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## INTRODUCTION

Objective 4.1D of the Martin County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan (CGMP) requires the County to "to collect and monitor development and population data to ensure sufficient land to address projected population needs."

The residential capacity analysis is made up of three parts. First, population projections are calculated in accordance with Policy 4.1D.2. This residential capacity and vacant land analysis is based on the 2017 Population Technical Bulletin, adopted by the Board of County Commissioners on July 25, 2017. The estimates and projections are primarily based on the 2010 United States Census and the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) annual report on population for the State of Florida Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR).

The second part of the analysis is to determine the future demand for residential units to accommodate the projected population. Calculations of demand are derived from formulas provided in Policy 4.1D.3. The demand calculations used in this analysis are provided in the 2018 Residential Demand Analysis.

The third part of the analysis is to determine the supply of residential units. Consistent with Policy 4.1D.5, the residential capacity and vacant land analysis defines the available residential development options that can accommodate the demand from the projected population.

This report is broken down in three Sections. Section I breaks down Policy 4.1D. 5 into five parts to show the supply of units from each category. Section II provides a summary of the total number of units identified in Section I. Section III compares the supply of units in Section II to the residential demand found in the 2018 Residential Demand Analysis.

## SECTION I

## Policy 4.1D. 5 Residential Supply to Meet Demand

The units needed (demand) in the 10 year period and the units needed in the 15 year period must be compared to the supply of vacant land and vacant units to determine if there is residential capacity in the urban service districts. The methodology to determine the supply of land and units is found in Policy 4.1D.5. The policy is broken down into five parts, and therefore the methodology in this analysis is broken down into five parts.

Below is Policy 4.1D. 5 that outlines the parameters to be measured for the supply of units available to meet the demand in the previous section:

Policy 4.1D. 5 Residential capacity analysis. Martin County shall produce a residential capacity analysis every five years. Residential capacity defines the available residential development options within the Primary and Secondary Urban Service Districts that can meet the demand for population growth consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

Residential supply shall consist of:
(1) Vacant property that allows residential use according to the Future Land Use Map. The maximum allowable density shall be used in calculating the number of available units on vacant acreage. For the purpose of this calculation, the maximum allowable density for wetlands shall be one-half the density of a given future land use designation.
(2) Subdivided single family and duplex lots. The following lot types shall be included in the residential capacity calculation:
(a) Vacant single family or duplex lots of record as of 1982 developed prior to the County's tracking of development approvals.
(b) Vacant single family or duplex lots of record platted after 1982.
(3) Potential for residential development in Mixed Use Overlays.
(4) Excess vacant housing not in use by permanent or seasonal residents. Excess vacant housing is a vacancy rate higher than $3 \%$ of the number of housing units in actual use.
(5) The eastern Urban Service District and the Western Urban Service District shall be considered separately.

NOTE: Chapter 2017-195, Laws of Florida, authorized the creation of the Village of Indiantown, pending a vote of the qualified electors residing within the corporate limits of the Village. On November 9, 2017 the residents voted to incorporate into the Village of Indiantown. The current methodology in the CGMP requires an analysis for the western urban service district, which is
included in this report. Staff has not included the Village in the supply due to its incorporation.

## Vacant land

(1) Vacant property that allows residential use according to the Future Land Use Map. The maximum allowable density shall be used in calculating the number of available units on vacant acreage. For the purpose of this calculation, the maximum allowable density for wetlands shall be one-half the density of a given future land use designation.

