

South Central County Study Area

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Form of the Study

The purpose of this Study is to create a demographic, financial, socioeconomic, public safety and land use profile of the unincorporated area of Broward County identified as the South Central County Study Area, its five sub-areas, and the adjacent jurisdictions of Dania Beach and Hollywood in order to establish a cost-benefit base line for future annexation(s).

This Study presents data pertaining to the entire South Central County Study Area, its sub-areas, and the Cities of Dania Beach and Hollywood with each described using the data provided by the various contributing resources. In all cases, every effort was made to provide information consistent with the Scope of Services.

South Central County Study Area

The South Central County Study Area is composed of five (5) neighborhood sub-areas described herein as:

<u>Sub-Area</u>	<u>Neighborhoods</u>
A	Estates of Fort Lauderdale and Ravenswood Estates;
B	Arapahoe Farms and Young Israel;
C	Remainder of the unincorporated lands in the South Central County Study Area south of Griffin Road not already included in Sub-Areas A or B
D	All unincorporated lands in the South Central County Study Area north of Griffin Road and south of the Dania Cut-Off Canal; and
E	All unincorporated lands in the South Central County Study Area north of the Dania Cut-Off Canal.

Sub-Areas A, B, C, and D are largely residential in character, with a minimum of non-residential uses. The housing types and values vary both within and among the sub-areas as do the income and education level profiles. Aside from a limited amount of vacant commercial and industrial land, nearly all growth in these sub-areas will be through residential development or redevelopment as available vacant land resources are dwindling.

Due to the relatively large amount of residential land and small amount of existing and future commercial and industrial land uses, the South Central County Study Area serves largely as a bedroom community to the Greater Fort Lauderdale/Miami-Dade/Palm Beach economic engines. Further, it is unlikely that there will be any significant change to the land use ratios that will even minimally increase the non-residential tax base. Due to this existing and continued high residential to non-residential land use ratio, the ad valorem tax base remains stable and moderate while the demand for services is substantial and has the propensity to increase over time.

Sub-Area E abuts the Broward County Resource Recovery Plant, contains no residential properties and is either agricultural or industrial in use. Due to the necessity to retain control over the Broward County Resource Recovery Plant, the Broward County Commission has determined that the Plant is not subject to annexation.

Annexation Policy

Historically, the Cities of Dania Beach and Hollywood mainly targeted high revenue-producing commercial and industrial areas adjacent to their jurisdictions for annexation. The Alanco annexation by Hollywood in 1990 which extended the city limits in a narrow northerly direction, and the extensive westward annexations by Dania Beach in the same year are examples of this trend. The largely residential sub-areas addressed in this study remain under the jurisdiction of Broward County, though both Dania Beach and Hollywood have expressed an interest in incorporating most of the entire South Central County Study Area into their respective cities.

In 1996, the Broward County Legislative delegation introduced a Special Act passed by the Florida Legislature. This legislation restricts the practice of piecemeal annexations within the county, and set a goal that all unincorporated areas are to be either annexed into existing cities or incorporated as new municipalities by the year 2010. The delegation established an Ad Hoc Committee on Annexation Policy to study annexation and receive public input and testimony.

In 1997, the Broward County Board of County Commissioners adopted recommended policies for annexation that provided for interlocal agreements between the county and potential annexing municipalities. The County Commission has urged that unincorporated area residents be given the opportunity to provide meaningful input at all stages of the annexation process. The Commission also allowed that whenever possible, fiscally feasible, and reasonable, consideration would be given to the establishment of a new municipality.

This Study was authorized by the County Commission to aid unincorporated area residents in the South Central County Study Area and the Cities of Dania Beach and Hollywood in the annexation decision making process.

Definition of Annexation Terms

The terms used in this Study are defined in Chapters 165 and 171, Florida Statutes, and are provided below.

Annexation means the adding of real property to the boundaries of an incorporated municipality, such addition making the subject real property in every way a part of the municipality, conducted in accordance with Florida Statute 171.

