

Application No. 15

Countywide

APPLICATION SUMMARY

Applicant/Representative:	Miami-Dade County Department of Planning and Zoning/Subrata Basu, Interim Director 111 NW 1 Street, Suite 1110 Miami, Florida 33128-1972
Location:	Countywide
Requested Text Changes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Revise the 17% density bonus for not-for-profit organizations described in the Land Use Element of the CDMP to allow the density bonus to apply to residential developers (not just not-for-profit organizations) as long as it is certified that 30% of the housing units will be made affordable to low income households.2. Add a subsection to the Land Use Element entitled "Density Bonus Programs for Affordable and Workforce Housing" which consolidates the text of all existing and proposed density bonus incentives in one location. The subsection shall describe the existing 17% density bonus for affordable housing and the 25% density bonus for workforce housing, as well as the proposed 30% density bonus for affordable/workforce multifamily infill housing, and the 60% density bonus for not-for-profit or government/public sponsored affordable housing providers.
Amendment Type:	Standard Text Amendment

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff:	ADOPT AND TRANSMIT
Community Councils:	NOT APPLICABLE
Planning Advisory Board (PAB) acting as Local Planning Agency:	TO BE DETERMINED (October 6, 2008)
Board of County Commissioners:	TO BE DETERMINED (November 6, 2008)

Final Recommendation of PAB acting as Local
Planning Agency:

TO BE DETERMINED

Final Action of Board of County Commissioners:

TO BE DETERMINED

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends: **ADOPT AND TRANSMIT** the proposed amendment based on the Staff conclusions summarized below:

1. Miami-Dade County is considered one of the least affordable housing markets in the State of Florida.¹ With the area median income (AMI) in Miami-Dade County at \$49,200, few households can afford a single-family home priced at a \$320,900 or a 2-bedroom apartment with an average rent of \$1,209 without being cost burdened.² Indeed, Miami-Dade County ranks top among all counties nationwide for having the highest percentage of homeowners who are severely cost burdened.³ Severely cost burdened households pay more than 50% of their income on housing costs.⁴ Although the real estate market has experienced a downturn since 2006, the data reveals that the housing market still remains unaffordable to low income households with incomes at or below 80% of the AMI (\$39,360), as well as workforce households with incomes at or below 140% of the AMI (\$68,880). In order to address this issue, the proposed amendment seeks to encourage the development of affordable housing for workforce and low to moderate-income households through various forms of density bonuses.
2. Although there have been efforts to construct new affordable housing units, such efforts have not kept pace with the steady loss of the existing affordable housing inventory in Miami-Dade County. The major cause for the decline in affordable housing inventory was the dramatic increase in housing values that took place from 2000 to 2006. However, other factors that contributed to the loss of inventory include condominium and mobile home conversions, as well as expiring affordability periods for assisted housing. It is estimated that 24,365 rental units and 3,575 mobile homes were lost to condominium and mobile home conversions. Another 5,342 units of assisted housing may be lost to contract expiration and expiring affordability periods within the next five years. The proposed amendment seeks to increase the supply of affordable housing by encouraging development.
3. In order to address the housing needs in Miami-Dade County, Objective HO-2 of the Housing Element calls for the County to designate +/-25,000 acres by 2025 to accommodate a variety of housing types at varying densities, with a focus on developing housing for very low to moderate income households. Furthermore, Objective HO-3 directs the County to assist the private sector in providing 294,000 affordable housing units by the

¹ Living in Florida: Florida Housing Finance Corporation, 2006 Annual Report.

² US Housing and Urban Development Income Limits for Miami-Dade County was utilized for the Area Median Income (AMI); the Florida Association of Realtors and University of Florida Bergstrom Center for Real Estate Studies, "Florida Sales Report for May 2008: Single Family, Existing Homes" was used for the median sales price of a single family home; and the "Miami-Dade County Quarterly Housing Report, Second Quarter of 2008," by Reinhold P. Wolff Economic Research, Inc. was used for the average rent for a two bedroom apartment in Miami-Dade County.

³ U.S. Census 2006 American Community Survey.

⁴ 2006 American Community Survey of the U.S. Census.

year 2025, with 42% (123,480 units) of new housing available to very low, low and moderate-income households. In addition to these objectives, the *Miami-Dade County Workforce Housing Plan, 2008 to 2015* identifies sites suitable for the development of affordable workforce housing and encourages the adoption of policies and strategies to facilitate the development of such housing. The proposed amendment seeks to address and facilitate the implementation of the CDMP objectives and the *Workforce Housing Plan* by creating incentives that would encourage the development of affordable housing throughout the County.