The table below shows the calculation of vacant land available. This excludes units in the Mixed Use Overlays, which are considered in part (3) below.

| Table 1 <br> Potential Units in the Primary USD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Future Land Use | Units per Acre | Total Acres | Wetland <br> Probability <br> Acreage | Total <br> Acres <br> less <br> wetlands | Dwelling <br> Units | Wetland <br> Density <br> Transfer <br> (units) | Units at Maximum Density (Rounded) |
| Comm. Waterfront | 10 | 19.7 | 0.28 | 19.42 | 194.2 | 1.4 | 196 |
| Comm/Off/Res | 10 | 19.04 | 1.99 | 17.05 | 170.5 | 9.95 | 180 |
| Estate Density 2 UPA | 2 | 181.12 | 48.33 | 132.79 | 265.58 | 48.33 | 314 |
| High Density | 10 | 12.6 | 0.02 | 12.6 | 126 | 0 | 126 |
| Medium Density | 8 | 14.16 | 0.01 | 14.16 | 113.28 | 0 | 113 |
| Low Density | 5 | 222.74 | 17.67 | 205.07 | 1025.35 | 44.175 | 1,070 |
| Mobile Home | 8 | 5.12 | 0 | 5.12 | 40.96 | 0 | 41 |
| Rural Density | 0.5 | 96.09 | 36.88 | 59.21 | 29.605 | 9.22 | 39 |
| Total |  | 570 |  |  |  |  | 2,079 |

Table 2
Potential Units in the Secondary USD

|  | Units <br> per <br> Acre | Total | Wetland <br> Probability <br> Acreage | Acres <br> less <br> wetlands | Dwelling <br> Units | Wetland <br> Density <br> Transfer | Units at <br> Maximum <br> Density <br> (Rounded) |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Future Land Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rural | 0.5 | $1,526.41$ | 594.35 | 932.06 | 466.03 | 148.59 | 615 |
| Ag Ranchette | 0.2 | 28.45 | 15.85 | 12.60 | 2.52 | 1.59 | 4 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{6 1 9}$ |

Summary table of potential units, Part (1):

| Urban Service District | Units at Maximum <br> Density |
| :--- | :---: |
| Vacant Primary USD | 2,079 |
| Vacant Secondary USD | $\mathbf{6 1 9}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 , 6 9 6}$ |

(2) Subdivided single family and duplex lots. The following lot types shall be included in the residential capacity calculation:
(a) Vacant single family or duplex lots of record as of $\mathbf{1 9 8 2}$ developed prior to the County's tracking of development approvals.

| USD | Lots |
| :--- | :---: |
| Primary | 1,282 |
| Secondary | 12 |

(b) Vacant single family or duplex lots of record platted after 1982.

The table below illustrates the number of lots of record after 1982:

| USD | Lots |
| :--- | :---: |
| Primary | 341 |
| Secondary | 316 |

The total number of vacant lots of record for the Eastern Primary Urban Service District 1,623. The total for the Secondary Urban Service District is 328.

## (3) Potential for residential development in Mixed Use overlays.

The vacant land within a CRA mixed use overlay available for residential development is shown in the table, as outlined in 4.1D.5(3). All Mixed Use areas are within a CRA.

| CRA Vacant | Units per <br> Acre | Total | Wetland <br> Probability <br> Acreage | Acres <br> less <br> wetlands | Dwelling <br> Units | Wetland <br> Density <br> Transfer | Units at <br> Maximum <br> Density <br> (Rounded) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Future Land Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comm. General | 11.25 | 13.60 | 0.00 | 13.60 | 153.00 | 0.00 | 153.00 |
| Comm. Limited | 11.25 | 16.37 | 0.00 | 16.37 | 184.16 | 0.00 | 184.16 |
| Comm/Off/Res | 11.25 | 21.65 | 0.07 | 21.58 | 242.78 | 0.39 | 243.17 |
| Comm. Waterfront | 11.25 | 6.71 | 0.00 | 6.71 | 75.49 | 0.00 | 75.49 |
| Low Density | 11.25 | 1.78 | 0.00 | 1.78 | 20.03 | 0.00 | 20.03 |
| Medium Density | 11.25 | 17.03 | 0.50 | 16.53 | 185.96 | 2.81 | 188.78 |
| Mobile Home | 11.25 | 6.45 | 0.00 | 6.45 | 72.56 | 0.00 | 72.56 |
| Industrial | 11.25 | 2.05 | 0.00 | 2.05 | 23.06 | 0.00 | 23.06 |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{8 5 . 6 4}$ |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{9 6 0}$ |

