

**The Florida Senate**  
**BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

---

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Committee on Community Affairs

---

BILL: SB 1730

INTRODUCER: Senator Lee

SUBJECT: Growth Management

DATE: March 19, 2019

REVISED: \_\_\_\_\_

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Peacock	Yeatman	CA	<b>Pre-meeting</b>
2.			IS	
3.			RC	

---

**I. Summary:**

SB 1730 amends various statutes relating to growth management. The bill restricts the ability of a county or municipality to adopt and enforce inclusionary housing ordinances or regulations. After receiving an application for approval of a development permit or order, the bill requires a county and municipality to review the application for completeness and issue a response to an applicant within a specified period of time. The bill requires a local government to credit certain contributions, constructions, expansions, or payments toward any other impact fee or exaction imposed by local ordinance for public educational facilities.

The bill also requires the collection of an impact fee occur no earlier than the issuance of builder permit for the property that is subject to the fee. The bill also codifies the ‘dual rational nexus test’ for impact fees as articulated in case law. Other requirements of the bill include earmarking impact fees for capital facilities that benefit new residents and prohibiting the use of impact fee revenues to pay existing debt unless specified conditions are met. Additionally, the bill prohibits a local government from charging an impact fee for the development or construction of affordable housing.

**II. Present Situation:**

**Local Government Authority**

The Florida Constitution grants local governments broad home rule authority. Specifically, non-charter county governments may exercise those powers of self-government that are provided by general or special law.<sup>1</sup> Those counties operating under a county charter have all powers of self-government not inconsistent with general law or special law approved by the vote of the electors.<sup>2</sup> Likewise, municipalities have those governmental, corporate, and proprietary powers

---

<sup>1</sup> FLA. CONST. art. VIII, s. 1(f).

<sup>2</sup> FLA. CONST. art. VIII, s. 1(g).

that enable them to conduct municipal government, perform their functions and provide services, and exercise any power for municipal purposes, except as otherwise provided by law.<sup>3</sup> Unlike counties or municipalities, independent special districts do not possess home rule power. Therefore, the powers possessed by independent special districts are those expressly provided by, or which can be reasonably implied from, the special district's charter or by general law.<sup>4</sup>

### ***Local Government Revenue Sources Based on Home Rule Authority***<sup>5</sup>

Pursuant to home rule authority, counties and municipalities may impose proprietary fees,<sup>6</sup> regulatory fees, and special assessments<sup>7</sup> to pay the cost of providing a facility or service or regulating an activity. Each fee imposed under a local government's home rule powers should be analyzed in the context of requirements established in Florida case law that are applicable to its validity.

Regulatory fees are home rule revenue sources that may be imposed pursuant to a local government's police powers in the exercise of a sovereign function. Examples of regulatory fees include building permit fees, impact fees, inspection fees, and storm water fees. Two principles guide the application and use of regulatory fees. The fee should not exceed the regulated activity's cost and is generally required to be applied solely to the regulated activity's cost for which the fee is imposed.

Special districts do not possess home rule powers; therefore, special districts may impose only those taxes, assessments, or fees authorized by special or general law.<sup>8</sup>

### **Impact Fees**

As one type of regulatory fee, impact fees are charges imposed by local governments against new development to provide for capital facilities' costs made necessary by such growth.<sup>9</sup> Examples of capital facilities include the provision of additional water and sewer systems, schools,<sup>10</sup> libraries, parks and recreational facilities. Impact fee calculations vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and from fee to fee. Impact fees also vary extensively depending on local costs, capacity needs, resources, and the local government's determination to charge the full cost or only part of the cost of the infrastructure improvement through utilization of the impact fee.

---

<sup>3</sup> FLA. CONST. art. VIII, s. 2(b). See also s. 166.021(1), F.S.

<sup>4</sup> Section 189.031, F.S. See also *State ex rel. City of Gainesville v. St. Johns River Water Mgmt. Dist.*, 408 So. 2d 1067 (Fla. 1st DCA 1982).

<sup>5</sup> Office of Economic and Demographic Research, The Florida Legislature, *2018 Local Government Financial Handbook*, 9-13, available at <http://edr.state.fl.us/Content/local-government/reports/lghfih18.pdf> (last visited March 18, 2019).

<sup>6</sup> Examples of proprietary fees include admissions fees, franchise fees, user fees, and utility fees.

<sup>7</sup> Special assessments are typically used to construct and maintain capital facilities or to fund certain services.