4. The CDMP currently allows a 17% density bonus for not-for-profit housing providers that develop affordable housing for low and very low income household, as well as a density bonus of up to 25% for the development of workforce housing. To maximize the development of affordable housing and workforce housing, however, a greater variety of incentives are needed. The proposed amendment seeks to accomplish this by creating more incentives for private developers and by increasing the density bonus for not-for-profit organizations. Furthermore, the amendment encourages and facilitates the development of affordable housing by providing significant density bonuses for projects that provide mixed income housing, urban infill, transit oriented development and good urban design, as well green building. The goal of the amendment is to make housing available to low-income and workforce households, while fostering smart growth, alleviating sprawl and encouraging transit use.
5. Density regulations are often cited as barriers to housing affordability, along with factors such as construction costs, land values, regulatory fees, impact fees and taxes. These factors are deemed to be barriers to housing affordability in that they affect the profit margin of developers; thus making it less feasible to provide affordable housing without subsidies. Indeed, higher densities generally allow for a more efficient and cost effective use of the land by allowing expenses, such as building permit fees and infrastructure costs, to be divided among the total units. Conversely, lower densities tend to yield a higher per unit cost. Other benefits related to higher densities include greater flexibility in providing mixed-income housing and a variety of housing types in one development. Through higher densities, it is also possible to allow for a greater number of market rate units; thus creating a form of internal cross subsidy to off-set the cost of providing affordable housing.
6. In order to assure that issues related to compatibility are addressed, the proposed amendment requires that a special zoning overlay be created for density increases of 30% or higher. The zoning overlay shall include compatibility standards for height, scale, setbacks, landscape buffers, screening elements, recreational open space, parking, and other regulatory issues. The intent of the zoning overlay is to assure that the proposed development is compatible or made compatible with surrounding uses.
7. It is important to note that the original application to amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) called for a density bonus program that would allow up to one, two or three density category increases for certain land use categories if specific conditions were satisfied. To determine the potential impact of the application, an analysis of the proposed densities was conducted which included a countywide assessment and a review of three sample sites. The purpose of the sample sites was to determine the maximum development and the potential impact on services that the amendment could generate. The analysis revealed that the original density increases could create significant compatibility issues due to the level of intensity being proposed. With respect to services, it was found that there was sufficient water and sewer capacity to meet the maximum demand

at the three sample sites; however, there were issues related to fire rescue service, schools and roadway capacity which required mitigation. (See Appendix C for the site specific analysis.) Staff assessed the results of the analysis and considered other density options. As result, the density bonus proposed in the original amendment application was reduced to 30% and 60%. These density increases were found to be less intense, while still providing adequate incentives for the development of affordable housing.

REQUESTED TEXT AMENDMENT:

In the interpretive section of the Land Use Element, under the subsection entitled “Gross Residential Density,” revise the third paragraph as follows:

The Board of County Commissioners, or the appropriate Community Zoning Appeals Board, may approve residential development at a density up to 17 percent above the maximums provided below where ~~the developer is a not-for-profit housing provider and~~ it is certified that no less than 30 percent of the units in the development, excepting accessory dwelling units, will be priced to be affordable to low and very-low income households. In order to efficiently use, and not prematurely deplete, the finite development capacity that exists inside the Plan's Urban Development Boundary (UDB), land should not be developed at densities lower than the minimum established for each category. Exceptions to the minimums may exist outside transportation or transit corridors where such an exception would serve the interest of compatibility or protect the public health, safety, or important resources. For purposes of this paragraph, transportation and transit corridors are land areas located within 660 feet of planned Major Roadways identified on the LUP map, and within one-quarter mile from existing rail transit stations, express busway stops, future transit corridors and planned transit centers identified in the CDMP.

In the interpretive section of the Land Use Element, after the land use category entitled “Density Increase With Urban Design,” add a new section called “Density Bonus Programs for Affordable Housing,” as follows:

Density Bonus Programs for Affordable Housing: The following describes the various density bonus incentives for affordable housing and workforce housing that the Board of County Commissioners may approve:

17% Density Bonus for Affordable Housing: A density bonus up to 17% above the maximum land use designation may be approved if it is certified that that no less than 30% of the units in the development, excepting accessory dwelling units, will be priced affordable to low and very-low income households (households at or below 80% of the Area Median Income [AMI]).