(4) Excess vacant housing not in use by permanent or seasonal residents. Excess vacant housing is a vacancy rate higher than $3 \%$ * of the number of housing units in actual use.

| Excess Vacant Residential Units |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Residential Unit Census Data Units Total  <br> Line 1 Occupied housing units (HO) in use by <br> permanent population. 52,883  <br> Line 2 Vacant seasonal housing units (HS) <br> occupied less than six months of the <br> year $6,140^{* *}$  |  |  |  |
| Line 3 | Add Line 1 and Line 2 for housing units in actual use <br> (HU). | 59,023 |  |
| Line 4 | Vacant housing not in seasonal use | $4,066^{* * *}$ |  |
| Line 5 | Add Line 3 and Line 4 for total residential units. | 63,089 |  |

Source: 2010 U.S. Census
*Note: This assumption is supported in the Planner's Estimating Guide, Projecting LandUse and Facility Needs, pages 24 - 25, Arthur C. Nelson, FAICP, 2004.
** Indiantown Units Removed (92 units from Census Tract 18.01)
***Note: From 2018 Demand Analysis

Calculation of excess vacant residential units

| Unit data from table above |  |  | Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Line 1 | Vacant housing not in seasonal use |  | 4,066 |
| Line 2 | 3\% of 59,023 housing units in actual use = | $1770.69 \text { (round to }$ $1,771)$ | 1,771 |
| Line 3 | Subtract Line 2 from Line 1 to calculate vacant units available for occupancy. |  | 2,295 |

The 2,295 excess vacant units are allocated by location. In accordance with Policy 4.1D.4, these units are assigned to the Primary, Secondary or are assigned outside the Urban Service Districts based on the allocation Certificates of Occupancy calculated in the Residential Demand Analysis, shown below.

Number of Certificates of Occupancy by Location, 2012 through 2016

| Urban Service <br> District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Percent <br> of Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eastern | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | Total | Average |  |
| Primary | 266 | $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 0 6 \%}$ |
| Secondary | 0 | 3 | 315 | 258 | 236 | 1372 | 274 | $89.79 \%$ |
| Outside | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 30 | 12 | 50 | 10 | $3.27 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 6}$ |

Source: Martin County Growth Management, using KIVA database
Using the CO percentage data in the table above, the excess vacant housing is allocated into the Urban Service Districts or outside the Urban Service Districts, as shown in the table below.

| Urban Service <br> District | Percent of <br> Total | Excess <br> vacant <br> units |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Eastern Primary | $89.79 \%$ | 2,060 |
| Eastern Secondary | $3.27 \%$ | 75 |
| Outside | $6.94 \%$ | 160 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 2 9 5}$ |

## SECTION II. SUMMARY OF THE SUPPLY OF POTENTIAL UNITS

Below is a summary of sections (1) through (4) of Policy 4.1D. 5 to illustrate the total number of units available to accommodate future demand.

| Supply of Units Primary Urban <br> Service District From Policy 4.1D.5 | Supply of Units <br> Primary Urban Service <br> District | Supply of Units <br> Secondary Urban <br> Service District |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| (1) Vacant Land | 2,079 | 619 |
| (2) (a) Pre-1982 Lots of Record | 1,282 | 12 |
| (b) Post-1982 Lots of Record | 341 | 316 |
| (3) Mixed Use Overlay | 960 | 0 |
| (4) Excess Vacancies | 2,060 | 75 |
| (5) Approved multifamily units* | 197 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 , 9 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 2 2}$ |

*Note: The methodology for counting multifamily units in the 2013 supply calculation was not approved by the Administration Commission. Therefore, only unbuilt multifamily units in approved final site plans have been included.

