**Table 1 - Multiway Boulevard Functional Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Lanes</th>
<th>Side Medians</th>
<th>Access Lanes</th>
<th>Wide Sidewalk</th>
<th>Store fronts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide traffic through movement, allowing longer trips to pass through the area. They also bring potential customers within viewing distance of the shops and storefronts along the edge.</td>
<td>Park-like medians establish the beginning of the pedestrian realm. Planted rows of trees provide enclosure, helping manage the central lane thoroughfare speeds. Medians also provide shade and protection for pedestrians, cyclists, and space for transit stops. The shared-use path allows bicycling, rollerblading, and strolling, with ample benches and lighting.</td>
<td>The narrow one-way access lanes serve vital on-street parking. They parallel the central lanes and can provide some circulation between elements of the street network, however this function is minor. They provide a quiet, pedestrian-friendly street for the store fronts facing the Boulevard. Total curb face to curb face width will not exceed 18 feet.</td>
<td>Allows pedestrian traffic to circulate freely between the store fronts and buildings along the median park and crossing areas. The wide sidewalks provide necessary space for pedestrian mobility, shopping and outdoor dining. Street trees and other plantings also greatly enhance the spaces.</td>
<td>Provide economic viability. Development located adjacent to the sidewalks, is accessible via all modes. The store fronts also send a clear message that this is an inviting place for people, a message that is not possible to convey with conventional arterial design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 55: Multiway Boulevard Functional Elements.*
Figure 60: Change from a suburban to urban center over time.

Figure 61: Change from a suburban to an urban landscape over time.
Creating Healthy Walkable Places and Greenways

The single most important component in the resurgence of any area is the people within it: how they feel about their experience while in the area and their desire to go back to that experience. As poet Wendell Berry wrote about place-making: “If what we see and experience…does not become real in imagination, then it never can become real to us, and we are forever divided from it…Imagination is a participating and a local force, native to the ground footprint.”

For the Uptown area, providing that positive experience means creating an environment that makes the pedestrian feel comfortable when moving around. One important way of doing that is establishing shaded pathways and making the experience of getting from one point to another convenient and safe. Creating such areas will also promote community health. In addition to strategies such as walkable streets described elsewhere in the TAP recommendations, several other examples that will lead to a healthier community are described below.

- Nature trails – Exercise and entertainment trails for biking, jogging, and walking could be routed through the heavily vegetated areas along I-95, east of Andrews Avenue between McNab and Cypress Creek Roads. The proposed trail system could connect existing paths that currently serve as office park amenities. Expanding and revitalizing the existing trail system would provide access to the entire community, including the multifamily areas as they are added to the Andrews Avenue corridor as recommended by the TAP.

- Community Gardens – A community garden adjacent to proposed multi-family residential areas could provide fresh food for the community in an otherwise fairly commercial area. In creating such a garden, other successful examples should be studied and an organization identified or formed to handle garden maintenance and insure long term success.

- Storm Water as an Amenity – Currently most property faces away from the stormwater collection areas or ponds along I-95. Those collection areas could be expanded and woven throughout the area as an amenity that would also increase property values by improving views and other aspects of biophilic urbanism (explained earlier in the TAP recommendations).
- Air Quality – Increased vegetation will improve the air quality of the community as vegetation filters particulate pollution as well as acts as a carbon sink. Reduced vehicle trips will result in reduced carbon emissions, which will lead to lower ground ozone pollution levels.

- Shading/Daylight – The use of natural and constructed shade is an important amenity. An example is pathways covered with fabric or by tree shade that provides a naturally lit healthy space that is reasonably sheltered from inclement weather. The indirect light would also reduce exposure to direct radiation. Making the outdoor transportation avenues more comfortable will increase usage.

- Safe Street Crossings – Transforming the Andrews Avenue and Cypress Creek Road intersection into a pedestrian-adapted multiway boulevard intersection will make it safer to walk to the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station. Relocating the on-ramp for I-95 southbound will also make walking from the park-ride lot to the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station much safer. At present, walking across Andrews Avenue there and at the intersection is very dangerous.