<sup>8</sup> See ch. 189, F.S. See also State Affairs Committee and Local, Federal & Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, The Florida House of Representatives, *The Local Government Formation Handbook 2018-2020*, 70, available at <http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Committees/committeesdetail.aspx?CommitteeId=3025> (last visited March 18, 2019).

<sup>9</sup> See supra note 5.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* With respect to a school impact fee, the fee is imposed by the respective board of county commissioners at the request of the school board. The fee amount is usually determined after a study of the actual impact/costs of new residential construction on the school district has been made.

In 2017, the most recent year for which the Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR) has impact fee data, 35 counties reported impact fee revenues totaling \$629.1 million, 194 cities reported impact fee revenues of \$279.7 million, and 28 school districts reported impact fee revenues of 329.7 million.<sup>11</sup>

### ***Florida Impact Fee Act***

In response to local governments' reliance on impact fees and the growth of impact fee collections, the Legislature adopted the Florida Impact Fee Act in 2006, which requires local governing authorities to satisfy certain requirements when imposing impact fees.<sup>12</sup> The Act was amended in 2009 to impose new restrictive rules on impact fees by requiring local governments to shoulder the burden of proof when an impact fee is challenged in court and prohibiting the judiciary from giving deference to local government impact fee determinations.<sup>13</sup>

Section 163.31801(3), F.S., provides requirements and procedures for the adoption of an impact fee. An impact fee adopted by ordinance of a county or municipality or by resolution of a special district must, at minimum:

- Require that the calculation of the impact fee be based on the most recent and localized data;
- Provide for accounting and reporting of impact fee collections and expenditures. If a local government imposes an impact fee to address its infrastructure needs, the entity must account for the revenues and expenditures of such impact fee in a separate accounting fund;
- Limit administrative charges for the collection of impact fees to actual costs; and
- Require that notice be provided at least 90 days before the effective date of an ordinance or resolution imposing a new or increased impact fee.

### ***Dual Rational Nexus Test***

While s. 163.31801, F.S., outlines many characteristics and limitations of impact fees, case law serves an integral role in the impact fee process in Florida. As developed under case law, an impact fee imposed by a local government should meet the 'dual rational nexus test' in order to withstand legal challenge.<sup>14</sup> A number of court decisions have addressed the dual rational nexus test and challenges to the legality of impact fees.<sup>15</sup>

In *Hollywood, Inc. v. Broward County*,<sup>16</sup> the Fourth District Court of Appeal addressed the validity of a county ordinance that required a developer, as a condition of plat approval, to dedicate land or pay a fee for the expansion of the county level park system to accommodate the new residents of the proposed development. The court found that a reasonable dedication or impact fee requirement is permissible if (1) it offsets reasonable needs that are sufficiently

---

<sup>11</sup> Office of Economic and Demographic Research, The Florida Legislature, *Impact Fees*, available at <http://edr.state.fl.us/Content/local-government/data/data-a-to-z/g-l.cfm> (last visited March 18, 2019).

<sup>12</sup> Section 163.31801, F.S.

<sup>13</sup> Chapter 2009-49, Laws of Fla., creates a "preponderance of the evidence" standard of review placing the burden of proof on the local government to show that the imposition or amount of an impact fee meets the requirement of case law and s. 163.31801, F.S.

<sup>14</sup> See supra note 4.

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., *Contractors & Builders Ass'n v. City of Dunedin*, 329 So.2d 314 (Fla. 1976); *Home Builders and Contractors' Association v. Board of County Commissioners of Palm Beach County*, 446 So.2d 140 (Fla. 4th DCA 1983).

<sup>16</sup> *Hollywood, Inc. v. Broward County*, 431 So.2d 606 (Fla. 4th DCA 1983).

attributable to the new development and (2) the fees collected are adequately earmarked for the acquisition of capital assets that will benefit the residents of the new development.<sup>17</sup> In order to show the impact fee meets those requirements, the local government must demonstrate a rational relationship between the need for additional capital facilities and the proposed development. In addition, the local government must show the funds are earmarked for the provision of public facilities to benefit the new residents.<sup>18</sup>

In *Volusia County v. Aberdeen at Ormond Beach*, the Florida Supreme Court ruled that when a residential development has no potential to increase school enrollment, public school impact fees may not be imposed.<sup>19</sup> The county in that case had imposed a school impact fee on a deed-restricted community for adults 55 years old and older. In *City of Zephyrhills v. Wood*, the Second District Court of Appeal upheld an impact fee on a recently purchased and renovated building, finding that structural changes had corresponding impacts on the city's water and sewer system.<sup>20</sup>

