

5.0 HOUSING

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The HOUSING element is required to be included within the Comprehensive Plan per requirements of State planning law and rule criteria. Specifically, Chapter 163.3177(6)(f), Florida Statutes establishes the HOUSING element requirements and Chapter 9J5.010, Florida Administrative Code establishes minimum criteria to guide its preparation.

This element contains a summary of the data, analyzes and support documentation necessary to form the basis for the future housing Goal, Objectives and Policies.

In keeping with the requirements of Chapter 9J5.005 and 9J5.010, Florida Administrative Code, the HOUSING element is structured according to the following format:

- Housing Data;
- Housing Analysis; and
- ~~Housing Goal, Objectives and Policies.~~

5.2 HOUSING DATA SUMMARY

An overview of conditions pertinent to the preparation of the HOUSING Goal, Objectives and Policies statements established in the Comprehensive Plan are presented in sections that follow.

5.2.1 Housing and Household Characteristics (Update)

~~Although there are only 51 acres of vacant residential land within the City at this time, there is more than an adequate amount to accommodate projected residential growth and development. The City housing stock consists of 605 single family, 447 multi family and 95 mobile home units.~~

As reported in the City's most recent Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR), adopted in January, 2009, there have been expansions to the corporate limits through annexation in recent years, but the increase in residential growth has been minimal. The limited amount of residential growth has been represented by in-fill development of residential areas and by some conversions from agricultural uses. Low density residential development continues to dominate the housing stock in South Bay. Single family, duplexes, multiple family and mobile home units are the housing types represented.

5.2.1.1 Housing and Residential Development

The University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) estimated that South Bay had 836 permanent, year-round units (households) in 2008; up from 833 units reported in 2007. In 2000, the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse (Shimberg analysis) reported 805 units (households). So, the increase to the housing stock in South Bay since 2000 has been minimal; averaging a mere 0.5% increase per year.

Approximately 9% of the total land within the existing corporate limits is Vacant and available for future development. The amount of land available from Vacant lands for future residential development, therefore, is limited. However, it is anticipated that some of the current agricultural lands will be available for residential development (See TABLE 3-7, FUTURE LAND USE PROJECTIONS, in the FUTURE LAND USE element).

There are three (3) mobile home parks and two (2) child care facilities and two (2) family foster homes located in South Bay; while, three (3) structures in the City are listed on the Florida Master File.

~~New housing growth, as evidenced by recent population estimates (Ref: TABLE 3-6; FUTURE LAND USE element) has been modest since 1990. In accord with City records the Shimberg Center's Affordable Housing Needs Assessment in 1995, there are presently a total of 1147 permanent housing units in South Bay. In 1990, the U.S. Census reported a total of 1242 housing units. A special Census in 1992 identified 1194 housing units. Current numbers reflect an approximate seven percent increase in the housing stock during the 1990—1995. This conclusion is substantiated by a history of building permit activity evidenced in the City during the 1990—1995 period (Ref: Table 5-1) coupled with the fact that demolition activity has occurred during that time.~~

~~During the 1990-1995 planning period, South Bay Growers, Inc. closed its operations in the City. Subsequently, South Bay Growers has prohibited the occupancy of the approximately 200 unit "Villa Lago" residential development. The City is currently pursuing methods to facilitate the occupancy of the Villa Lago Development.~~

~~According to Table 5-2, 813 housing units were constructed in the City during 1960 to 1980 period. Adding units constructed since that time (i.e. estimated at 260 units) leads to the conclusion that 86.3% of the housing stock in the City has been constructed since 1960, with the balance 13.7% constructed prior to that time.~~

~~The housing stock within South Bay in 1995, constitutes a minute share of the Countywide totals. approximately .02% of the 430,710 total units reported by the 1995 Shimberg Center Affordable Housing Needs Assessment. The U.S. Census reported that~~

there were 556,428 households in the County in 2000. Whether this is compared to the 805 households reported in 2000 by the Census for South Bay (0.14% of the County households) or to the 836 permanent households reported for the City in 2008 by BEBR, the City's percentage of the total number of households Countywide continues to be extremely minor. With the limited amount of residential development expected in South Bay in the future, it is reasonable to assume that the City will continue to contribute a very minor percentage of the overall Countywide housing stock in both the short term (5-year) and long term (10-year) planning periods of the Comprehensive Plan.

5.2.1.2 Household Characteristics

Characteristics of the housing within the City including type, tenure, rent, value, and monthly costs and cost-to-income ratio are examined in this section and compared with those characteristics exhibited Countywide. The most current statistics available for an inventory and analysis of this type is the ~~1990~~ 2000 U.S. Census and the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse (Shimberg) analysis.

Nearly all housing in South Bay continues to be occupied housing units. In 2000, the U.S. Census reported a total of 935 housing units in South Bay. Of that total, approximately 87.5% of all total housing units were reported by BEBR as permanent, year-round units (households). In 2008, BEBR estimated that 90% of all housing units in South Bay were occupied units; or 836 housing units. This occupancy rate continues to be substantially greater than the 73% reported Countywide. Occupied units are defined as housing with "year-round" occupancy. It is expected that nearly all housing units and households in South Bay will be classified as "year-round" occupied housing units in both the 5 and 10-year planning periods of the Comprehensive Plan.

The majority occupied housing units in South Bay continues to be owner-occupied. It was reported by the 2000 U.S. Census that approximately 58.5% of all occupied housing units were owner-occupied. Therefore, the percentage of renter-occupied units was estimated at 41.5%. The most recent estimate provided by the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse (Shimberg) for 2005 revealed that the percentage of owner-occupied units had increased slightly to 59.2% while the percentage of renter-occupied units had decreased slightly to 40.8%. Even though there is no available data from the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse (Shimberg analysis) projecting owner-occupied and renter-occupied rates, it is expected that the majority of housing units in South Bay will continue to be owner-occupied in both the 5 and 10-Year planning periods of the Comprehensive Plan. It is further expected that there will be more conversions in the Villa Lago development from rental to owner-occupied units in the future which further supports this claim.

TABLE 5-1

TOWN OF SOUTH BAY
BUILDING PERMIT ACTIVITY 1980-1987

<u>Single Family</u>	<u>Multi Family</u>	<u>Mobile Home</u>	<u>Net Total Units</u>
14	(21)	10	3

Source: University of Florida, Shimberg Center 1995 Affordable Housing Needs Assessment

TABLE 5-2

COMPARATIVE AGE OF YEAR ROUND HOUSING UNITS

<u>Year Built</u>	<u>Number of Units</u>	
	<u>Palm Beach County</u>	<u>City of South Bay</u>
1939 or Earlier	11,408	13
1940-1949	11,258	10
1950-1959	38,503	146
1960-1969	63,110	373
1970-1979	145,234	440
1980-1984	95,717	108
1985-1988	80,453	117
1989-1990	15,982	35

Source: University of Florida, Shimberg Center, 1995 Affordable Housing Needs Assessment.

NOTE: A 1992 Historical Site Survey identified 3 homes more than fifty (50) years of age (see Appendix A).

Comparative tenure characteristics are presented on Table 5-3. Of the 1242 housing units reported in 1990 by the U.S. Census, 564, or 45.4%, were owner-occupied while 678, or 54.6%, of the units were reported as renter-occupied. Owner and renter-occupied statistics represent “year-round” occupancy, while the remainder (19%) are vacant or “occasional use” units. The City has a higher rental vacancy rate, 14.4%, than the County’s 12.8%, while the City’s homeowner vacancy rate, 0.4%, is significantly lower than the County’s 3.8%. The City has substantially higher percentage of renter-occupied units than the County as a whole; 54.6% to 24.4%, respectively.