- Safety – Redeveloping and infilling existing office and retail parcels north of Cypress Creek Road to include compact multifamily residential units as well as encourage more walk/bike access for the office building employees will increase the pedestrian volumes at the street level. Redeveloping existing office parcels south of Cypress Creek and encouraging buildings with ground floor retail to be developed closer to the sidewalk will also heighten pedestrian volumes. A by-product of higher pedestrian street movement can decrease the likelihood of crime.

The features described above should improve the health of the community through motion and exposure to nature, the TAP concluded. In addition, views of nature usually increase the asset value of the built environment, which in turn leads to higher tax revenue, which funds more community-based improvements and the cycle continues.

Encouraging Development and Redevelopment
The city can take a number of steps now to continue the momentum established over the last couple of years. Working with Envision Uptown and the Broward MPO to expand the scope of the Cypress Creek mobility project could fast track preparation of the regulating plan and form-based land development regulations. Between now and when the recommended code and regulations are in place (which can be a lengthy process), the city might consider an interim step to create an environment that encourages interested developers and landowners to begin the development and redevelopment process for projects that are consistent with the Uptown Urban Village called for by Envision Update. Taking steps now will continue the current feeling of excitement about the prospects for the Uptown area and the creation of an urban village within it.

Sites currently under public agency or government control present a good opportunity for those first developments. Evaluating such sites now and agreeing on a course of action will facilitate their evolution into productive parcels that will illustrate and enhance the Uptown vision. Two examples of good demonstration sites (because of their strategic location) are the park and ride site owned by the Florida Department of Transportation and the area around the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station.

The park and ride site is important because it serves as the front door to the Uptown Urban Village. Whatever development is proposed must exhibit the principals of an urban character, a mix of uses, and connectivity. The Cypress Creek station also is important to the success of the remake of Uptown. According to a study by the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, the area around the station is ranked eighth in population and second in employment within a half-mile radius. Those characteristics present a unique opportunity to boldly step into the TOD implementation stage, a step that represents an organic evolution of redevelopment and is encouraged by the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA). A TOD redevelopment in that area is an important component of the Uptown Urban Village vision and is called for in the plans of a variety of local and regional agencies as described earlier in this report.

An important first step in pursuing such a TOD development is to form a public-private partnership that includes landowners. The partnership would work collaboratively in a charrette process to develop a shared vision for that important combination of sites designed at the pedestrian scale. Organizing such a partnership...
and engaging its members in meaningful dialogue is an appropriate role for Envision Uptown. In addition to landowners, partners should include the SFRTA, the city, and the Broward MPO.

A more intensive look at the proposed development was also encouraged. Designers should fully understand major regulatory implications such as the policies driving development within the immediate area of the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport. The regulations contain specific land use, height, noise, and other constraints that will affect the efficient use and re-use of the proposed TOD site and could ultimately determine its character. (Please see Chapter 333 of the Florida Statutes and referenced Code of Federal Regulations (CFR): 14CFR Part 77 and Part 150, ‘Safe, efficient use, and preservation of the navigable airspace’ and the “airport noise compatibility planning,” respectively, for details.)

The TAP Team decided to analyze a test block (see Figure 66) to demonstrate how redevelopment opportunities could create a mix of uses and achieve the desired sense of place. The selected block is at the southeast corner of the Cypress Creek and Powerline Road intersection. The ideas tested, which are for one simple scenario, are outlined below.

Figure 64: A system of greenways, trails, and walking paths will provide residents of the Uptown Urban Village an opportunity to enjoy a stroll or take a long walk or run, and visit with friends, and be with nature.
The letters correspond with those in Figure 66. The variety and mix of uses, the TAP noted, are achievable.

**A:** Five-story building with ground floor retail and the upper four floors office, consisting of 26,000 square feet (sf) retail and approx. 100,000 sf of office.

**B:** Four-story building with ground floor retail and the upper three floors residential apartments, consisting of 14,000 sf of retail and 45 apartments with an average size of approx. 1,200 sf each.

**C:** Vertical parking garage consisting of four parking levels with 124 parking spaces per floor for a total of 496 parking spaces.