Compactness means the concentration of a property in a single area, and precludes any annexation action which would create enclaves, pockets, or finger areas in serpentine patterns. Annexations should be designed to ensure that the area is reasonably compact in order to provide for an efficient delivery of services.

Contiguous means that a substantial part of the boundary of the property that is the subject of annexation has a common boundary with the annexing municipality.

Contraction means the de-annexation, or reversion of, a property from a municipality to its status as unincorporated pursuant to Chapter 171, Florida Statutes.

Enclave means an improved or developed area surrounded by a single municipality or bounded by a single municipality and a natural or man-made obstacle that allows the passage of vehicular traffic to that unincorporated area through the single municipality.

Municipality means a municipal corporation created pursuant to Article VIII, Section 2a of the Florida Constitution, Chapter 165.061 F.S. and/or by a Special Act of the Florida Legislature.

Annexation Requirements

Chapter 171 of the Florida Statutes prescribes the procedures a municipality must follow in order to annex contiguous, compact, unincorporated lands. The relevant portions of the Statute that are applicable to this Study are:

Section 171.0413, Florida Statutes. Annexation procedures. - Any municipality may annex contiguous, compact, unincorporated territory in the following manner:

(1) An ordinance proposing to annex an area of contiguous, compact, unincorporated territory shall be adopted by the governing body of the annexing municipality pursuant to the procedure for the adoption of a non-emergency ordinance established by s. 166.041. Each such ordinance shall propose only one reasonably compact area to be annexed. However, prior to the ordinance of annexation becoming effective, a referendum on annexation shall be held as set out below, and if approved by the referendum, the ordinance shall become effective 10 days after the referendum, or as otherwise provided in the ordinance, but not more than 1 year following the date of the referendum.

(2) Following the final adoption of the ordinance of annexation by the governing body of the annexing municipality, the ordinance shall be submitted to a vote of the registered electors of the area proposed to be annexed. If the proposed ordinance would cause the total area annexed pursuant to this section during any one calendar year period cumulatively to exceed more than 5 percent of the total land area of the municipality or cumulatively to exceed more than 5 percent of the municipal population, the ordinance shall be submitted by a separate vote of the registered electors of the annexing municipality and the area proposed to be annexed. The referendum for annexation shall be called and conducted and the expense thereof paid by the governing body of the annexing municipality.

(3) If the referendum is held only in the area proposed to be annexed and receives a majority vote, or if the ordinance is submitted to a separate vote of the registered electors of the annexing municipality and the area proposed to be annexed and there is a separate majority vote for annexation in the annexing municipality and in the area proposed to be annexed, the ordinance shall become effective on the date specified therein. If there is any majority vote against annexation, the ordinance shall not become effective, and the area proposed to be annexed shall not be the subject of an annexation ordinance for a period of 2 years from the date of the referendum on annexation.

The Statute continues with the format of the prerequisites to annexation, which include the preparation of an annexation study by the annexing municipality assessing the impact of annexation on the municipality. This analysis must identify the costs of providing services to the area proposed for annexation, as well as the source for funding such expenses. The study is filed with the County Commission.

A municipality may propose the annexation of land if that land is contiguous and reasonably compact, and the area is not within another municipality. Additionally, the area must be in part urban in character.

Depending on the language in the special annexation act or annexation agreement, after annexation the newly annexed area may be subject to some, or all, laws and regulations in effect within the municipality. Municipalities may adopt the county land use plan into the local comprehensive plan, and incorporate the county zoning code into their own, as in the case of the 1996 annexation of lands by the City of Dania Beach. Municipal franchise agreements in effect for at least six months before annexation that provide for solid waste collection services remain in effect for five years or the remainder of the franchise term, whichever is shorter.

The South Central County Study Area appears to meet the criteria established in the Special Act for annexation since it is in part urban in character and no part is presently within a municipality. Additionally, the Area is reasonably compact and is contiguous to the Cities of Dania Beach and Hollywood.