## SECTION III. COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL DEMAND AGAINST SUPPLY

The language in Policy 4.1D. 5 contains the following requirement:
The 15 year planning period for residential capacity began with the 2010 Census and shall be updated to a new 15 year planning period every 5 years. The residential capacity analysis showing the total residential supply within the Primary and the Secondary Urban Service Districts shall be compared to the projected residential demand as outlined in Policy 4.1D.3. and 4.1D.4 above. The report shall show demand and supply comparisons for a ten year period as well as for the 15 year planning period.

Therefore the residential demand for a ten-year and fifteen-year planning period will be compared to the amount of land available to accommodate that demand. The residential demand is taken from the 2018 Residential Demand Analysis.

## 2016-2025 Analysis of Supply versus Demand

| Eastern Urban <br> Service Districts | 2025 Demand | Unit Supply | Percent of Need in the <br> 10-year planning <br> period |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary | 4,240 | 6,919 | $163 \%$ |
| Secondary | 154 | 1,022 | $663 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 , 3 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 2 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 7 \%}$ |

2016-2030 Analysis of Supply versus Demand

| Eastern Urban <br> Service District | 2030 Demand | Unit Supply | Percent of Need in the <br> 15-year planning <br> period |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary | 6,360 | 6,919 | $109 \%$ |
| Secondary | 231 | 1,022 | $442 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 , 5 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 2 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5 \%}$ |

PURSUANT TO 4.1D. 5 for consideration purposes only

## Residential Capacity for the Village of Indiantown

| Table 1 <br> Potential Units in the Village of Indiantown - Primary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Future Land Use | Units per Acre | Total | Wetland Probability Acreage | Acres less wetlands | Dwelling Units | Wetland Density Transfer | Units at Maximum Density (Rounded) |
| Estate Density 2 UPA | 2 | 434.83 | 93.85 | 340.98 | 681.96 | 93.85 | 776 |
| Medium Density | 8 | 72.61 | 16.81 | 55.8 | 446.4 | 67.24 | 514 |
| Low Density | 5 | 990.21 | 176.02 | 814.19 | 4070.95 | 440.05 | 4,511 |
| Total |  | 1497.65 |  |  |  |  | 5,800 |

Table 2
Potential Units in the Village of Indiantown - Secondary

|  | Units <br> per <br> Acre | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Rural | 0.5 | 49.98 | 16.54 | 33.44 | 16.72 | 4.14 | 21 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Ag Ranchette | 0.2 | 122.75 | 3.4 | 119.35 | 23.87 | 0.34 | 24 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{4 5}$ |

Summary table of potential units, Part (1):

| Village of Indiantown | Units at Maximum Density |
| :--- | :---: |
| Vacant Primary USD | 5,800 |
| Vacant Secondary USD | $\mathbf{4 5}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 , 6 9 6}$ |

(2) Subdivided single family and duplex lots. The following lot types shall be included in the residential capacity calculation:
(a) Vacant single family or duplex lots of record as of 1982 developed prior to the County's tracking of development approvals.

| USD | Lots |
| :--- | ---: |
| Primary | 156 |
| Secondary | 12 |

(a) Vacant single family or duplex lots of record as of 1982 developed prior to the County's tracking of development approvals.

| USD | Lots |
| :--- | ---: |
| Primary | 67 |
| Secondary | 0 |
|  |  |

The total number of vacant lots of record for the Village of Indiantown Primary Urban Service District 224. The total for the Secondary Urban Service District is $\mathbf{1 2 .}$
(3) Potential for residential development in Mixed Use overlay.