In 2008, BEBR estimates that 10% of the total households (approximately 930 total units) in South Bay is comprised of seasonal residents. Therefore, in 2008, it was estimated that of the 930 total housing units, approximately 93 units were seasonal and vacant units and 836 units were reported as permanent, year-round units..

The 1990 Census indicates a total vacancy rates for housing units in South Bay of 11.4%. During the 1989-1995 planning period, the 200-unit Villa Lago development and a “barrack type” farmworker multi-family development at the southern end of SW 12th Avenue were closed, thereby, reducing the amount of total units in the City’s housing stock by 200+ units. Such a rapid change has increased the demand for housing in the City to the point where the vacancy rate is believed to be somewhere between 1.3% and 2.4%. The vacancy rate is approximated by assuming the total number of housing units, 1242, (1990 Census) is reduced by 212 units (200 units in Villa Lago and 12 units in barracks) resulting in 1042 total units. The number of occupied units, 1017 as reported by the Census, is then subtracted from the total units (1030 total units—1017 occupied units) to arrive at a total vacant units (13 units). The number of vacant units (13) is then divided by total units (1030) to arrive at the approximate vacancy rate of between 1.3% and 2.5%. A limited amount of variability is allowed due to the approximation of total number of units reduced by the closing of the farmworker housing complexes. Therefore, although the Census reported a rather high vacancy rate (11.4%) demand for housing within the City is high, the current situation has changed as described. A fairly common vacancy rate is approximately 5% which usually indicates normal turnover. Due to the closing of Villa Lago (200 units) and the SW 12th-Avenue farmworker multi-family development, the City has determined the current vacancy rate to be approximately 1.3% to 2.3% indicating the high demand for housing in the City.

It was estimated that approximately 1000 people were affected by closing of the two previously mentioned developments. Subsequently, a 1994 Glades Empowerment Study estimated that in 1994 approximately 100 families were on a waiting list for apartments at the South Bay Public Housing site and nearly 500 families had expressed interest in an infill housing program. This large demand for housing further indicates that demand for housing is clearly ahead of supply. It is estimated that there are currently between 13 and 28 vacant units available for resident occupancy. This estimate is based upon the total number of units available for resident occupancy as reported by the Census and modified to account for the two closings discussed previously. This compares to a 7.8% vacancy rate in Palm Beach County (as reported by the Shimberg Center) in 1990.

TABLE 5-3

Household Characteristics

Owner occupied	45.4%
Renter occupied	54.6%
Vacant/Occasional Use	1.3%
Homeowner Vacancy Rate	0.4%
(Palm Beach County)	2.0%
Rental Vacancy Rate	14.4%
(Palm Beach County)	12.8%
Monthly Gross Rent (1990)	
South Bay	\$323
Palm Beach County	\$587
Monthly Gross Mortgage (1990)	
South Bay	\$434
Palm Beach County	\$869
Medium Value of Swelling Units (1990)	
South Bay	\$50,900
Palm Beach County	\$98,400

Source: 1990 U.S. Census

Comparative monthly gross rent (i.e. 1990) data, for Palm Beach County and South Bay are presented on TABLE 5-4A while monthly rent to income ratios (i.e. 1990) for renter-occupied units in the City are presented in TABLE 5-4B. The median monthly rent for renter-occupied units in South Bay was \$224 in 1990 as compared to \$499 for Palm Beach County. In terms of affordability, it is generally concluded that a rent to income ratio of 30% or less is an acceptable rate. With limited additional liabilities (e.g. car payments, commercial loans, etc.) acceptable rates can be raised to 35% to 45% of household income. On this basis, it is difficult to determine the affordability level of rental housing from data presented on TABLE 5-4B other than to conclude that approximately 52% of the rental units are reasonably priced in relation to renter income levels. Comparative value (i.e. 1990) of non-condominium owner-occupied housing data for Palm Beach County and South Bay are presented on TABLE 5-5A while comparative monthly costs (i.e. 1990) for owner-occupied units are presented on TABLE 5-5B and owner cost to income ratios (i.e. 1990) for owner-occupied units in the City are presented on TABLE 5-5C.

TABLES 5-4A

MONTHLY GROSS RENT OF RENTER OCCUPIED UNITS, 1990

<u>Contract Rent</u>	<u>Dwellings</u>	
	<u>Palm Beach County</u>	<u>South Bay</u>
< \$200	9467	292
\$250-499	39,527	202
\$500-749	36,356	5
\$750-999	7152	
\$1000+	5060	
Total	97,562	499
Median	\$499	\$224

Source: 1990 U.S. Census

TABLE 5-4B

RENT TO INCOME RATIO FOR RENTER OCCUPIED UNITS, 1990

	<u>Palm Beach County</u>	<u>South Bay</u>
<20%	25,593	202
20%-24%	15,160	65
25%-29%	12,442	21
30%-34%	9099	37
35%+	34,643	209
Not Computed	5348	16
Total	102,285	550
Median	28.4%	25.0%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census

TABLES 5-5A

VALUE OF OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING, 1990

Value	Dwellings Palm Beach County	Dwellings South Bay
<\$50,000	12,080	176
\$50,000-99,000	71,662	186
\$100,000-149,000	34,902	5
\$150,000-199,000	18,282	
\$200,000-299,000	13,057	
\$300,000+	12,892	
Total	162,875	367
Median	\$98,400	\$50,900

Source: 1990 U.S. Census

TABLE 5-5B

MONTHLY OWNER COSTS OF OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS, 1990

Mortgage Status and
Selected Monthly Owner
Costs

	Palm Beach County	South Bay
Owner-Occupied Housing Units with a Mortgage	116,584	230
<\$300	2941	39
\$300-499	12,497	94
\$500-699	21,426	79
\$700-999	35,503	12
\$1000-1499	26,443	6
\$1500-1999	8752	0
\$2000+	9022	0
Median	\$871	\$434

Source: 1990 U.S. Census

The median value of owner-occupied units reported in 1990 was \$50,900 in South Bay, as compared to \$98,400 for Palm Beach County. The most commonly occurring value range was \$50,000-99,000 in the City and in the County. South Bay reported that 68% of the owner-occupied units were valued at less than \$60,000 per unit. South Bay reported no condominium units in 1990.

The 1990 Census reported a median monthly cost of owner-occupied housing in South Bay of \$434 for those units with a mortgage and a median cost of \$194 for those without a mortgage. This compares to median values in the County of \$871 for units with a mortgage and \$241 for those units not mortgaged. Both South Bay and the County reported that monthly costs varied greatly for housing units with a mortgage.

According to the State Department of Community Affairs, if a 30% cost-to-income ratio is exceeded, it is often difficult to obtain a mortgage. The 1990 U.S. Census revealed that 75% of the owner-occupied units exhibited a cost-to-income ratio of less than 30%. Using the 30% “rule of thumb”, it appears that the housing stock is affordable in terms of income levels exhibited by City residents.