25% Density Bonus for Workforce Housing: Through the Voluntary Inclusionary Zoning program, a density bonus of up to 25% may be allowed for projects that set aside residential units for workforce housing. The Voluntary Inclusionary Zoning program defines workforce as households with incomes between 65 and 140% of the County's median income.

30% Density Bonus for Affordable/Workforce Multifamily Infill Housing: A density bonus of up to 30% above the maximum allowable density may be approved for projects that are located in close proximity to transit service and provide a mix of market rate, workforce and affordable housing opportunities. Below is a list of the conditions that must be met for the 30% density bonus to be awarded:

- 1) At least 30% of the total residential units shall be priced affordable to households at or below 140% of the AMI, and no less than 20% of the total units shall be priced affordable to households at or below 80% of the AMI for a period of no less than 30 years, pursuant to a deed restriction;
- 2) The site shall have a land use designation of Low-Medium Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Medium-High Density Residential, Office/Residential, or Business and Office (Estate, Low Density or High Density land use designations shall not be eligible);
- 3) The site shall front a major roadway and be located within ¼ mile radius of transit service, which is defined as a transit station or bus stop with at least one route that provides 20 minute peak-hour headways or better during weekdays;
- 4) The location of the site shall be consistent with the guidelines for urban form;
- 5) The site is located within ½ mile radius of activity nodes with neighborhood retail establishments;
- 6) The property is located within ½ mile radius of public recreational open space or a public school, unless 15% of the site is set aside for recreational open space facilities. Recreational facilities are defined as play areas, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other active outdoor facilities.
- 7) Existing and planned public services and facilities, including water and sewer facilities, shall be adequate to serve the maximum development allowed on the proposed site; and
- 8) The development shall obtain a certification rating from LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) or a similar organization accredited by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGB); and

A maximum of 25% of the proposed building structure may be used for business and office uses if mixed use development is found to be compatible with surrounding uses.

60% Density Bonus for Not-for-Profit or Government/Public Sponsored Affordable Housing Providers: A density bonus of up to 60% above the maximum allowable density may be permitted if: 1) the developer is a not-for-profit affordable housing provider, a government/public sponsored affordable housing provider, or if the application site is publicly owned and made available for the development of affordable/workforce housing; and 2) all the conditions for the 30% Density Bonus for Affordable/Workforce Multifamily Infill Housing are satisfied. A government/public sponsored affordable housing provider is defined as a private developer or organization that has been awarded public funding or is participating in a public housing program to develop affordable/workforce housing, and/or a private developer or organization that has received approval to develop affordable/workforce housing on a County or publicly owned site either through donation of the land, a lease, or other form of legal agreement.

Density Bonus programs of 30% or higher shall only take effect upon the adoption of an ordinance for the "Multifamily Infill Housing Zoning Overlay." Upon the adoption of the aforementioned zoning overlay, approval of any density bonus of 30% or higher shall require a zoning boundary change through a resolution.

To be eligible for any of the density bonuses described above, the proposed development shall be consistent with the adopted goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan. The actual density achieved on a particular property will depend on all applicable land development regulations and compatibility standards. Sites shall be within the Urban Development Boundary, and sound urban design principles adopted by County ordinance or other binding instrument approved by action of the Board of County Commissioners must be applied. Appropriate compatibility standards must be followed to assure that the proposed development is compatible or made compatible with any adjoining or adjacent uses. Density bonuses shall not be combined and shall not apply to existing or proposed developments with vehicular entrances that are controlled or have entry gates. Furthermore, all residential units set aside for workforce housing or affordable housing should be disbursed throughout the housing development and be similar in size and type, as well as appearance on the exterior from non-set-aside units in the housing development. Prior to receiving the certificate of occupancy for market-rate units, all of the affordable housing units shall be under actual construction.