**D:** Represents a 25-foot land dedication for right-of-way purposes.

**E:** Represents a 40-foot mid-block access easement required from the adjacent property to the east.

**F:** Represents the gateway statement (see Figure 62), which may take the form of a monolith or other simple distinctive feature that, when combined with similar features at the other corners of the intersection, will create a sense of arrival into the Uptown Urban Village. The recommended greenways system should be evaluated along with the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport land ownership to determine if there are opportunities for public gathering places and vest pocket parks. Another possible location to examine for such amenities is a satellite city hall/police substation.

**G:** Represents the existing building on site.

**H:** Represents a 20-foot right-of-way dedication for Powerline Road that could be used for sidewalk pedestrian circulation.

The proposed test block study incorporates the modified Cypress Creek Road cross-section as well as the compact urban format outlined in this report. Another key ingredient in this test block is the use of vertical parking to achieve the desired pedestrian scale and urban form.

---

**Figure 65, right, and Figure 66, below:** The TAP used a test block to examine the potential results of the proposed concept to use in creating the Uptown Urban Village.
Continuing to Grow the Uptown Urban Village as a Recognized Center of Innovation and Employment

The Uptown area already has a large employment base (some 70,000 jobs as described earlier in this report) and contains leading technology firms such as Citrix and Microsoft to build on. To be competitive in a global economy, the Uptown innovation and employment center needs to be geographically identifiable, physically compact, transit accessible, and tech wired for businesses, such as medical, specialty manufacturing, high tech, and start-up. A mix of housing choices, offices, retail, restaurants, and other support services such as car sharing, laundries and drugstores must be available in order to be a comprehensive innovation and employment center. The innovation/collaborative district approach is illustrated in Appendix C.

The Uptown Urban Village design must project a different model to the employees (millennials) of today and tomorrow who prefer urban living with amenities immediately accessible from housing and transit. Under today's corporate model, the firms that want to employ those workers will locate and invest in the center, rediscovering the time-honored linkages between the economy, place making, and social networking.

Reshaping the core of Uptown as a true urban village center gives the city of Fort Lauderdale and Broward County a propitious opportunity to revisit the highly inefficient single-use, isolated sprawl model of the past encouraged by auto-only mobility. The new center can demonstrate their re-thinking what has been typical edge city development. That will require re-thinking Uptown's market position and how to build on some of the area's greatest assets, including the highly used For Lauderdale Executive Airport and Cypress

Figure 67: The Fort Lauderdale-based AxisSpace, which is located on Las Olas Way in the Las Olas River House, provides an alternative to traditional office space. Its amenities and open layout are designed to encourage collaboration and innovation and to build a unique business culture and community. Users have access to services such as conference rooms with state-of-the-art technology, printers/scanners, and fully furnished offices. Amenities include a spa, pool, gym, locker rooms, outdoor casual seating, and organized weekly social gatherings.
Creek Tri-Rail station and a large existing employment base. The Uptown Urban Village design should include a bold statement about the employment sector in Uptown and define a clear district that will encourage the desired convergence of educational institutions, employers, and government. The design should have the express purpose of educating the future employment sector in Uptown. It should also generate the desire to live and work in an area that offers an urban environment in a resilient region, poised to remake itself into a competitive, livable, and connected urban village center. The concept infill and greenways plan is illustrated in Appendix D.

Moving Forward with the Right Implementation Tools to Turn the Uptown Urban Village Center into Reality

The redevelopment of the Uptown Urban Village will depend on a series of implementation tools to demonstrate the City’s commitment to moving forward with the Uptown Vision. Those changes will require partnerships and the involvement and investments by community stakeholders, local government, and private landowners. The tools discussed below include those that are currently available, those that may become available, and those yet to be implemented. They include creative financing tools that can complement the recommended land use plan and zoning regulation adjustments and help governmental agencies coordinate the orderly infrastructure improvement funding necessary to build a strong core and encourage redevelopment.

Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) and Other Financing Tools

The Florida legislation creating CRAs allows a city to leverage its tax base in areas where the physical or economic deterioration of a target area requires investment and specific actions to help bring about change. As the CRA regulations have matured through the legislature and the courts, specific adjustments, controls, and limitations have been imposed on what CRAs can do. Those changes have generally strengthened CRAs. The evolution of the law has reflected due process and is a barometer of the current thinking on the topic. However, action by the Broward County Board of County Commissioners to cease the establishment of all future CRAs in Broward County is not encouraging. If the city is ultimately allowed to proceed with new CRAs in Broward County, it should strongly consider an Uptown Urban Village CRA as a mechanism for funding considerable infrastructure improvements necessary for the Uptown Vision to come alive.

Other financing tools include a variety of dependent and independent district tools available to governments to assist in the funding of new and improved infrastructure to support growth and sustainability. The key to utilizing those tools is for government to have the support of its leadership to facilitate an active and creative exchange of ideas among all stakeholders. The private sector must take a lead in the planning and visioning and also become active in the funding and implementation process to encourage the positive changes needed to create a true urban village. Property

Figure 68: Wrapping parking structures with residential and/or retail uses will activate the street level and ensure that pedestrians or those driving by are not looking at blank walls. Shown here are examples from Mizner Park, FL (left) and Boulder, CO (right; photo by Kyle Gradinger).
owners’ associations and not-for-profit business alliances are also tools available to the private sector, property owners, and other stakeholders.

**Supportive Zoning and Land Use Regulations**

One early step is to change the city's land development regulations and the comprehensive plan future land use map to allow mixed-use development and redevelopment as outlined earlier in this report. The Uptown Urban Village vision calls for a major change in the urban fabric to a compact, walkable pattern. A vital companion to redevelopment of the land pattern is adoption of a Complete Streets transportation mobility plan. To succeed, Uptown needs to provide employees and residents the freedom to use all modes of travel. That begins with creating a more walkable environment that includes the multiway boulevard sections, sidewalks, paths, and trails described in the Uptown Urban Village vision.

**Use of Vacant Lots and Parking Structures**

The limited number of vacant parcels creates one of the most significant hurdles in creating a village-like setting because realizing the Uptown Vision is largely dependent on redevelopment versus greenfield development. Redevelopment is further complicated by land values and ownership structures. However, many surface parking lots are ideal candidates for redevelopment, a resource that would not be available in every market. The existing office parks in the Uptown submarket generally offer enough concentration (employees and square footage) to support a parking garage.

In addition, the strong land values in the area due to the limited land supply in Broward County should support the economics of a higher and better use than surface parking.

Although structured parking is encouraged, it should be developed with care. Parking garages should avoid blank walls facing or overlooking pedestrian-oriented streets and other public spaces and require liner buildings with active ground floor uses. As shared parking is analyzed and on-street parking is introduced code parking requirements should not be in contradiction to the Uptown Urban Village Vision.

**A Redevelopment Facilitator**

Because of the many hurdles and complexities, such as existing zoning codes, approvals, ownership, capital structures, and financing conditions affecting the ability to develop a site, a task force should be formed (possible through Envision Uptown) to work hand-in-hand with landlords to help encourage and assist with moving forward.

One approach is to partner with well-respected multifamily and/or retail developers who can help form marketable plans with specific property owners on target parcels. That will help shift the focus from an interesting vision to a real opportunity. One such redevelopment opportunity is located just north of the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station (retail center) and south of McNab Road where a mobile home park of approximately 23 acres exists. Displacing the residents is not being suggested, but a long term redevelopment strategy surrounding that parcel should be assessed. Other opportunities include the

![Figure 69: Compact residential housing and related mixed-use development should achieve a massing and placement that achieves a street-level pedestrian environment.](image)
park and ride site at I-95 and Andrews Avenue, the parking lot next to the rail station, and vacant parcels owned by the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport.

**The Importance of Branding and Programming**

The TAP recommends that Envision Uptown and other community groups clearly define and brand the Uptown Urban Village Vision and its guiding principles. They also should also create marketing tools to drive both awareness and development, using all forms of media (print, news, and social). Those materials should showcase the area, the available incentives, and the development opportunities. Outreach should target the brokerage and development communities. Programming a full calendar of events to bring the Uptown area alive is also critical to the area’s success. This is the type of activity for which the Envision Uptown could be responsible.