As developed under case law, an impact fee must have the following characteristics to be legal:

- The fee is levied on new development, the expansion of existing development, or a change in land use that requires additional capacity for public facilities;
- The fee represents a proportionate share of the cost of public facilities needed to serve new development;
- The fee is earmarked and expended for the benefit of those in the new development who have paid the fee;
- The fee is a one-time charge, although collection may be spread over a period of time;
- The fee is earmarked for capital outlay only and is not expended for operating costs; and
- The fee-payers receive credit for the contributions toward the cost of the increased capacity for public facilities.<sup>21</sup>

### ***Timing of Collection for Impact Fees***

Florida Statutes do not specify when a local government must collect impact fees. As a result, the applicable local government makes this decision, and the time of collection varies.<sup>22</sup> For example, in Orange County, residential impact fees are due when the building permit is issued,

---

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at 611.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at 611-12.

<sup>19</sup> *Volusia County v. Aberdeen at Ormond Beach*, 760 So.2d 126, 134 (Fla. 2000).

<sup>20</sup> *City of Zephyrhills v. Wood*, 831 So.2d 223, 225 (Fla. 2d DCA 2002).

<sup>21</sup> Committee on Community Affairs, The Florida Senate, *Impact Fees*, 4 (Issue Brief 2010-310) (Sept. 2009), available at [http://archive.flsenate.gov/data/Publications/2010/Senate/reports/interim\\_reports/pdf/2010-310ca.pdf](http://archive.flsenate.gov/data/Publications/2010/Senate/reports/interim_reports/pdf/2010-310ca.pdf) (last visited March 18, 2019).

<sup>22</sup> Common benchmark development actions include plat approval, building permitting, and certificate of occupancy. A 2015 national impact fee study by Duncan Associates entitled *State Impact Fee Enabling Acts* identified 29 states with impact fee enabling acts. The study found that “about one-third of enabling acts allow impact fees to be collected at any time during the development process. Most of the others provide that impact fees cannot be collected prior to the building permit or certificate of occupancy.” See [http://impactfees.com/publications%20pdf/state\\_enabling\\_acts.pdf](http://impactfees.com/publications%20pdf/state_enabling_acts.pdf) (last visited March 18, 2019).

although the county allows the fees to be deferred in certain circumstances.<sup>23</sup> In contrast, in Volusia County, impact fees are due before the issuance of a certificate of occupancy or business tax receipt.<sup>24</sup>

### **Concurrency and Proportionate Share**

Concurrency requires public facilities and services to be available concurrent with the impacts of new development. Concurrency in Florida is required for sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, and potable water.<sup>25</sup> Concurrency was formerly required for transportation, schools, and parks and recreation, but in 2011, the Legislature made concurrency for these facilities optional with the passage of the Community Planning Act (CPA).<sup>26</sup> Many local governments continue to exercise the option to impose concurrency on transportation and school facilities. If local governments elect to retain public education facilities concurrency, then their comprehensive plans must comply with the requirements included in s. 163.3180(6), F.S.

Concurrency is tied to provisions requiring local governments to adopt level-of-service (LOS) standards, address existing deficiencies, and provide infrastructure to accommodate new growth reflected in the comprehensive plan.<sup>27</sup> Local governments are charged with setting LOS standards within their jurisdiction, and if the LOS standards are not met, development permits may not be issued without an applicable exception.

Proportionate share is a tool local governments may use to require developers to help mitigate the impacts of their development notwithstanding a failure to achieve and maintain the adopted level of service. Proportionate share requires developers to contribute to or build facilities necessary to offset a new development's impacts.<sup>28</sup> Local governments may require proportionate share contributions from developers for both transportation and school impacts.<sup>29</sup>

For school proportionate share mitigation, the impact fee should be reduced by an amount equal to the per unit amount of any previously paid or agreed to proportionate share mitigation.<sup>30</sup> A variety of scenarios for the crediting of impact fees are possible among school districts, and each proportionate share methodology should clearly define how these credits are to be applied and the procedures to be followed.

---

<sup>23</sup> Orange County Government, Florida, *Residential Impact Fees*, available at <http://www.orangecountyfl.net/PermitsLicenses/Permits/ResidentialImpactFees.aspx#.WgnLs0kUmUl>. (last visited March 18, 2019).