STAFF ANALYSIS

In 2006, the Florida Housing Finance Corporation indicated that Miami-Dade County had the sixth highest housing affordability gap in the State of Florida.⁵ That same year, the American Community Survey of the U.S. Census ranked Miami-Dade County top among all counties nationwide with the highest percentage of homeowners who are severely cost burdened. Severely cost burdened households spend more than 50% of their income on housing costs.⁶ Although the real estate market has experienced a down turn since 2006, there is still an acute need for affordable housing in Miami-Dade County, particularly for households that are at or below 80% of the area median income. To address this issue, the County adopted several programs intended to increase the supply of affordable housing. Some of the programs called for making County-owned land available for affordable housing. However, density restrictions, the regulatory approval process, and the cost of construction have limited the number of units that have been constructed, causing eligible sites to remain undeveloped. Indeed, efforts to construct affordable housing have not kept pace with the steady loss of the existing affordable housing inventory. It is estimated that from 2000 to 2006 approximately 24,365 rental units and 3,575 mobile homes were lost to condominium and mobile home conversions. In the next five years, another 5,342 units of assisted housing may be lost to contract expiration and expiring affordability periods.⁷ Unfortunately, those most affected by the loss of affordable housing opportunities have been workforce households and working poor families with extremely low, very low, and low incomes.

The proposed amendment seeks to encourage and facilitate the development of affordable housing by providing significant density bonuses for projects that provide mixed income housing, with a mix that includes market rate units, as well as units for workforce households

⁵ Living in Florida: Florida Housing Finance Corporation, 2006 Annual Report.

⁶ 2006 American Community Survey of the U.S. Census.

⁷ Miami-Dade County Workforce Housing Plan, 2008 to 2015, adopted July 1, 2008.

(140% of the AMI) and low income households (80% of the AMI). The amendment also encourages urban infill, transit oriented development and good urban design, as well green building. The goal of the amendment is to make housing available to low-income and workforce households, while fostering smart growth, alleviating sprawl and encouraging transit use.

The following analysis provides an assessment of the housing needs in Miami-Dade County and an overview of the barriers that affect housing affordability, including density restrictions. The analysis also provides an assessment of the proposed amendment, with site-specific examples of the amendment and potential impact on services.

Housing Need

With the area median income in Miami-Dade County at \$49,200, a single-family home priced at a \$320,900 or a 2-bedroom apartment with average rent of \$1,209 is unaffordable to most households without experiencing some form of cost burden.⁸ Housing is considered affordable when a household spends less than 30% of the total household income toward housing expenses. Households become cost burdened when their housing costs exceed 30%.⁹ Recent estimates provided in the *Miami-Dade County Workforce Housing Plan, 2008 to 2015* project that from 2000 to 2015 approximately 91,599 households in Miami-Dade County will become cost burdened.

In order to address the need for affordable housing, Objective HO-2 of the Housing Element calls for the County to designate +/-25,000 acres by 2025 to accommodate a variety of housing types at varying densities, with special attention given to developing units for very low to moderate income households. In addition, Objective HO-3 directs the County to assist the private sector in providing 294,000 affordable housing units by the year 2025, with 42% (123,480 units) of new housing available to very low, low and moderate-income households. The proposed amendment seeks to address and facilitate the implementation of the CDMP objectives by providing conditions that help to identify areas suitable for affordable housing and creating incentives to encourage the development of such housing throughout the County.

Barriers to Affordability

Factors such as construction costs, land values, regulatory fees, impact fees and taxes are often cited as barriers to housing affordability. These factors add to the cost of housing development and affect the profit margin of developers, making it less feasible to provide affordable housing without subsidies. In addition to factors that add to the cost of development, it has been found that density regulations also affect affordability. Indeed, higher densities allow for a more efficient and cost effective use of the land. For example, some building permit fees, infrastructure costs, and other expenses can be divided among the total units; thus reducing the per unit costs. Conversely, lower densities have been found to yield a higher per unit cost; thus making it less likely that developers will provide affordable housing at the lower densities.

Analysis of the Proposed Density Program

The original application to amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) called for a density bonus program that would allow up to one, two or three density category increases for certain land use categories if specific conditions were satisfied. To determine the potential impact of the application, an analysis of the proposed densities was conducted. The analysis

⁸ US Housing and Urban Development Income Limits for Miami-Dade County and Florida Association of Realtors and University of Florida Bergstorm Center for Real Estate Studies, "Florida Sales Report for May 2008: Single Family, Existing Homes."

⁹ 2006 American Community Survey of the U.S. Census.

included a countywide assessment to identify potential compatibility issues and an assessment of three sample sites.