TABLE 5-5C

OWNER COST TO INCOME RATIO FOR OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS,
1990

Owner Cost to Income Ratio	<\$10,000	\$10,000 19,999	\$20,000 24,999	\$35,000 49,999	\$50,000+
<20%	0	26	76	27	54
20-24%	18	4	17	0	0
25-29%	0	0	52	0	0
30-34%	0	0	3	0	0
35%+	30	48	6	0	0
Not Computed	6	0	0	0	0

Source: Shimberg Center 1995 Affordable Housing Needs Assessment

Most single family structure in South Bay are forty (40) to fifty (50) years old. The U.S. Census reported in 2000 that most single family structures in South Bay had been built in the 1970's; approximately 37% (340 of 931 structure reported in 2000). Another 23.2% of all single family structures were reported to have been built in the 1960's while another 21% were built in the 1980's.

Housing values are substantially lower in South Bay than housing values Countywide. In 2006, the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse (Shimberg) reported that the “average”

value of a single family unit in South Bay was \$73,987 compared to \$442,598 Countywide. There were no mobile home or condominium values reported for South Bay; however, it is expected that these housing values would also be substantially lower than those reported for Palm Beach County; mobile home average value - \$67,504 and \$247,770 for condominium units.

The “average” selling price of housing units is also substantially lower in South Bay than the selling price of housing Countywide. In 2006, the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse (Shimberg) reported that the “average” selling price for a single family unit in South Bay was \$129,000 compared to \$572,160 Countywide. The “median” sales price for a single family unit in South Bay was \$143,000 in 2006 while the “median” sales price of a single family home was \$375,000 Countywide.

In 2006, the selling price of a single family unit continued to be higher than the reported value of the homes. However, since 2006, there has been a substantial decline in the housing market not only in South Bay and Palm Beach County, but countrywide as well. Therefore, until the housing market bottoms out, it is expected that the housing market will continue to be depressed in the immediate future; therefore, housing values are expected to continue to decline, or bottom-out, during the short term planning period of the Comprehensive Plan with a hopeful resurgence in values during the long term planning period.

The median gross rents in South Bay are less than in Palm Beach County as a whole. The 2000 U.S. Census reported median monthly gross rent in the City of South Bay was \$461 compared to \$739 Countywide. The trend is expected to be similar in the 5 and 10-Year planning periods.

In 2000, less than one-half of the owner-occupied housing in South Bay were reported as having mortgages. The 2000 Census reported that 233 of the 479 occupied households in South Bay were carrying mortgages (48.6% of all households) while 246 of the households (51.4% had no mortgage. With the limited development projected for the 5 and 10-Year planning periods, the percentage of mortgaged units is expected to increase some with conversion of more rental units (Villa Lago development primarily) to owner-occupied units.

Household incomes are classified as “Very Low”, “Low” and “Moderate and Above”, and for South Bay are measured against median incomes of families in Palm Beach County. Households with less than 50% of the County median income are considered to be households with “Very Low” incomes. Households with incomes between 50% and 80% of the County median income are considered to be “Low” income households. Households with incomes of greater than 80% of the County median are classified as “Moderate and Above” income households. In 2005, the Florida Housing Data

Clearinghouse (Shimberg analysis) indicated that 59.2% of household incomes in South Bay were in the “Moderate and Above” range. Contrarily, the percentage of households with “Very Low” and “Low” incomes combined represented approximately 40% of all households; 21.5% classified as “Very Low” income households and 19.3% of all households classified as “Low” income households.

Household incomes in relation to the cost of housing determine the “Cost Burden” of households. “Cost Burden” is expressed in terms of percentage of household and housing related costs. If less than 30% of household income is spent on housing, it is determined that “No Cost Burden” on the household. If between 30% and 50% of household income is spent for housing, then a “Cost Burden” is being placed on the household. Further, if greater than 50% of household income is spent for housing, then a “Severe Cost Burden” exists. Based on these classifications, the degree of “Cost Burden” can be determined for the various household income levels described above for South Bay households in 2005.

In 2005, most households in South Bay were determined to have “No Cost Burden” in terms of meeting their overall housing costs; however, the percentage of households facing a Cost Burden” was significant. In 2005, the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse (Shimberg analysis), revealed that 70.6% of all households were experiencing “No Cost Burden” in the provision of housing. The remaining 29.4% of households were experiencing a “Cost Burden”: 17.1% experiencing a Cost Burden” and 12.3% facing a “Severe Cost Burden”. As noted earlier in this section, nearly one-half of all households were not carrying a mortgage which would decrease the cost burden on those households.

It is projected in this EAR that growth and residential development expected in South Bay during the timeframes of the updated Comprehensive Plan will be limited. The potential and projected amount of growth expected in the short term (5-Year) and long term (10-Year) planning timeframes of the updated Plan should not change the status of housing affordability in South Bay.

5.2.2 Housing and Living Conditions

The ever increasing cost of new homes will more than likely place additional cost burdens on South Bay residents into the 5 and 10-year planning periods. Therefore, it is important to stress the necessity to maintain the quality of the existing housing stock through effective building and housing codes and code enforcement.

Definitions for evaluating housing conditions are updated and adopted by the City in Policy 1.2 under OBJECTIVE 1 in the HOUSING element of the Comprehensive Plan. The following definitions are used:

Standard Condition – A residential structure meeting all minimum standards for basic equipment and facilities, as set forth in the current Florida Building Code.

Substandard Condition. – A residential structure which does not meet all minimum standards for basic equipment and facilities, as set forth in the current Florida Building Code, as determined by the Building Official, where the costs of rehabilitation, renovation or code compliance are valued at less than 50% of the total value of the structure.

In Need of Replacement – A residential structure which does not meet all minimum standards for basic equipment and facilities, as set forth in the current Florida Building Code, as determined by the Building Official, where the costs of rehabilitation, renovation or code compliance are valued at greater than 50% of the total value of the structure.

The City has a substantially higher percentage of substandard housing than is evidenced in Palm Beach County as a whole. In 2000, the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse reported that 282 housing units, or 32.1% of all units in South Bay, were overcrowded. This compared to 5.4% Countywide. Twenty six (26) units, or 3.2% of the housing stock, did not have heating facilities compared to 2.1% Countywide. Twelve (12) units, or 1.3% of all units, lacked completed kitchen facilities in South Bay compared to 0.5% Countywide, and thirteen (13) units, or 1.4%, lacked complete plumbing facilities compared to 0.4% Countywide.

Housing conditions are closely monitored by the Building Official and Code Enforcement Officer, and strict enforcement of building and housing codes have maintained good housing conditions in South Bay.

The City follows the Florida Building Code and other local addendums in regard to plumbing, mechanical, electrical and other building and housing regulations. These codes have been amended and updated periodically.