| CRA Vacant <br> (MU) | Units <br> per <br> Acre | Total | Wetland <br> Probability <br> Acreage | Acres <br> less <br> wetlands | Dwelling <br> Units | Wetland <br> Density <br> Transfer | Units at <br> Maximum <br> Density <br> (Rounded) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Future Land Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comm. General | 11.25 | 131.48 | 2.47 | 129.01 | $1,451.36$ | 13.89 | $1,465.26$ |
| Industrial | 11.25 | 166.66 | 8.33 | 158.33 | $1,781.21$ | 46.86 | $1,828.07$ |
| Comm/Off/Res | 11.25 | 29.65 | 0.07 | 29.58 | 332.78 | 0.39 | 333.17 |
| Comm. Waterfront | 11.25 | 34.22 | 0.00 | 34.22 | 384.98 | 0.00 | 384.98 |
| High | 11.25 | 1.32 | 0.00 | 1.32 | 14.85 | 0.00 | 14.85 |
| Low Density | 11.25 | 112.18 | 35.79 | 76.39 | 859.39 | 201.32 | $1,060.71$ |
| Medium Density | 11.25 | 10.86 | 0.50 | 10.36 | 116.55 | 2.81 | 119.36 |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{4 8 6 . 3 7}$ |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{5 , 2 0 6}$ |

(4) Excess vacant housing not in use by permanent or seasonal residents. Excess vacant housing is a vacancy rate higher than $3 \%$ * of the number of housing units in actual use.

| Excess Vacant Residential Units |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Village of Indiantown - Census Tract 18.01 |  |  |  |
| Residential Unit Census Data | Units | Total |  |
| Line 1 | Occupied housing units (HO) in use by <br> permanent population. | 1,826 |  |
| Line 2 | Vacant seasonal housing units (HS) <br> occupied less than six months of the year | 63 |  |
| Line 3 | Add Line 1 and Line 2 for housing units in actual use <br> (HU). | 1,918 |  |
| Line 4 | Vacant housing not in seasonal use | $162^{* * *}$ |  |
| Line 5 | Add Line 3 and Line 4 for total residential units. | 2,080 |  |

Source: 2010 U.S. Census,
*Note: This assumption is supported in the Planner's Estimating Guide, Projecting LandUse and Facility Needs, pages 24 - 25, Arthur C. Nelson, FAICP, 2004.
***Note: From 2018 Demand Analysis

## Calculation of excess vacant residential units

| Unit data from table above |  | Units |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Line 1 | Vacant housing not in seasonal use | 162 |
| Line 2 | $3 \%$ of 1918 housing units in actual use = | 57.54 (round to 58) |$) 58$.

The 104 excess vacant units are allocated by location. In accordance with Policy 4.1D.4, these units are assigned to the Primary, Secondary or are assigned outside the Urban Service Districts based on the allocation Certificates of Occupancy shown in the Residential Demand Analysis, shown below.

| Supply of Units Primary Urban <br> Service District From Policy 4.1D.5 | Supply of Units <br> Primary Urban Service <br> District | Supply of Units <br> Secondary Urban <br> Service District |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| (1) Vacant Land | $\mathbf{5 , 8 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}$ |
| (2) (a) Pre-1982 Lots of Record | 156 | 12 |
| (b) Post-1982 Lots of Record | 67 | 0 |
| (3) Mixed Use Overlay | $\mathbf{5 , 2 0 6}$ | 0 |
| (4) Excess Vacancies | 104 | 0 |
| (5) Approved multifamily units* | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 1 , 3 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 7}$ |

SECTION III. COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL DEMAND AGAINST SUPPLY

2016-2025 Analysis of Supply versus Demand

| Eastern Urban <br> Service Districts | 2025 Demand | Unit Supply | Percent of Need in the <br> 10-year planning <br> period |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary | 6,869 | 11,333 | $164 \%$ |
| Secondary | 154 | 57 | $37 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 , 0 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 3 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 2 \%}$ |

2016-2030 Analysis of Supply versus Demand

| Eastern Urban <br> Service District | 2030 Demand | Unit Supply | Percent of Need in the <br> 15-year planning <br> period |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary | 7,103 | 11,333 | $159 \%$ |
| Secondary | 1,075 | 57 | $530 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 , 1 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 3 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 9 \%}$ |