The analysis revealed that the original density increases could generate significant compatibility issues due to the level of intensity being proposed. With respect to services, there appeared to be sufficient water and sewer capacity to meet the maximum demand. However, there were issues related to fire and rescue service, school and roadway capacity. All of the three sites yielded issues related to level of service standards after the maximum development was applied. (See Appendix C for the site specific analysis.) Given these results, the density bonus proposed in the original amendment application was reduced to 30% and 60%. These density increases were found to be less intense and helped to reduce the demand on services, while still providing adequate incentives for the development of affordable housing.

Consistency Review With CDMP Goals, Objectives, Policies, Concepts and Guidelines

The following CDMP Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Concepts will be furthered should the Application be adopted:

- LU-1C. Miami-Dade County shall give priority to infill development on vacant sites in currently urbanized areas, and redevelopment of substandard or underdeveloped environmentally suitable urban areas contiguous to existing urban development where all necessary urban services and facilities are projected to have capacity to accommodate additional demand.
- Objective LU-7 Miami-Dade County shall require all new development and redevelopment in existing and planned transit corridors and urban centers to be planned and designed to promote transit-oriented development (TOD), and transit use, which mixes residential, retail, office, open space and public uses in a pedestrian-friendly environment that promotes the use of rapid transit services.
- LU-7I. Miami-Dade County will review development incentives to encourage higher density, mixed use and transit-oriented development at or near existing and future transit stations and corridors.
- Objective HO-2. Designate by the year 2025 sufficient land (+/-25,000 acres) to accommodate sites at varying densities for a variety of housing types including manufactured homes, with special attention directed to units for extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income households, including workforce housing.
- Objective HO-6 Increase affordable housing opportunities for extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income households, including workforce options, within reasonable proximity to places of employment, mass transit and necessary public services in existing urbanized areas.
- HO-6C. Priority should be given to assisting affordable work force housing projects which are proximate to employment concentrations, mass transit, or with have easy access to a range of public services.

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Density Bonuses for Affordable Housing and Workforce Housing
(Displays the number of units per acre that the proposed density bonuses may yield by land use category.)
- Appendix B: Potential Development of Sample Sites (Includes the maximum development based on the original amendment and the maximum development with the revised density increases.)
- Appendix C: Impact Analysis of Sample Sites (Based on the maximum development for the density bonuses in the original amendment.)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A

Density Bonuses for Affordable Housing and Workforce Housing

(Displays the number of units per acre that the proposed density bonuses may yield by land use category.)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Density Bonuses for Affordable Housing & Workforce Housing

Residential Communities

Land Use	Dwelling Units Allowed	Allowed in CDMP w/out Amend			Proposal	
		Exception Granted in the CDMP	Up to 17% for Not-for-Profits**	Up to 25% for Workforce Housing***	30% Bonus	60% Bonus
Low Density	2.5 - 6	10*	7	7	---	---
Low-Medium Density	6 - 13	---	15	16	16	20
Medium Density	13 - 25	---	29	31	32	40
Medium-High Density	25 - 60	---	70	75	78	96
High Density	60 - 125	---	---	---	---	---

*Low Density allows 10 units per acre for blocks abutting activity nodes or blocks abutting section line roads between nodes

**17% density above the maximum allowed by the site's land use designation for not-for-profit housing providers if no less than 30% of units are priced to be affordable to low and very low income households.

***a site may be allowed a density increase of up to 25% of the maximum land use allowed if workforce housing units are set aside as per the Voluntary Inclusionary Zoning Program

Non-Residential Communities

If Residential Use is Adjacent or Adjoining to Site

Land Use	Dwelling Units per Acre Allowed	Adjacent or Adjoining Land Use		Allowed in CDMP w/out Amend		Proposal	
				DI-1 of Adjacent or Adjoining Use	17% Bonus	30% Bonus	60% Bonus
Business and Office Office/Residential	Allows 1 density higher than the adjacent area	Low Density	2.5 - 6	13	---	---	---
		Low-Medium	6 - 13	25	29	32	40
		Medium	13 - 25	60	70	78	96
		Medium-High	25 - 60	125	---	---	---
		High Density	60 - 125	---	---	---	---

If Residential Use is Across the Roadway from Site

Land Use	Dwelling Units per Acre Allowed	Land Use Across Roadway		Allowed in CDMP w/out Amend		Proposal	
				Density Equal to Use Across Roadway	17% Bonus	30% Bonus	60% Bonus
Business and Office Office/Residential	Allows densities equal to the use across roadway	Low Density	2.5 - 6	6	---	---	---
		Low-Medium	6 - 13	13	15	16	20
		Medium	13 - 25	25	29	32	40
		Medium-High	25 - 60	60	70	78	96
		High Density	60 - 125	125	---	---	---