<sup>24</sup> Volusia County, Florida, *Frequently Asked Questions on Impact Fees*, available at <https://www.volusia.org/services/growth-and-resource-management/impact-fees/faqs-impact-fees.stml> (last visited March 18, 2019).

<sup>25</sup> Section 163.3180(1), F.S.

<sup>26</sup> Chapter 2011-139, s. 15, Laws of Fla.

<sup>27</sup> Section 163.3180, F.S.

<sup>28</sup> Florida Department of Community Affairs (now Department of Economic Opportunity), *Transportation Concurrency: Best Practices Guide*, pg. 64 (2007), retrieved from [http://www.cutr.usf.edu/pdf/DCA\\_TCBP%20Guide.pdf](http://www.cutr.usf.edu/pdf/DCA_TCBP%20Guide.pdf) (last visited March 18, 2019).

<sup>29</sup> Sections 163.3180(5) and 163.3180(6), F.S.

<sup>30</sup> See s. 163.3180(6)(h)2., F.S.

## **Affordable Housing**

Affordable housing is generally defined in relation to the annual area median income of the household living in the housing adjusted for family size. Section 420.9071(2), F.S., within the State Housing Initiatives Partnership (SHIP)<sup>31</sup> Program defines “affordable” to mean that monthly rents or monthly mortgage payments, including taxes and insurance, do not exceed 30 percent of that amount which represents the percentage of the median annual gross income for:

- Very-low-income households, i.e., total annual gross household income does not exceed 50 percent of the median annual income for the area;<sup>32</sup>
- Low-income households, i.e., total annual gross household income does not exceed 80 percent of the median annual income for the area;<sup>33</sup>
- Moderate-income households, i.e., total annual gross household income does not exceed 120 percent of the median annual income for the area.<sup>34</sup>

With respect to rental units, a household’s annual income at initial occupancy may not exceed the three threshold percentages above. While occupying the unit, the household’s annual income may increase to an amount not to exceed 140 percent.<sup>35</sup>

The Florida Housing Finance Corporation administers the SHIP Program that provides funds to all 67 counties and Florida’s larger cities on a population-based formula to finance and preserve affordable housing based on locally adopted housing plans<sup>36</sup> and the State Apartment Incentive Loan (SAIL) Program that provides low-interest loans on a competitive basis to affordable housing developers each year.

## **Inclusionary Housing**

In 2001, the Legislature created ss. 125.01055<sup>37</sup> and 166.04151, F.S.,<sup>38</sup> that provides “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of law, a county (municipality) may adopt and maintain in effect any law, ordinance, rule, or other measure that is adopted for the purpose of increasing the supply of affordable housing using land use mechanisms such as inclusionary housing ordinances.”

Inclusionary housing ordinances (sometimes called inclusionary zoning ordinances) are land use regulations that require affordable housing units to be provided in conjunction with the development of market rate units.<sup>39</sup> The intent of these ordinances is to increase the production

---

<sup>31</sup> See ss. 420.907-420.9089, F.S. Administered by Florida Housing Finance Corporation, the SHIP Program provides funds to all 67 counties and Florida’s larger cities on a population based formula to finance and preserve affordable housing for very low, low, and moderate income families based on locally adopted housing plans.

<sup>32</sup> Section 420.9071(28), F.S.

<sup>33</sup> Section 420.9071(19), F.S.

<sup>34</sup> Section 420.9071(20), F.S.

<sup>35</sup> See ss. 420.9071(19), (20), and (28), F.S.

<sup>36</sup> See ss. 420.907-420.9089, F.S.

<sup>37</sup> Ch. 2001-252, s. 16, Laws of Fla.

<sup>38</sup> Ch. 2001-252, s. 15, Laws of Fla.