**Achieving the Required Residential Development**

The area proposed for the Uptown Urban Village lacks the blend and density of multi-family residential uses required to create an active district. The closest residential units are primarily single family home and townhome communities and are not within walking distance of the Uptown Village Center location. The TAP recommends targeting compact multi-family residential development within the gateway hub areas and in/around the existing office parks. Infill residential development will start to create the residential base required to support future, active retail uses and allow people to live and work within the neighborhood. Residential densities should range from 50 to 150 dwelling units per acre.

Higher density should be concentrated near major roads and the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station, transitioning to lower intensities closer to existing single-story/low-rise residential development. The height and location of residential development should take into account the requirements of the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport. Increasing compact residential patterns should be addressed in the form based zoning code for the Uptown Urban Village. Code requirements can be used to avoid superblocks and encourage the creation of a pedestrian-scaled block pattern of development.

Broward County’s affordable housing requirements also need to be considered. Although providing affordable housing for working-class professionals is important for the diversity and vibrancy of the area, a requirement of that nature is not recommended for the early years of the area’s rebirth. It is important to get development kick-started and minimize potential barriers to entry. However, affordable housing requirements should be re-analyzed as development in the submarket progresses. Such an analysis should occur on a set schedule to address political, social, and/or citizen concerns with the requirement’s early exclusion. As shown in Appendix E, Existing Housing Stock Resales Data (3 mile radius of the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport), the area already offers a range of housing choices. Over 79 percent of the residential transactions in the last three months are less than $175,000 and over 50 percent are less than $125,000.

---

**Figure 70: Well-thought out and crafted branding and use of marketing and outreach tools are also essential.**
Public Parks

Creation of public parks within walking distance of the residential target areas is crucial to encouraging more urban forms of development where open space is provided through public areas as opposed to a behind the “gates” location. Each residential project will most likely still have its own amenity areas, such as gyms and a pool, but large outdoor common areas should be provided through the public realm just as they are in the downtown cores of major cities.

Active Ground Floor Uses

Active ground floor uses are very important to help achieve the Urban Village Center Vision. The ground floor spaces in new buildings should be designed to accommodate commercial uses, however ground floor retail uses in those spaces should only be required in target areas and on streets where leasing the space is likely. That will avoid what has happened in other South Florida developments where ground floor retail uses were required, creating spaces in challenging locations based upon visibility, market demand, and/or parking that have remained vacant. Within those retail spaces, professional office and other market-driven uses should be allowed as long as they are set up with windows and doors on the sidewalk, similar to the way a small doctor’s or accounting office would be in an old main street setting. Optimally, ground floor uses such as restaurants, cafes, coffee shops, dry cleaning, a small grocery, and pharmacy would serve the neighborhood. Appendix F, Road Change Progression, illustrates how ground floor retail, combined with a complete street, can activate a previously underutilized corridor.

Incentives

To help encourage development in a more urban-like form, an incentive system should be crafted that grants density bonuses and/or impact fee credits based upon implementing a menu of desired outcomes. Such a menu should include green building practices and climate resiliency strategies. If an incentive system is implemented, the density ranges suggested above might need to be adjusted so that desired outcomes are still acceptable under the assumption that an average number of menu items are implemented and bonuses granted.

One area for incentives involves addressing the older office space in the Uptown. It is crucial that the Uptown Urban Village remain competitive in attracting and retaining corporate users. Competition from newer, more modern office parks in areas such as Sunrise and Weston must be taken into account, although both lack the requisite walkability. Modernization of existing office space is important for the village to remain competitive and attract quality tenants and, ultimately, jobs. An incentive-based program sponsored through local government and predicated on job creation should be created to encourage reinvestment in the office stock. Programs could include tenant improvement allowances, financing mechanisms, and permit discounts/credits.