The Legislative Delegation has the final authority over the eventual annexation of all or part of the South Central County Study Area into the Cities of Dania Beach and/or Hollywood.

South Central County Study Area

Profile

The South Central County Study Area is composed of four residential sub-areas (A, B, C, & D) and one industrial/agricultural sub-area (E). According to the 1990 U.S. Census data, the South Central County Study Area had a population of 7,115 (see Table 1: 1990 Population, Age and Ethnicity). The 1990 population was composed of 6,178 (86.8%) white non-Hispanics, 643 (9%) Hispanics, 199 (2.8%) black non-Hispanics, 71 (1%) Asian non-Hispanics, and 24 (less than 1%) Native American and other non-Hispanics. Less than 20% of the population was under the age of 18 during the 1990 Census. Population projections for the Study Area reflect an average annual growth rate of around 1% between the years 2000 to 2010 (see Table 2: Population Projections).

More than 80% of all housing units in the Study Area were occupied during the 1990 Census; more than two-thirds were owner-occupied and the remainder were rentals (see Table 3: Housing Occupancy). The number of housing units is projected to grow to a total of 3,907 in the year 2000, and 4,247 in the year 2010 (see Table 4: Housing Unit Projections). Almost one-third of all housing units reported in the 1990 U.S. Census data consisted of single-family detached and attached homes (see Table 5: Housing Units by Type). Multi-family units — duplexes and structures containing between three and 49 units — comprised almost 29% of the housing stock. Almost 40% of the housing units were characterized as “mobile homes and others”. Almost two-thirds of all housing units were valued between \$50,000 and \$99,999, based on 1989 dollar values (see Table 6: Housing Values). Fewer than 6% of the units were valued at less than \$50,000; 70 housing units (8.4% of the total) were valued at \$299,999 or more.

The South Central County Study Area has a total taxable value (1999 value) of \$197,578,710 (see Table 7: Property Tax Values by Type of Use). The 3,097 residential parcels account for \$166,967,390 or 84.5% of the total taxable value. The remaining non-residential lands comprise \$30,611,320 or 15.5% of the total taxable value. Vacant and improved commercial parcels totaled almost \$7.8 million (3.9% of the total) in taxable value; improved industrial lands were valued at \$530,910 (0.3% of the total); an agricultural parcel was valued at almost \$10 million (5.0% of the total); and institutional, non-agricultural and other miscellaneous lands totaled almost \$12.5 million (6.1% of the total) in taxable value.

There are 2,113 partial or complete property tax exemptions in the South Central County Study Area (see Table 8: Property Tax Exemption Value). The total value of property exempted from taxation is \$71,232,840. This amounts to 26.5% of total property valuation in the South Central County Study Area.

There are 1,700 parcels subject to a homestead exemption. According to the 1990 U.S. Census, residential property owners occupied 68.3% of all occupied dwellings. The housing unit projection for the year 2000 is 3,907 units. If the occupancy rate remained the same as reported in the 1990 U.S. Census, and the proportion of owner-occupants remained

the same, approximately 2,140 dwelling units would be occupied by owners in the year 2000. A homestead exemption may be filed for property that is owner-occupied, subject to specific additional residency requirements. A maximum of 440 additional residential parcels might be eligible for homestead exemptions (the difference between the estimated number of owner-occupied dwellings projected for the year 2000, and the current number of homestead exemptions in the South Central County Study Area). It is not known at this time how many of the 440 parcels may satisfy the homestead exemption requirement.

Sub-Area A Profile

The portion of the Study Area identified as Sub-Area A includes the Estates of Fort Lauderdale and Ravenswood Estates. The Estates of Fort Lauderdale and Ravenswood Estates are located in the eastern portion of the South Central County Study Area and are generally bounded on the east by Ravenswood Road, on the west by Lagoon Drive, on the north by Southwest 50th Street, and on the south by Southwest 58th Manor or Stirling Road. The area consists of approximately 380 acres and is primarily residential in character.