<sup>39</sup> Jamie Ross and Uma Outka, The Florida Housing Coalition, *Inclusionary Housing: A Challenge Worth Taking*, available at <https://www.flhousing.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Inclusionary-Housing-A-Challenge-Worth-Taking.pdf> (last visited March 18, 2019).

of affordable housing in general and to increase the production in specific geographic areas that might otherwise not include affordable housing.<sup>40</sup>

Elements of an inclusionary zoning ordinance typically include a minimum project size, a percentage set aside, density bonus, and costs offsets. The threshold size must be large enough to contribute to the financial feasibility of the required affordable units. The share of affordable units varies, and requirements for developers to set aside 10 to 25 percent of their new housing developments as affordable are most common. A density bonus allows a developer to construct a certain number of additional market rate units beyond what is normally allowed under the current zoning ordinance, in exchange for providing a specified number of affordable units. To enable the construction of affordable housing, developers may be given waivers from certain development standards and receive waivers, for fees, such as demolition, water and sewer charge, and utility connection fees. Developers may be eligible for reduced parking requirements and other benefits, such as expedited permitting.<sup>41</sup>

### **Development Permit Process**

A development permit is any building permit, zoning permit, subdivision approval, rezoning, certification, special exception, variance, or any other official action of local government having the effect of permitting the development of land.<sup>42</sup>

Sections 125.022(1) and 163.033(1), F.S., provide that when reviewing an application for a development permit, counties and municipalities cannot request additional information from an applicant more than three times, unless the applicant waives the limitation in writing. Prior to the third request for information, the county or the municipality is directed to offer a meeting to try to resolve outstanding issues. If the applicant believes the request for additional information is not authorized by ordinance, rule, statute or other legal authority, the county or municipality, at the applicant's request, must proceed with processing the application. These sections do not apply to building permits.<sup>43</sup>

When a county or municipality denies an application for a development permit, the county or municipality must give written notice to the applicant. The notice must include a citation to the applicable portions of ordinance, rule, statute or other legal authority for the denial of the permit.<sup>44</sup>

For any development permit application filed with a county or municipality after July 1, 2012, that county or municipality is prohibited from requiring, as a condition of processing or issuing a development permit, that an applicant obtain a permit or approval from any state or federal agency unless the agency has issued a final agency action that denies the federal or state permit

---

<sup>40</sup> *Id.*

<sup>41</sup> See Florida Housing Coalition, *Affordable Housing Incentive Strategies: A Guidebook for Affordable Housing Advisory Committee Members and Local Government Staff* available at <http://www.flhousing.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/AHAC-Guidebook-2017.pdf> (last visited March 18, 2019).

<sup>42</sup> Section 163.3164(16), F.S.

<sup>43</sup> See ss. 125.022(3) and 166.033(3), F.S.

<sup>44</sup> See ss. 125.022(2) and 166.033(2), F.S.

before the county or municipality action on the local development permit.<sup>45</sup> The issuance of a development permit by a county or municipality does not create any rights on the part of the county or municipality for issuance of the permit if the applicant fails to obtain the requisite approvals or fulfill the obligations imposed by a state or federal agency or undertakes actions that result in a violation of state or federal law.<sup>46</sup> A county or municipality must attach such a disclaimer to the issuance of a development permit and must include a permit condition that all other applicable state or federal permits be obtained prior to commencement of the development.<sup>47</sup>

### III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

**Section 1** amends s. 125.01055, F.S., regarding affordable housing, to prohibit a county from adopting or imposing a requirement in any form, including, without limitation, by way of a comprehensive plan amendment, ordinance, or land development regulation or as a condition of a development order or development permit, which has any of the following effects:

- Mandating or establishing a maximum sales price or lease rental for privately produced dwelling units.
- Requiring the allocation or designation, whether directly or indirectly, of privately produced dwelling units for sale or rental to any particular class or group of purchasers or tenants.
- Requiring the provision of any on-site or off-site workforce or affordable housing units or a contribution of land or money for such housing, including, but not limited to, the payment of any flat or percentage-based fee, whether calculated on the basis of the number of approved dwelling units, the amount of approved square footage, or otherwise.

This section would effectively eliminate inclusionary housing that is currently allowed under state law.

The bill does not limit the authority of a county to create or implement a voluntary density bonus program or any other voluntary incentive-based program designed to increase the supply of workforce or affordable housing units.

**Section 2** amends s. 125.022, F.S., to require a county to review an application for a development permit or development order for completeness and issue a letter indicating that all required information is submitted or specifying with particularity any areas that are deficient within 30 days after receiving such application.

The bill provides that the terms “development permit” and “development order” have the same meaning as in s. 163.3164, F.S., but does not include the term “building permit.”

If deficient, the applicant has 30 days to address the deficiencies by submitting the required additional information. Within 90 days after the initial submission, if complete, or the supplemental submission, whichever is later, the county must approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application for a development permit or development order. These time periods may

---

<sup>45</sup> See ss. 125.022(4) and 166.033(4), F.S.