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX B

Potential Development of Sample Sites

(Includes the maximum development based on the original amendment and the maximum development with the revised density increases.)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF SAMPLE SITES

SITE	82 ND Street	Gran Via*	West Dade Library
Location	8240 NW 7 Avenue	SW 127 Avenue/ 8 Street	9445 Coral Way
Gross/Net Acres	11.1 / 9.34	2.36	8.80 / 8.30
LAND USE DESIGNATION	Bus&Office (5.28 acres) Low-Med (5.82 acres)	Bus&Office (2.36 acres) (adjacent Low-Med)	Low Density

ALLOWABLE DENSITY WITHOUT AMENDMENT

Potential Development	Option 1 (Bus & Res) 75 d.u. SF attached 78,059 sq. ft. Bus	Option 1 (Residential) 59 d.u. MF	Option 1 (Residential) 52 d.u. SF detached
	Option 2 (Residential Only) 207 d.u.	Option 2 (Mixed Use) 84 d.u. MF	
	Option 3 (Mixed Use) 399 d.u. MF		

ALLOWABLE DENSITY WITH THE ORIGINAL AMENDMENT

1 Density Increase	278 d.u.	59 d.u.	114 d.u.
2 Density Increase	666 d.u.	142 d.u.	220 d.u.
3 Density Increase	1388 d.u.	---	

ALLOWABLE DENSITY WITH THE REVISED AMENDMENT

Maximum Potential Development			
17% Density Bonus	240 d.u.	68 d.u.	62 d.u.
30 % Density Bonus	262 d.u.	76 d.u.	---
60 % Density Bonus	328 d.u.	94 d.u.	---

---Does not apply

*Business and Office Adjacent to Low Med
d.u. - dwelling units

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX C

Impact Analysis of Sample Sites

(Based on the maximum development for the density bonuses in the original amendment.)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IMPACT ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE SITES (Based on original maximum impacts for one, two or three full density increases)

SITE	82ND Street	Gran Via	West Dade Library
Location	8240 NW 7 Avenue	SW 127 Avenue/ 8 Street	9445 Coral Way
MSA	4.2	6.1	5.4
TAZ (2000)	406	914	979
S-T-R	11-53-41	02-54-39	09-54-40
Gross/Net Acres	11.1 / 9.34	2.36	8.80 / 8.30
CURRENT USE			
CDMP Land Use Designation	Part A - Business and Office Part B - Low-Med Density	Business and Office	Low Density
Existing Use	"communications," "governmental" & "vacant"	"vacant"	"governmental"
Current Potential Development	Option 1 (Bus & Res)	Option 1 (Residential)	
Dwelling Units	75 d.u. SF attached	59 d.u. MF	52 d.u. SF detached
Business Sq ft,	78,059 sq. ft. Bus		
Employees	195 employees		
Population	194 Pop	158 Pop	166 Pop
Students	39 Students	28 Students	22 Students
	Option 2 (Residential Only)	Option 2 (Mixed Use)	
Dwelling Units	207 d.u.	84 d.u. MF	
Population	494 Pop	224 Pop	
Students	96 Students	40 Students	
	Option 3 (Mixed Use)		
Dwelling Units	399 d.u. MF		
Population	Pop 906		
Students	172 Students		
PROPOSED USE			
Maximum Potential Development	Option 1 (3 density increases)	Option 1 (2 density increases)	Option 1 (2 density increases)
Dwelling Units	1,387 d.u. MF,	295 d.u. MF	220 d.u. MF
Population	Pop - 3,148	788 Pop	477 Pop
Students	597 Students	387 Students	