The office buildings with frontage on the local arterials could convert a portion of their ground floor space into active uses. Therefore, a program should be implemented to encourage that conversion (an expedited approval process for example). Some buildings already have small cafés and cafeterias that

Figure 71: The Citrix Operational Headquarters (left) in Uptown provides a good example of a mini-park where employees can gather and relax. Urban trails (right) provide green elements in the public realm that can provide pleasant way to move from one destination to another.
are not known and/or inaccessible to the general population. For example, the Trade Centre South building has a small café on an upper floor that is only open to tenants and building guests. That building provides direct access to the Cypress Creek Tri-Rail station and should have located the café on the ground floor to serve both the building and rail passengers.

**Leverage Currently Available Resources**

The Uptown area offers a number of essential strategic assets (highlighted below) that can be leveraged to make the Uptown Urban Village Center a reality.

**Envision Uptown**

Leverage the dedication and commitment reflected by Envision Uptown, an organization created by a group of landowners, developers, and heads of major corporations located on Cypress Creek Road. Envision Uptown is the core group with which to start a dialogue about next steps in the process of revitalization, redevelopment, and place making. Members of the organization have already been meeting and strategizing to help make the Uptown area competitive in an ever changing marketplace. The city could look to Envision Uptown to provide a number of important roles.

- Serve as a first source for committed stakeholders to assist in the planning charrettes necessary to define the vision and create the regulating plan and form based code to implement development and redevelopment.
- Provide a modest piece of the matching funds necessary to fund the next steps planning effort, in conjunction with the Broward MPO and city of Ft. Lauderdale.
- Investigate the formation of an improvement district for the Uptown greater area. Such a district could supply implementation funding for a variety of necessary activities to advance to Envision Uptown vision described earlier in this report.
- Manage the marketing and branding of the Uptown greater area and coordinate programming to draw people to the area and maintain their interest. A strong programming initiative is a critical component to the success of the Uptown area.

The TAP recommendation to redesign Cypress Creek Road within the Uptown core is an essential ingredient in achieving a multi-modal, mixed-use, and economically competitive urban center that is a desirable live, work, play environment. Although the recommended multiway boulevard design can be viewed as disruptive, it is through such disruption that meaningful change can occur. Strong city leadership, collaboration and dedication by all stakeholders will be required to see this vision emerge, regardless of the difficulty.
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**The Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport**

Leverage the general aviation Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport that has become and will continue to be a regional economic engine. Supporting the airport’s expansion and growth will be a positive contributor to the success of the Uptown Urban Village. All stakeholders should work together to expand the airport’s brand and role in the region. They should also work with the airport to encourage an entrance design statement along Cypress Creek Road. Another action would be for the airport to evaluate to what extent an Uptown greenways system could be encouraged on portions of its land outside the airport primary property.

**Robust Employment Base**

Leverage the current 70,000-worker employment base that travels from outside the Uptown area and at the end of the day does not stay and shop or meet friends at the local coffee shop but rather heads for their cars and seeks the quickest vehicular route to either I-95 or Florida’s Turnpike. The first step is giving them a reason to stay in the area after work, and the second is to provide a reason to want to live in the revitalized Uptown Urban Village. Initial strategies could include, among many other events:
• Organizing a restaurant food truck invasion in an established employer's location, preferably located along Cypress Creek Road to help promote the event and the Uptown area.

• Holding a party in the park where kids can have a great play experience (for families who might not live in the area but work there). The idea is to show them that there is life and vision and excitement in the Uptown area.

Remember that the employee of tomorrow is the millennial of today and they have a very different view of what the ideal workplace is or should be, as well as every institution sacred to the older generations. The numbers tell the story. Only 26 percent of millennials were married by the time they were 32 years old, compared to 36 percent of Generation X, 48 percent of Baby Boomers, and 65 percent of the Silent Generation. The differences in thinking are dramatic, and so is their view of where and how they will choose to live. Those leading the reinvention of Uptown need to be prepared to accommodate that critical workforce.

Educational Institutions

Leverage the educational institutions in Uptown and encourage more to locate there. The convergence of education, employers, and entrepreneurs in one place will establish the creative employment environment needed to encourage innovation and new product creation and the deployment of that new product into the marketplace. Only then will Uptown begin to compete with and win the best and the brightest minds and become the desired location for corporations to locate into the region and relocate from within the region.