~~There are several measures which can be used to evaluate housing stock and living conditions within the City, including: age of structure; over crowding; the lack of certain necessary facilities; structural integrity; and Standard Housing Code requirements. Specific indicators of sub-standard housing or living conditions for each of the above measures are as follows:~~

- ~~1. Age of Structure – Housing unit constructed prior to 1940 (Source: Palm Beach County Planning Division).~~
- ~~2. Over Crowding – 1.01 persons per room or more within a dwelling unit.~~
- ~~3. Lacking Adequate Facilities – Housing unit lacking complete electrical or plumbing facilities, heating and cooking facilities and/or complete kitchen facilities or a housing unit containing such facilities, but not meeting code requirements.~~

4. ~~Structural Integrity~~— Obvious damage, such as cracking, sagging or deterioration to the following structural components: foundations or flooring; exterior walls; roofs; and doors.
5. ~~Code Violations~~— The City has adopted the Standard Housing Code . The code incorporates the following definition of unsafe residential buildings:

~~“All residential buildings or structures used as such which are unsafe, unsanitary, unfit for human habitation or which constitute a fire hazard or are otherwise dangerous to human life, or which in relation to existing use constitute a hazard to safety or health by reason of inadequate maintenance, dilapidation, obsolescence or abandonment, are considered unsafe buildings.”~~

The Housing Code further states:

~~“All such unsafe buildings are hereby declared illegal and shall be abated by repair and rehabilitation or by demolition...”~~

~~It is recommended that the above facilities be utilized by the City as a basis for code enforcement. The following discussion outlines a rationale which can be used for preparing definitions of “standard” living and housing conditions in terms of five measures listed and defined above.~~

~~From Table 5-2, it can be observed that only 13 units within the City were constructed prior to 1940. Since only 1% of the housing stock was constructed prior to 1940, it is concluded that AGE OF STRUCTURE does not, in itself, raise any issues regarding overall substandard living and housing conditions within the City.~~

~~An over-crowded condition is normally defined to occur when there are greater than 1.01 persons per room in a dwelling unit (note: excludes bathrooms, open porches, utility rooms, unfinished attics, etc.— rooms not used for “living” purposes). The 1990 Census reported that 28.9% of the occupied housing units in South Bay were overcrowded based upon the application of this criterion. On this basis, OVER CROEDING raises a serious problem within the City regarding overall substandard living and housing conditions.~~

~~The 1990 Census reported that 97.3% of the occupied, year round housing stock had complete plumbing facilities, 98.9% had complete heating facilities, 98.2% had complete cooking facilities, 98.2% had complete kitchen facilities, and 64.5% had telephone availability. Although the level of availability is relatively high, it is concluded that LACK OF FACILITIES is of concern regarding overall substandard living and housing conditions within the City.~~

5.2.2.2 Neighborhood Strategy Area

As part of the Palm Beach County Community Development Block Grant Program, a detailed survey of housing conditions in South Bay was completed in 1986. As result of this survey, a Neighborhood Strategy Area (NSA) was defined. The boundaries of the NSA, illustrated on FIGURE 5-1, are as follows: North—NW 2nd Street; South—SW 3rd Street; East—U.S. Highway 27; and West—all properties bordering on SW and NW 12th Avenues. During the planning period, the NSA was expanded to include the neighborhood north of the FEC Railroad and West on U.S. 27, in addition to the addition to the area west of U.S. 27, south of FEC rail lines and north at the large agricultural area in the southerly area of the City. As part if the Glades Housing Plan, prepared by the Palm Beach County Community Development Division (PBCCDD), a windshield survey of housing conditions within the NSA was performed. It was stated that the windshield survey was lonely a preliminary check on the conditions of NSA households and that a total inspection of the units defined as in need of rehabilitation was necessary to determine those which actually could be salvaged by renovation and those which needed to be demolished. The windshield survey identified a total of 485 year round housing units within the NSA, of which 161 are single family homes and 324 multi family units. Of the single family homes, 56 (34.8%) were identified as violating municipal electrical, plumbing and structural codes, while 31 (19.2%) were defined as “unfit for human habitation”, meaning that continued occupancy may be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the residents. Of the multiple family units within the NSA, 121 (37.3%) were identified as violating municipal electrical, plumbing and structural codes, while 63 (19.4%) were defined as “unfit for human habitation”. Based upon the results of the PBCCDD survey, it is concluded that South Bay has substantial housing problems related to the condition of the housing stock.

In October of 1988, the City employed a full-time Code Enforcement Officer with funds from the PBCCDD. Since that time, the City has initiated demolition consent orders on 61 units with a majority of those located within the NSA. Inspection and enforcement actions to date have been concentrated within the NSA, however the program will eventually be City wide in focus.

The STANDARD HOUSING CODE has not been adopted by the City; however, Code enforcement action to date has focused upon electrical, plumbing and structural code violations.. Therefore, violation of the Standard Housing Code cannot be used at this time as a basis to raise any issues regarding substandard living and housing conditions within the City.

However, since substandard living and housing conditions is a major issue within the City at this time, based upon work completed within the NSA, it is necessary to prepare appropriate housing conditions definitions. Timely preparation and implementation of definitions will allow the institution of appropriate programs oriented to improving the

Neighborhood Strategy Area

(Delete in Update)

FIGURE 5-1

5.15

~~current quality of living and housing conditions. Since no definitions currently exist, they will be prepared as part of the Goal, Objectives and Policies section of this element. Issues to be addressed in their preparation include: public nuisance; attractive nuisance; danger or detriment to human life, health and safety; over crowding; adequacy of equipment and/or facilities; sanitary and structural condition.~~

5.2.3 Subsidized Housing

There are a number of programs for subsidized housing, primarily at the federal level. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds numerous rental housing subsidy programs. Major federal programs include the traditional Public Housing Program, Section 8, Section 202, Section 312, Section 221d3 and Section 236. Some of these programs are not presently being funded for additional construction; nevertheless housing constructed or rehabilitated under these programs in the past continues to serve the occupants and provide for additional tenants when vacancies occur.

In addition to HUD programs, other rental and owner subsidy programs are funded by the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA), U.S. Department of Agriculture. FmHA's rental programs include the Section 515 rental housing program and the Section 514/516 Farm Labor Housing program. Subsidized housing may also be produced under general community assistance programs such as Palm Beach County Community Block Grants (CDBG) and the Urban Development Action Grants (UDAG).

~~During the 1989-1995 planning period and just prior to the period, a number of dilapidated dwellings were demolished and several units were reconstructed and/or rehabilitated. Through a City administered CDBG program, 9 new infill replacement homes have been constructed and 6 more will be constructed shortly. The City has acquired a parcel of land in the northwestern area of the City through the RICO Act. A portion of this property is proposed to be developed with approximately 100 affordable single family homes. In order to acquire funding for and encourage development of this property, the City coordinated with the Business Development Board of Palm Beach County and the Glades Economic Development Task Force. At present, the future residential development of this property is proposed to be a zero lot line single family home project to be constructed by Pulte Home Corporation.~~

~~During the planning period (1994) the City's largest employer South Bay Growers announced its closing and ceased operations. This closing left 1300 people unemployed including approximately 511 of the City's residents. In addition, a 192 unit housing project operated by the South Bay Growers (Villa Lago) was closed. The closing of this project reduced the total housing stock of the City by approximately 15.4%. The City is~~

~~currently evaluating the possibility of purchasing the “Villa Lago” project as well as other housing owned by agri-business that have been closed.~~

Other assisted housing can be constructed through State and local programs. The State of Florida established the Florida Housing Finance Agency which through the sale of bonds, provides funding for low and moderate income households. ~~The Palm Beach County Housing Finance Authority can provide the same function on a Countywide level. Subsidized housing projects within South Bay are listed on TABLE 5-6.~~

Since its inception as a City, housing in South Bay has been primarily supplied by the private sector. However, there are three (3) publicly subsidized housing developments located within the City which are available to those qualifying for those units. Both the public and private sectors have adequately provided housing to accommodate the needs of City residents at various income levels, and this trend is expected to continue in the future.