<sup>46</sup> See ss. 125.022(5) and 166.033(5), F.S.

<sup>47</sup> *Id.*



be waived in writing by the applicant. An approval, approval with conditions, or denial of the application for a development permit or development order must include written findings supporting the county's decision.

**Section 3** amends s. 163.3180, F.S., to require a local government to credit certain contributions, constructions, expansions, or payments toward any other impact fee or exaction imposed by local ordinance for public educational facilities on a dollar-for-dollar basis at fair market value. The credit must be based on the total impact fee assessed and not upon the impact fee for any particular type of school.

**Section 4** amends s. 163.31801, F.S., to add minimum conditions that certain impact fees must satisfy.

The bill prohibits any local government from collecting an impact fee any time prior to the date of issuance of the building permit for the property that is subject to the fee.

The bill codifies the requirement for impact fees to be proportional and reasonably connected to, or have a rational nexus with, the need for additional capital facilities and the increased impact generated by the new residential or commercial construction.

The bill requires the impact fee to be proportional and reasonably connected to, or have a rational nexus with, the expenditures of the funds collected and the benefits accruing to the new residential or nonresidential construction.

The local government must specifically earmark funds collected under the impact fee for use in acquiring, constructing, or improving capital facilities to benefit new users.

Revenues generated by the impact fee may not be used, in whole or in part, to pay existing debt or for previously approved projects unless the expenditure is reasonably connected to, or has a rational nexus with, the increased impact generated by the new residential or nonresidential construction.

The local government must credit against the collection of the impact fee any contributions related to public educational facilities, including, but not limited to, land dedication, site planning and design, and construction, whether provided in a proportionate share agreement or any other form of exaction. Any such contributions must be applied to reduce impact fees on a dollar-for-dollar basis at fair market value. If the local government adjusts the amount of impact fees assessed, outstanding and unused credits must be adjusted accordingly.

If the holder of impact fee or mobility fee credits granted by a local government, whether granted under this section, s. 380.06, F.S.(developments of regional impact), or otherwise, uses such credits in lieu of the actual payment of an impact fee or mobility fee, the holder of those credits must, whenever they are utilized, receive the full value of the credit as of the date on which it was first established based on the impact fee or mobility fee rate that was in effect on such date.

In any action challenging the government's failure to provided required dollar-for-dollar credits for the payment of impact fees as provided in s. 163.3180(6)(h)2.b, F.S., (school concurrency),

the government has the burden of proving preponderance of the evidence that the amount of the credit meets the requirements of state legal precedent and the provisions of this section. The bill prohibits the court from using a deferential standard for the benefit of the government.

In any action challenging an impact fee, the court may award attorney fees and costs to the prevailing party. However, the court must award attorney fees and costs to a prevailing property owner if the court determines that the impact fee is not:

- Reasonably connected to, or does not have a rational nexus with, the need for additional capital facilities and the increased impact generated by the new residential or nonresidential construction;
- Reasonably connected to, or does not have a rational nexus with, the expenditures of the funds collected and the benefits accruing to the new residential or nonresidential construction; or
- Proportionate to and exceeds the impacts of the proposed use that the governmental entity seeks to avoid, minimize, or mitigate.

The bill specifies that all provisions governing impact fees in s. 163.31801, F.S., also apply to mobility fees.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in ch. 163, F.S., if a local government does not provide the required credit for contributions related to public educational facilities for a project, then the local government may not impose concurrency mitigation conditions of any kind on the project.

Beginning July 1, 2019, a local government may not charge an impact fee for the development or construction of housing that is affordable, as defined in s. 420.9071, F.S.

**Section 5** amends s. 166.033, F.S., to require a municipality to review an application for a development permit or development order for completeness and issue a letter indicating that all required information is submitted or specifying with particularity any areas that are deficient within 30 days after receiving such application.

The bill provides that the terms “development permit” and “development order” have the same meaning as in s. 163.3164, F.S., but does not include the term “building permit.”

If deficient, the applicant has 30 days to address the deficiencies by submitting the required additional information. Within 90 days of the initial submission, if complete, or the supplemental submission, whichever is later, the municipality must approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application for a development permit or development order. These time periods may be waived in writing by the applicant. An approval, approval with conditions, or denial of the application for a development permit or development order must include written findings supporting the municipality’s decision.