Talent

Leverage the city's significant talent in planning for the Uptown Urban Village. That should include working collaboratively with the Broward MPO, SFRTA and other agencies. Together these organizations working in partnership with Envision Uptown and other civic organizations, agencies, businesses, and property owners can and will create a highly successful, resilient, livable, and exciting 24-hour Uptown Urban Village that will have a positive and lasting impact on the region.
APPENDIX A: TAP AGENDA

ULI Southeast Florida/Caribbean Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) Workshop
Uptown Urban Village – City of Fort Lauderdale
August 12 & 13, 2014

Tuesday, August 12

11:45 am – 3:00 pm  Panel arrives, tour of study area & lunch
                    Meet at Broward MPO Offices Building
                    Trade Centre South, 100 W. Cypress Creek, Fort Lauderdale

3:00 – 4:00 pm      Workroom Time, Presentation on Cypress Creek Mobility Hub by the Broward MPO
                    Broward MPO Conference Room
                    Trade Centre South, 100 W. Cypress Creek Road, Suite 850, Fort Lauderdale

4:00 – 5:30 pm      Panel discussion with stakeholders
                    Broward MPO Offices, Board Room
                    100 W. Cypress Creek Road, Suite 850, Fort Lauderdale
                    This meeting is open to the public.

5:30 – 6:30 pm      Hotel check-in (if needed) and break
                    Sheraton Suites, 555 NW 62nd Street (Cypress Creek Blvd.), Fort Lauderdale

6:30 – 8:30 pm      Dinner & discussion
                    Sheraton Suites, Private Room, 555 NW 62nd Street (Cypress Creek Blvd.), Fort
                    Lauderdale

Wednesday, August 13

7:30 – 8:30 am      Breakfast at hotel for those staying at Sheraton Suites

8:30 – 10:00 am     Panel work session, Broward MPO Offices, Conference Room

10:00 – 10:15 am    Break

10:15 am – 12:30 pm Panel work session continued

12:30 – 1:30 pm     Working lunch

1:30 – 3:00 pm      Panel work session continued

3:00 – 3:30 pm      Break

3:30 – 4:30 pm      Panel review of draft report & power point presentation

4:30 – 5:30 pm      Presentation of draft report; Questions & Answers
                    Broward MPO Offices, Board Room
                    This meeting is open to the public
APPENDIX B: Tour Route

UPTOWN URBAN VILLAGE - Tour Route
August 12, 2014, 11:45 am – 3:00 pm

11:45 am – Group meets in Lobby of the Broward MPO Office Building – Trade Centre South, 100 W. Cypress Creek, Fort Lauderdale – 33309

STOP 1
Corporate Park
   Workforce One, Stryker, Bosch, Broward College, and Citrix
   FDOT property
Points of Interest to next stop:
   Airport perimeter, planned improvements, free trade zone, etc.

STOP 2
Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport (FXE)
   Lunch
   Meet panel and provide background.
Points of Interest to next stop:
   City College
   Transition from commercial to industrial to residential development

STOP 3
Calvary Church
Points of Interest to next stop:
   Proposed FXE Perimeter Walking Path
   Palm Aire Neighborhood
   City of Tamarac
   Barry University
   Kaiser College
   Former FAU Campus – vacant lot
   Twin Lakes Neighborhood
   CSX Railroad Line

STOP 4
Proposed site for Schlitterbahn Waterpark & Sports Village
Points of Interest to next stop:
   Powerline Road – observing walkability and bikability of the area

STOP 5
Cypress Creek Tri-Rail Station
   Transit Connections including Uptown Link Trolley Service
   Introduction of Potential Transit Oriented Development Area (core)

STOP 6
Microsoft Corporation
Points of Interest to next stop:
   Cypress Creek Station Shops

FINAL STOP
Diner on West side of Cypress Creek Road
   Disembark trolley and walk back to Broward MPO Offices for pedestrian experience.
APPENDIX C: REDEVELOPMENT AREAS AND INNOVATION ZONE
Bike lanes in Vancouver.
APPENDIX E: EXISTING HOUSING STOCK RESALES DATA
(3 MILE RADIUS OF THE FORT LAUDERDALE EXECUTIVE AIRPORT)