5.2.4 Group Facilities and Homes

The Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services operates a number of programs licensing group homes and foster care facilities. These group homes serve adults and children, and generally are operated by private or non-profit sponsors. The programs and types of group homes inventoried here are:

Children, Youth and Families (CYF):

Family Group Homes (Troubled Youth)
Foster Family Group Homes (Dependents)
Licensed Child Caring/Child Placing Facilities

Division of Developmental Services (DDS):

Long Term Residential Care (LTRC) Facilities
Centers for Independent Living

Aging and Adult Services:

Adult Congregate Living Facilities (ACLF)
Nursing Home (NH)

An inventory of current facilities in South Bay licensed under these programs is presented on TABLE 5-7.

TABLE 5-6

SUBSIDIZED HOUSING DEVELOPMENT, 1987
SOUTH BAY

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year Built</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Units</u> <u>Type</u>
<u>CONVENTIONAL ASSISTED HOUSING</u>			
<u>Hex Street</u> <u>(P.B.C. Housing Auth.)</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>Rental (Townhouse)</u>
<u>Tripp Addition</u> <u>(PBCHD/FmHA)</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>Owner (Single Family)</u>
<u>South Bay Villas</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>Rental (Apartment)</u>

SECTION 8 PRIVATELY OWNED RENTAL HOUSING PROGRAM
N/A

REHABILITATION PROGRAMS IN CDBG TARGET AREA
N/A

SECTION 221D RENTAL HOUSING FOR LOW AND MODERATE INCOME FAMILIES
N/A

SECTION 202 HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED
N/A

SECTION 515 RURAL RENTAL HOUSING
N/A

Source: Palm Beach County Housing and Community Development

* Palm Beach County Housing Finance Authority Funded; built and managed by
NOAH DGI Corp., a non-profit corporation.

TABLE 5-7

INVENTORY OF GROUP HOMES IN
THE CITY OF SOUTH BAY

Division of Children, Youth & Families

<u>Program/Facility Name</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Location</u>
Child Care/South Bay Child — Care Center	N/A	625 Palm Beach Rd.
Child Care/Frazier Family Day	N/A	270 N.W. 12 th St.
Child Care/Mims Family Day	5	490 S.W. 1 st St.

Developmental Services Division

Family Foster Home/EPPS	2	140 N.W. 7 th Ave.
Family Foster Home/Morris	4	185 N.W. 6 th Ave.

Aging and Adult Services

N/A

5.2.5 Mobile Homes

City has three licensed mobile home parks; Starling Trailer Park (35 lots) located on U.S. Highway 27, Northmoor Trailer Park (21 lots) located on Staste Road 80 and Henderson Trailer Park (56 lots) located on U. S. Highway 27. There are no mobile home subdivisions within the City.

5.2.6 Historically Significant Housing

The State of Florida Master File is a listing of structures over fifty years of age in the State of Florida. In 1992, the City of South Bay initiated a study to evaluate the presence of potentially historically significant structures within the City. The study concluded that there were no historically significant housing units within the City, however, there were approximately 3 structures which were over fifty years old (See Appendix A). These structures have been added to the Florida Master File. The City should annually monitor the age of the existing housing stock and coordinate with the Department of State to identify structures which may be of potential architectural or historical significance. There is no housing in South Bay identified on the National Register of Historic Places, nor have any been designated by the City.

5.3 HOUSING ANALYSIS

5.3.1 Housing Projections

The University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) estimated that South Bay had 836 permanent, year-round units (households) in 2008; up from 833 units reported in 2007. In 2000, the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse (Shimberg analysis) reported 805 units (households). So, the increase to the housing stock in South Bay since 2000 has been minimal; averaging a mere 0.5% increase per year. It should be noted that the prison population (nearly 30% of the City's population count) is considered in these household counts.

The City's current housing stock continues to consist of mostly single family housing units with a lesser amount, but nearly equal, number of multiple family units. There duplexes scattered throughout the City, and the three (3) mobile home parks have approximately 95 lots total to accommodate one mobile home per lot.

The future land use projections presented in the FUTURE LAND USE element of this Support Documentation predicts that overall growth in South Bay is expected to be relatively insignificant both in the short term and long-term planning periods of the Comprehensive Plan; 1.3% increase predicted between 2008 and 2013 and 3.0% between 2013 and 2018. However, growth in the residential sector is expected to be more significant; primarily in expectation of low density growth in the north section of the City. It is estimated that approximately 25 acres of low density residential development will occur during both the 2008 and 2013 timeframe and the 2013 -2018 planning period. If developed to maximum allowable density of 6 dwelling units/acre, nearly 300 units of new low density residential (50 acres X 6 dwelling units/acre = 300 housing units), or 150 units per each planning period is anticipated.

Virtually no growth is expected in the high density or mobile home park areas in either planning period. Likewise, relatively no growth is expected in medium density residential development during the short-term planning period, but some modest medium density growth is expected in the second 5-year planning period.

It is estimated that there will still be approximately 65 acres available for future development after the 10-year planning timeframe of the Comprehensive Plan. Future conversion of agricultural lands is expected as the State purchase of much of this land is affected. Although conversions will bring a mix of uses, it is hoped that economic development can be spurred by future non-residential uses that, in turn, will provide a need for future new and improved opportunities in the City of South Bay.

The South Bay population was estimated at 4027 residents in 1994 (Ref: TABLE 3-6; FUTURE LAND USE element). Applying an estimated average household size of 3.55

persons per unit (Ref: TABLE 3-6; FUTURE LAND USE element) results in an estimated 1134 resident occupied housing units in 1994; approximately 98.8% of the total housing stock which was surveyed at 1147 units. The housing stock of the City currently consists of the following components: single family—605 units (52.8%); multi-family—447 units (39.0%); and mobile homes—95 (8.2%). Vacant residential land analyses (Ref: TABLES 3-11A and 3-11B; FUTURE LAND USE element) indicate that the remaining residential build out potential of the City is 495 units consisting of the following zoning based components: single family—199 units (40.2%); multi family—228 units (46.1%); and high density—68 units (13.7%). When existing housing stock (1147 units) is added to remaining build-out potential (495 units) it is concluded that total residential build out (1642 units), it is concluded that the total residential build out of the City is 1642 units consisting of the following components: single family—804 units (59%); multi family—743 units (45%) and 95 mobile homes (6%). The above estimates are based upon the assumption that no agricultural lands will be converted to residential uses. If a comparison is made between the components of the projected total build-out situation and the components of the current housing stock, particularly in light of the relatively low projected growth, it can be concluded that the current population and housing characteristics of the City (Ref: TABLE 3-9; FUTURE LAND USE element) will remain relatively unchanged throughout the short-term and long-range planning periods. (NOTE: It is recognized that household income statistics will increase due to inflation during the planning periods). Based upon population projections (Ref: Section 3.3.4; FUTURE LAND USE element) and anticipated development the following table presents total housing stock projections.

Due to the relatively stagnant growth trends experienced by the City in recent years, anticipated growth is based upon currently proposed projects. The construction of the Wackenhut Correctional Facility (completed in 1997) is expected to positively effect the economy of the City and is anticipated to stimulate an additional demand for housing in the City. The proposed single family home development to be constructed by the Pulte Home Corporation will consist of approximately 100 affordable, zero lot line single family homes. Therefore, due to past growth in the City, the Pulte Project constitutes the only significant anticipated residential growth for the City. It is expected that construction of the 100 single family homes will occur during the 1995-2000 planning period. For planning purposes, the City has utilized the year 2015 as a “theoretical” date for build out. The closing of South Bay Growers has significantly impacted the City of South Bay rendering the projection of future growth somewhat difficult to accomplish with any degree of accuracy. The construction of the Wackenhut Correctional Facility is anticipated to have significant positive economic effects upon the community. The proposed development of the Commerce Park is also anticipated to positively effect the economic future of the City. Although positive economic impact stemming from the development of these projects are anticipated, the degree of impact and date that the projects will be complete is difficult to predict with any degree of specificity. However, it is felt that the majority of the proposed Commerce Park will be constructed by the year

2015 and that the City will experience the full economic impact of the prison and the Commerce Center during the 2000-2015 period. Therefore, the City has predicted build-out of all potential residential areas by 2015.