The 1990 U.S. Census data for Sub-Area A includes the data for Sub-Area B as well; this data is reported in Tables 10 through 13. The 1990 population for Sub-Areas A and B was 2,979, with almost 93% of the population reported as white, non-Hispanic; Hispanics comprised 4.7% of the population (see Table 10: 1990 Population, Age, and Ethnicity). Almost 16% of the population was under the age of 18; more than one-quarter of the population was aged 65 and older. Owners occupied almost 84% of all occupied dwelling units (see Table 11: Housing Occupancy). The vacancy rate in Sub-Areas A and B was almost 26%. One-quarter of all dwelling units consisted of single-family (detached and attached) homes (see Table 12: Housing Units by Type). Two-thirds of all housing units were classified as “mobile homes and others”. Almost three-quarters of all homes were valued at between \$50,000 and \$99,999, according to the 1990 U.S. Census and reported in 1989 dollars (see Table 13: Housing Values).

Residential land accounts for 97.3% of the total taxable value in Sub-Area A (see Table 14: Property Tax Value by Type of Use). Mobile homes comprises 74% of the taxable residential value, and 17% of the taxable residential value is attributable to single-family homes. One improved commercial parcel contributes more than \$1.5 million in taxable value, 2.7% of the total taxable value in Sub-Area A.

There are 1,070 partial or complete property tax exemptions in Sub-Area A; more than three-quarters of these are homestead exemptions (see Table 15: Property Tax Exemption Value). Approximately 30% of the total land value in Sub-Area A is exempt from taxation.

**Table 10: Sub-Areas A and B
1990 Population, Age, and Ethnicity**

1990 Population	2,979	% of Total
Males	1,426	47.9%
Females	1,553	52.1%
Age of Population		
0-4 years	152	5.1%
5-17 years	318	10.7%
18-44 years	997	33.5%
45-64 years	754	25.3%
65+ years	758	25.4%

Ethnicity		
White, Non-Hispanic	2,766	92.8%
Black, Non-Hispanic	48	1.6%
Native American, Non-Hispanic	2	<0.1%
Asian, Non-Hispanic	22	0.7%
Other Non-Hispanic	1	<0.1%
Hispanic	140	4.7%

**Table 11: Sub-Areas A and B
Housing Occupancy**

1990 Units	1,830	% of Total
Occupied Units	1,357	74.2%
Owner	1,132	[83.4%]
Renter	224	[16.5%]
Vacant	474	25.9%
Seasonal	386	

Note : Almost 85% of all occupied units are owner-occupied; vacancy rate near 26%

**Table 12: Sub-Areas A and B
Housing Units by Type**

Type	# Units	% of Total
Single-family, Detached	184	10.1%
Single-family, Attached	261	14.3%
Duplex Units	126	6.9%
3 or 4 Units	13	0.7%
5 – 19 Units	37	2.0%
20 – 49 Units	0	0%
50 + Units	0	0%
Mobile Homes, Other	1,208	66.0%
Total	1,829	100.0%

Note : One-quarter of all units consist of single-family (detached and attached) homes; two-thirds were classified as mobile homes and others

**Table 13: Sub-Areas A and B
Housing Values**

Unit Value	# Units	% of Total
Greater than \$299,999	40	12.2%
\$200,000 – 299,999	7	2.1%
\$150,000 – 199,999	16	4.9%
\$125,000 – 149,999	7	2.1%
\$100,000 – 124,999	17	5.2%
\$75,000 – 99,999	149	45.3%
\$50,000 – 74,999	86	26.1%
\$40,000 – 49,999	2	0.6%
\$30,000 – 39,999	3	0.9%
\$20,000 – 29,999	1	0.3%
< \$19,999	1	0.3%
Total	329	100.0%

Note: Reported housing values (1989 dollars) indicate almost three-quarters of all units valued between \$50,000 and \$99,999