SITE	82ND Street	Gran Via	West Dade Library
Compatibility w/ Adjacent Uses			
Adjacent Land Use/density	Low Medium Density	Low Medium Density	Low Density
Airports	None	None	None
Military Installations	None	None	None
Rock Mining	None	None	None
AVIATION	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
DERM			
Flood Protection			
County Flood Criteria (NGVD)	5.5 ft	7.5 ft	8 ft
Federal Flood Zone	X	AH	X
Hurricane Evacuation Zone	None	None	None
Biological Conditions			
Wetlands Permits Required	None	None	None
Native Wetland Communities	None	None	None
Specimen Trees	Tree Removal Permit Expired	May contain tree specimen	May contain tree specimen
Natural Forest Communities	None	None	None
Hazardous Waste	Contamination abutting site	No contamination	Contamination abutting site
Other Considerations			
Within Wellfield Protection Area	No	No	No
Archaeological/Historical Resources	None	None	None
FIRE			
Facility Serving the Site			
Station	Station 30 9500 NE 2 nd Ave	Station 58 12700 SW 6 St	Station 47 9361 SW 24 St
Equipment	Advanced Life Support (ALS) Engine and a Rescue	Advanced Life Support (ALS) Engine and a Rescue	Advanced Life Support (ALS) Engine and a Rescue
Staff	Seven (7) firefighter/paramedics	Seven (7) firefighter/paramedics	Seven (7) firefighter/paramedics

SITE	82ND Street	Gran Via	West Dade Library
Avg Travel Time in Vicinity			
Life Threatening Emergencies:	7:10 minutes	5:34 minutes	3:09 minutes
Structure Fires	4:42 minutes	No structures reported	4:13 minutes
Annual Alarms			
Current Potential Development	112 annual alarms	24 annual alarms	15 annual alarms
Maximum Potential Development	389 annual alarms	83 annual alarms	62 annual alarms
Net Difference	277	59	47
Impact	Severe	Moderate	Severe
Mitigation	Completion of planned Station 67 in 2011 (1275 NW 79 St)	Completion of planned Station 68 in 2011 (NW 112 Ave & NW 17St)	No planned stations in the vicinity
PARKS	No Objections	No Objections	No Objections
ROADWAYS			
Failing Roadways	None	SW 8 Street (127 Ave - HEFT)	None
TRANSIT	Served by Transit Service	Served by Transit Service	Served by Transit Service
SCHOOLS			
Additional Enrollment With Application	573	116	157
Elementary	275	56	77
Middle	126	25	33
High School	172	35	47
FISH Capacity (Current)			
Elementary	66%	90%	112%
Middle	61%	96%	100%
High School	77%	101%	88%
FISH Capacity (With Application)			
Elementary	101%	94%	121%
Middle	73%	99%	103%
High School	83%	102%	89%
Impact (Must not exceed 115%)	Within Capacity	Within Capacity	Exceeds Capacity

SITE	82ND Street	Gran Via	West Dade Library
SOLID WASTE	No Objections	No Objections	No Objections
WATER & SEWER			
Capacity of Water Facility	Hialeah Preston	Alexander Orr	Alexander Orr
Existing Plant Capacity			
Project GPD	182,600	29,000	108,000
Project mgd	0.18	0.03	0.11
Rated Capacity (mgd)	225.0	225.0	225.0
Treatment Capacity (mgd)	200.90	200.90	200.90
Capacity Remaining (mgd)	24.10	24.10	24.10
% Capacity Remaining	10.71%	10.71%	10.71%
Plant Capacity With Project			
New Treatment Capacity (mgd)	201.08	200.93	201.01
New Capacity Remaining (mgd)	23.92	24.07	23.99
New % Capacity Remaining	10.63%	10.70%	10.66%
Impact	Plant has Sufficient Capacity	Plant has Sufficient Capacity	Plant has Sufficient Capacity
Capacity of Sewer Facility	Central District	South District	South District
Project GPD	182,600	29,000	108,000
Project mgd	0.18	0.03	0.11
Design Capacity (mgd)	143.0	112.5	112.5
12 Month Avg Flow (mgd)	115.00	99	99
% of Design Capacity	80.42%	87.58%	87.58%
New 12 Month Avg Flow (mgd)	115.18	98.56	98.64
New % of Design Capacity	80.55%	87.61%	87.68%
Impact	Plant has Sufficient Capacity	Plant has Sufficient Capacity	Plant has Sufficient Capacity
Water Impact Fee	\$ 253,814	\$ 40,310	\$ 150,954
Sewer Impact Fee	\$ 1,022,560	\$ 162,400	\$ 608,160
Public Right-of-Way Cost	\$ 16,862.00	\$ 328,995.00	\$ -
Infrastructure Improvements			
Water	8-inch water main (48 ft)	8-inch water main (40 ft)	None required
Sewer	8-inch sewer force main (38 ft)	8-inch sewer force main (25 ft) Public Pump Station	None required