UNIT TYPE	UNITS		
	1987	1994	1999
Low	592	642	678
Medium	352	382	403
High	276	299	315
Mobile Home	55	55	55
Total	1275	1378	1451

Land requirements necessary to accommodate the above projections are shown on TABLE 3-13 of the FUTURE LAND USE element.

Land requirements necessary to accommodate the above projections are shown on Table 3-25 TABLE 3-7, FUTURE LAND USE PROJECTIONS of the FUTURE LAND USE element.

5.3.1.2 Household Characteristics Projections

The number of current resident-occupied households in the City is estimated at 1134 (i.e. 1994 population — 4027 and a 3.55 persons per household average). Projections of total household growth, based upon resident population projections, anticipated development and estimated average household sizes (Ref: TABLE 3-11; FUTURE LAND USE element) are presented on the following table:

	1994	2000	2015
Households	1134	1309	1629

The above estimates have included the assumption of an adequate number of vacant units to meet or exceed the rate defined by the 1990 Census.

Projections of population and housing characteristics, based upon the assumption that the current character of the City will be maintained, are presented in TABLE 5-8.

Due to the condition of the housing stock, as evaluated in Section 5.2.2 of this element, it is concluded that normal maintenance of residential properties during the short and long-range planning periods will preclude the need for renovation and replacement activities.

TABLE 5-8

PROJECTED POPULATION AND HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS
CITY OF SOUTH BAY

	<u>1994</u>
Population	3960
Per Capita Income (\$)	6572
Households	985
Household Income	
— % less than \$5000	15.5
— % \$5000 – \$9999	9.4
— % \$10,000 – \$14,999	14.0
— % \$15,000 – \$24,999	23.1
— % \$25,000 – \$34,999	18.9
— % \$35,000 – \$49,999	11.4
— % \$50,000 – \$74,999	4.9
— % \$75,000 – \$99,999	1.1
— % \$100,000 – \$149,999	1.7
— % \$150,000 and over	0.0
— Median (\$)	20,561
Age	
— % 0 – 20	44.0
— % 21 – 64	50.4
— % 65+	5.6
— Median	24.0
Occupied Units	
— % Renter	45.4
— % Owner	54.6
Households	
— Average Size	3.55
Race	
— % White	22.8
— % Black	60.5
— % Asian/Pacific	0.1
Islander	
— % American Indian/Eskimo/Aleut	0.0
— % Other	16.5
— % Hispanic Origin	29.8

SOURCES: 1990 Census

1994 Florida Estimates of Population BEBR.

~~Further, due to the character of the City and its agricultural orientation, the City continues to anticipate some need for farmworker housing despite agricultural closings and more mechanized harvesting practices. While some of the permanent residents may be employed in agricultural concerns, most farmworkers are imported. Therefore, physical facilities are difficult to determine separately.~~

5.3.1.32 Housing Delivery Process

~~From its beginning, housing in South Bay has been primarily supplied by the private sector. Household income levels (Ref: TABLES 3-8 and 3-9; FUTURE LAND USE element), in relation to housing construction costs (Ref: TABLE 5-1) housing values and rents (Ref: TABLES 5-4A and 5-5A), vacancy rates (Ref: TABLE 5-3) and the substandard quality and condition of the housing stock (Ref: Section 5.2.2) lead to the conclusion that public sector assistance will play an increasing role in meeting defined housing needs throughout the 1995-2005 planning periods of the Comprehensive Plan. Vacant land patterns substantiate this conclusion also. In addition to the proposed Pulte Homes Development, additional Residential development will consist of "in-fill" within existing, established residential neighborhoods whose current declining character has established a set of negative conditions for any remaining growth. Agricultural conversions will also account for some additional residential growth in the future. Available programs and the City's current participation therein are discussed in Section 5.2.3. On this basis, it is further concluded that public/private participation in the housing delivery process is critical to meeting City housing needs.~~

~~Indicators of the cost of housing are presented in Table 5-5A. In 1990, the median value of owner-occupied housing units in South Bay was approximately 50% (\$50,900) of that for median values in Palm Beach County. Apart from the proposed 100 affordable single family homes, a majority of future residential development will consist of infill within established residential neighborhoods where current land and construction costs will dictate unit selling prices unless public sector participation is implemented. It is expected that new housing costs, unless subsidized in some manner, within the stated historical ranges can be expected. Rental housing demand will continue to be met primarily by existing supply due to the lack of population growth, unless additional replacement activities are initiated.~~

5.3.2 Alternative Housing Issues/Affordability

Limited growth and development within the existing corporate limits of South Bay; changing economic conditions; and, changing market conditions are parameters that have a direct effect on the amount, type, cost and affordability of future housing in South Bay.

The amount of additional future housing to be expected in the short and long term planning periods have been analyzed in the Housing Projections sub-section of this ele-

ment and has been determined to be highly unpredictable because of uncertain market conditions and the other factors cited above. However, expansion and improvement to the existing housing stock is expected to be about the same in the short and long term planning periods. The amount of additional housing will be directly affected by the availability of land for future development and the densities allowed in those areas. The City dictates this growth through densities established in the Comprehensive Plan and the residential districts in it's Zoning Ordinance.

In 1994, the City's largest employer at that time, South Bay Growers, ceased operations. This closing left 1300 people unemployed and the 192 rental unit development that housed its workers (Villa Lago) was closed. This situation and displacement of persons created a significant problem. Since its closing, some of these units have been converted to ownership units and others are expected; however, the situation needs to be continually addressed by the City as best as possible

The City of South Bay continues to participate in the Palm Beach County Community Development Block Grant Program in an effort to provide standard and affordable housing to those in need.

The City continues to anticipate some need for farmworker housing despite agricultural closings and more mechanized harvesting practices. While some of the permanent residents may be employed in agricultural concerns, most farmworkers are from out of the area. Therefore, physical facilities continue to be difficult to determine separately.

The City recognizes the needs of special populations such as the elderly, single parent households, persons of disabilities and farmworkers through the establishment of Objectives and Policies in its adopted Comprehensive Plan and the necessity of coordinating with those organizations that specialize in these needs. Likewise, the Comprehensive Plan also recognizes the importance of developing and maintaining partnerships between housing providers and organizations interested in water and energy conservation.

The City recognizes the value and need for mobile homes within South Bay as an alternative housing type. The City allows for mobile homes within South Bay through the MHRP, Mobile Home Rental Park zoning district within the Zoning Code.

Since its inception as a City, housing in South Bay has been primarily supplied by the private sector. However, there are three (3) publicly subsidized housing developments located within the City which are available to those qualifying for those units. Both the public and private sectors have adequately provided housing to accommodate the needs of City residents at various income levels, and this trend is expected to continue in the future.

~~An analysis of household income and age group statistics from TABLE 3-8 (Ref: FUTURE LAND USE element) in relation to housing values, monthly costs of housing without a mortgage and rent to income and owner cost to income ratios (Ref: TABLES 5-5A, 5-5B and 5-5C) lead to the conclusion that low and moderate income households (i.e. less than \$16,262 per year in 1990) consists primarily of renters and young families.~~

~~Rental unit vacancy statistics from TABLE 5-3 (i.e. 14.4%) indicate that supply is meeting demand (NOTE: a 5% vacancy rate is indicative of an equilibrium situation where supply equals demand, accounting for a normal turnover of tenants); However, the high percentage of over-crowded units (Ref: Section 5.2.2.1) indicates that vacancy rate statistics are misleading and that an under supply of affordable rental units may exist. On this basis, it is concluded that replacement and/or renovated housing based upon the analysis of conditions in Section 5.2.2 is the primary concern, as opposed to constructing additional supply to meet future population growth based demand. It is further concluded that low to moderate income owners will consist primarily of young families.~~

~~The above analyses, coupled with the relatively small projected growth in the City (Ref: Section 3.3.7; FUTURE LAND USE element) leads to the conclusion that current demographic and housing characteristics will remain consistent throughout the short-term and long-range planning periods. As discussed previously, the recent completion of the Wackenhut Correctional Facility and proposed development of the South Bay Commerce Park are anticipated to stimulate the economic vitality of the City. The positive economic effects of the prison and new commerce park should, in turn, positively effect incomes within the City due to increase in the number of jobs anticipated to increase demand for housing, thereby providing an incentive for development of housing by the private sector through the construction of new development and rehabilitation of existing development.~~

5.3.2.1 Availability of Services

Infrastructure services are currently in place to serve projected growth in all areas in all urbanized areas of the City, although additional upgrading may be required. Wellfields; water treatment facilities and distribution mains provided by the GUA; wastewater collection and transmission mains (currently provided by the City) and treatment and disposal facilities (currently provided at the regional treatment facility in Belle Glade); drainage systems and primary roads; and solid waste disposal systems are in place and have capacities to accommodate the projected residential growth in South Bay. In this vein, the Palm Beach County Housing Authority and Community Development Program has provided funds on many occasions to the City through the spent in excess of \$4,500,000 within the South Bay NSA since the inception of the Community Development Block Grant Program since its inception in 1975. In summary, funds were spent for the following types of infrastructure improvements: sidewalks; swale and drainage refurbishment; main construction; street paving; installation of stormwater

drains; and recreation facilities. In addition to infrastructure improvements, approximately \$245,000 has been spent for land acquisition for low and moderate income housing and \$316,550 has been spent for housing replacement, demolition and rehabilitation. An overall strategy for addressing needed improvements can be developed through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program.

5.3.2.2 Substandard Housing Conditions

Substandard housing conditions are discussed at some length in Section 5.2.2. Strategies are currently being continue to be developed to address housing conditions in South Bay, the defined Neighborhood Strategy Area (NSA). The City is currently working with the County Housing and Community Development Division to effectuate strategies to alleviate substandard conditions defined within the South Bay NSA. Substandard housing conditions in the City have been addressed by the Palm Beach County Housing and Community Development Division in the Glades Housing Plan. It was concluded in this Plan that the construction of ten single family homes and, at a minimum, sixty multi-family units within the South Bay NSA would be a positive beginning towards alleviating substandard living conditions. During the 1990-1995 planning period and just to the period, a number of dilapidated dwellings were demolished. Through a City-administered CDBG program, 9 new infill replacement homes have been constructed and 6 more will be constructed shortly. During the 1989-1995 Planning Period the City was generally successful in meeting the need for single family units but was unsuccessful in meeting the multi-family target.

Also, there will likely be considerable displacement of NSA residents due to demolition or rehabilitation of housing units. Therefore, funds will also be needed for temporary and/or permanent relocation. And, because a substantial percentage of these housing units are beyond repair, further funds will be needed for demolition and clearance.

In order to totally eradicate substandard housing conditions and meet the housing needs described above, it is projected that the following activities and associated costs are necessary:

~~—Housing Construction Costs~~

— 10 Single Family Homes	— \$420,000
— (9 homes complete 1990-1994)	
— Average 1200 sq. ft. @ \$35/sq. ft.	
— Site Improvements	— 84,000
— 60 Multi Family Homes	— 2,415,200
— Average 1150 sq. ft. @ \$35/sq. ft.	
— Site Improvements	— 523,250

~~The amount reflects costs originally estimated in the Glade Housing Plan necessary to alleviate present substandard conditions found in the South Bay Neighborhood Strategy Area (NSA). However, it was stated that this figure was an estimate which is subject to change based upon the increasing needs of NSA residents.~~

~~It was concluded that the initial housing development activities as outlined above, are an appropriate beginning towards providing clean, safe and affordable housing for the residents of the South Bay NSA. Efforts on the part of individual owners are currently being encouraged by the City in the form of Code enforcement actions. In this regard, the City employed a Code Enforcement Officer in November, 1988.~~

~~Although no specific definitions of sub standard housing were used to evaluate Town housing stock in Section 5.2.3, the application of several measures lead to the conclusion that there are no defined concerns regarding potential sub standard housing conditions at this time. Definitions for Standard Condition, Substandard Condition and In Need of Replacement are established in the HOUSING element of the Comprehensive Plan which are used to measure substandard living and housing conditions. City responsibilities are expected to continue consisting of monitoring and enforcement of the Florida Building Code.~~

5.3.2.3 Very Low, Low and Moderate Income Housing

Household incomes are classified as “Very Low”, “Low” and “Moderate and Above”, and for South Bay are measured against the median incomes for a family of four in Palm Beach County. Households with less than 50% of the County median income are considered to be households with “Very Low” incomes. Households with incomes between 50% and 80% of the County median income are considered to be “Low” income households. Households with incomes of greater than 80% of the County median are classified as “Moderate and Above” income households. Nearly 60% of all households in South Bay have “Moderate and Above” household incomes. In 2005, the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse (Shimberg analysis) indicated that 59.2% of household incomes in South Bay were in the “Moderate and Above” income range. Contrarily, the percentage of households with “Very Low” and “Low” incomes combined represented approximately 40% of all households; 21.5% classified as “Very Low” income households and 19.3% of all households classified as “Low” income households.

Household incomes in relation to the cost of housing determine the “Cost Burden” of households. “Cost Burden” is expressed in terms of percentage of household income spent for housing and housing related costs. If less than 30% of household income is spent on housing, it is determined that “No Cost Burden” exists. If between 30% and 50% of household income is spent for housing, then a “Cost Burden” exists. Further, if greater than 50% of household income is spent for housing, then there is a “Severe Cost Burden” on the household. Based on these classifications, the degree of “Cost Burden” can be determined for the various household income levels described above for South Bay households in 2005.

In 2005, most households in South Bay were determined to have “No Cost Burden” in terms of meeting their overall housing costs; however, the percentage of households facing a Cost Burden” was significant. In 2005, the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse (Shimberg analysis), revealed that 70.6% of all households were experiencing “No Cost Burden” in the provision of housing. The remaining 29.4% of households were experiencing a “Cost Burden”: 17.1% experiencing a Cost Burden” and 12.3% facing a “Severe Cost Burden”. As noted earlier in this section, nearly one-half of all households were not carrying a mortgage which would decrease the cost burden on those households.

It is projected that growth and residential development expected in South Bay during the timeframes of the updated Comprehensive Plan will be limited. The potential and projected amount of growth expected in the short term (5-Year) and long term (10-Year) planning timeframes of the updated Plan should not change the status of housing affordability in South Bay.

The Shimberg analysis concluded in 1995 that there was a deficit of housing units for very low income homeowners and renters, and had projected that that this deficit of affordable housing would continue to increase through 2010. As noted above, the percentage of those households witnessing a “Cost Burden” was about 30% in 2005. Although the circumstance has improved, there still is a significant number of households in South Bay experiencing a “Cost Burden” in the provision of affordable housing that needs to be recognized.

The costs for housing and projected “Cost Burdens” have been determined to have some effect on future homeowners and renters. Therefore, it has been determined that future housing should be affordable, for the most part, in South Bay. However, for that sector of the population having a difficult time meeting future housing costs, alternative housing types, and ordinances, need to be investigated that could further promote housing affordability.

The City has worked closely in the past with HUD, Palm Beach County Housing and Community Development, NOAH Development Corporation, Farmers Home Administration and others to analyze and provide improvements to housing conditions. The City continues to participate in the Palm Beach County Community Development Block Grant Program in an effort to provide standard and affordable housing to those in need.

~~Affordability is defined in the rental market as paying no more than 30 percent of income towards rent, consistent with the federal definitions of cost burden. Affordability for owner occupied housing units is defined as purchasing a home that costs approximately 2.11 times the household annual income. The 2.11 number, calculated by the Florida Housing Finance Agency based on experience with their ownership programs, is designed to reflect the price of home a household can afford consistent with their ability~~

to make a down payment, their other debts, and the interest rate and term of a loan. The affordability table illustrates households by income and tenure with 1995 occupied units by price or rent. It then compares the number of units in a given price range to the number of households corresponding income range and examines the difference between units and households.

During the planning period, the State of Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) adopted a new methodology for the determination of need for affordable housing to be included in all municipal Comprehensive Plans. In order to assist local municipalities with the new assessment methodology, DCA performed the required affordable housing needs assessment for the entire State of Florida.

TABLE 3-9.5

CITY OF SOUTH BAY
CUMULATIVE SURPLUS/DEFICIT OF AFFORDABLE OCCUPIED UNITS
BY INCOME CATEGORY

<u>Income Categories</u>		<u>Owner-Occupied Units*</u>				<u>Renter-Occupied Units*</u>			
		<u>1995</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2010</u>
30% of median	\$9,757	54	62	67	76	126	139	146	157
Very Low 50% of median	\$16,262	37	54	67	83	114	96	85	71
Low 80% of median	\$26,019	152	125	104	75	132	107	94	78
Moderate 120% of median	\$39,029	93	60	30	4	42	14	2	15
200% of median	\$65,048	23	9	38	70	0	27	37	54

* Households minus units, positive number means deficit of affordable units.

SOURCE: Shimberg Center of the University of Florida, 1996 Affordable Housing Needs Assessment.

TABLE 3-9.5 above represents the Shimberg Center's Assessment of the City of South Bay's Affordable Housing needs.

The Shimberg Center has assessed that in 1995 there is a deficit of housing units for very low income homeowners, and for very low income renters and has projected that the deficit of affordable housing units affordable to these groups will increase slightly by 2010. It should be noted that the Shimberg Center has identified a surplus of both owner occupied and renter units affordable to the low income households in the City. The surplus of rental units affordable to low income households indicates that while there is a projected deficit for very low income households, housing in general is more affordable in South Bay than as compared to the majority of Palm Beach County. As mentioned previously, the City is pursuing the re-opening of the Villa Lago development to provide

~~additional housing opportunities for City residents. During the 1995–2000 planning period, the City should continue to pursue the re-opening of the Villa Lago Development and cooperate as appropriate with the private sector in order to facilitate the provision of housing affordable to all income levels.~~

~~Discussions in Section 5.3.1.2, and as referenced in the 1996 Shimberg Center Affordable Housing Needs Assessment as referenced above, led to the conclusion that the private sector delivery process has not adequately provided housing to accommodate the needs of the City residents at various income levels, particularly in light of housing conditions noted. It is anticipated that this will continue to be the case throughout the short-term and long-range planning periods. Therefore, it is recommended that public and non-profit housing assistance programs, as discussed in Section 5.2.3 continue to be pursued. Efforts on the part of the City to make adequate housing available to those in need and improve housing conditions are expected to continue to center around the following activities: code enforcement; relocation of displaced residents; coordination of public/private housing construction and rehabilitation programs; and provision of infrastructure and services oriented to improving the climate for residential development activities.~~

~~As previously identified, there are currently three mobile home parks and no mobile home subdivisions in South Bay. Current capacity is 112 units. South Bay has included a MHRP Mobile Home Rental Park District within the Zoning Code; however, it is not anticipated that there will be any additional facility development due to a lack of zoned sites within the City, unless a private sector initiative is undertaken.~~

~~The City continues to anticipate some need for farmworker housing despite agricultural closings and more mechanized harvesting practices. While some of the permanent residents may be employed in agricultural concerns, most farmworkers are imported. Therefore, physical facilities are difficult to determine separately. In 1987, there were 344 dwelling units available exclusively for farmworker housing needs. As of 1995, the 200-unit Villa Lago development and a “barrack-type” multi-family development at the southern terminus of SW 12th Avenue have been closed. Both of these developments are privately owned by agri-business companies. In addition, outside of the City limits are several other housing structures on farms used for migrant farmers. In 1994, Palm Beach County prepared a Florida Glades Community Rural Empowerment Zone Study which included the City of South Bay. The study detailed the existing housing, employment and economic conditions within the Glades Area. The study included all housing issues, including farmworkers issues. The study estimated that 70% of all employment in the Glades Area is related to agricultural concerns. However, according to the 1990 U.S. Census, 32% of employment by City residents was related to farming. Because of South Bay Growers closing operations, families and individual farmworkers that may have resided in the projects listed above were forced to relocate to other housing. The very low vacancy rate (1.3%) indicates that demand is well ahead of supply. A 5% vacancy~~

rate is fairly common in housing indicating normal turnover. It is estimated approximately 1000 people were affected by these housing development closings. There are long waiting lists for public housing in South Bay, both single family homes and multi-family homes. The 1994 Glades Empowerment Study estimated approximately 100 families were waiting for an apartment in the South Bay Public Housing site and nearly 500 families have expressed an interest in the Infill Housing Program. The City cannot address the needs of housing for farmworkers isolated from other Glades area communities or Palm Beach County. The City has worked closely with HUD, Palm Beach County Housing and Community Development, NOAH Development Corporation, Farmers Home Administration and others to analyze and provide improvements to housing conditions. Attempts are being made to acquire the Villa Lago housing development and other housing owned by agri-business that have been closed.

5.3.2.4 Group Homes

Day care centers and family foster homes are the only “Group Home” facilities in South Bay at present; however, adult congregate living facilities, foster care facilities and other group home facilities may be allowed in the R-2 Zoning District (**Double check**) by Special Exception, if the City Commission finds a proposal to be in the public interest.

5.3.2.5 Conservation Activities

The City is expected to continue in the County’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program as a basis for funding renovation and rehabilitation activities. In particular, the City’s conservation activities are expected to center around continuing current inspection, enforcement, demolition and replacement/rehabilitation activities. Further, conservation by private owners is expected to be better implemented by housing code enforcement activities.