**Section 6** amends s. 166.04151, F.S., regarding affordable housing, to prohibit a municipality from adopting or imposing a requirement in any form, including, without limitation, by way of a comprehensive plan amendment, ordinance, or land development regulation or as a condition of a development order or development permit, which has any of the following effects:

- Mandating or establishing a maximum sales price or lease rental for privately produced dwelling units.
- Requiring the allocation or designation, whether directly or indirectly, of privately produced dwelling units for sale or rental to any particular class or group of purchasers or tenants.
- Requiring the provision of any on-site or off-site workforce or affordable housing units or a contribution of land or money for such housing, including, but not limited to, the payment of any flat or percentage-based fee, whether calculated on the basis of the number of approved dwelling units, the amount of approved square footage, or otherwise.

The bill does not limit the authority of a municipality to create or implement a voluntary density bonus program or any other voluntary incentive-based program designed to increase the supply of workforce or affordable housing units.

**Section 7** provides the bill takes effect upon becoming a law.

#### **IV. Constitutional Issues:**

##### **A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:**

Article VII, Section 18(b) of the Florida Constitution provides that the Legislature, except upon approval by a two-thirds vote, may not enact a general law if the anticipated effect of doing so would be to reduce the *authority* that counties or municipalities have to raise revenues in the aggregate. However, the mandate requirements do not apply to laws having an insignificant fiscal impact, which for Fiscal Year 2018-2019 is forecast at slightly over \$2 million.<sup>48,49,50</sup>

In 1991, Senate President Margolis and House Speaker Wetherell created a memo to guide the House and Senate in the review of local government mandates.<sup>51</sup> Using this guide, the county/municipality mandates provision of Art. VII, S. 18 of the Florida Constitution may apply to SB 1730 because the bill reduces local government authority to raise revenue by prohibiting the charging of impact fees for the development or construction of affordable housing. If the bill is determined to reduce the authority that counties and municipalities have to raise revenues in the aggregate and exceeds the threshold for insignificant fiscal impact, the bill may qualify as a mandate and require final passage by a two-thirds vote of the membership of each house of the Legislature.

---

<sup>48</sup> FLA. CONST. art. VII, s. 18(d).

<sup>49</sup> An insignificant fiscal impact is the amount not greater than the average statewide population for the applicable fiscal year times \$0.10. See Florida Senate Committee on Community Affairs, *Interim Report 2012-115: Insignificant Impact*, (Sept. 2011), available at <http://www.flsenate.gov/PublishedContent/Session/2012/InterimReports/2012-115ca.pdf> (last visited March 18, 2019).

<sup>50</sup> Based on the Florida Demographic Estimating Conference's November 5, 2018 population forecast for 2019 of 21,170,399. The conference packet is available at <http://edr.state.fl.us/Content/conferences/population/ConferenceResults.pdf> (last visited March 18, 2019).

<sup>51</sup> Memorandum to Members of The Florida House and The Florida Senate from Gwen Margolis, President of the Senate and T.K. Wetherell, Speaker of the House, *County and Municipal Mandates Analysis*, (March 7, 1991) (on file with the Senate Committee on Community Affairs).

Also, the county/municipality mandates provision of Article VII, Section 18 of the Florida Constitution may apply because the bill restricts the time at which a county or municipality may collect its impact fees. An impact fee collected at the platting stage is theoretically worth more than an amount collected no earlier than the issuance of the building permit due to the time value of money.<sup>52</sup> It is unclear if this bill lessens the type of *authority* contemplated by President Margolis and Speaker Wetherell.

**B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:**

None.

**C. Trust Funds Restrictions:**

None.

**D. State Tax or Fee Increases:**

None.

**E. Other Constitutional Issues:**

None identified.

**V. Fiscal Impact Statement:**

**A. Tax/Fee Issues:**

The Revenue Estimating Conference has not yet determined the impact of SB 1730.

**B. Private Sector Impact:**

Developers will not have to pay impact fees prior to the issuance of the building permit for a property. Developers will receive dollar-for-dollar credit at fair market value relating to their expenditures for public education facilities, land dedication, site planning and design, and construction. Also, the elimination of impact fees for affordable housing may act as an incentive for additional private sector development of various types of affordable housing.

**C. Government Sector Impact:**

Counties, municipalities, and special districts will not be able to collect impact fees prior to the issuance of the building permit for a property. There may be a reduction in the amount of impact fees imposed as the bill requires local governments to provide credits to developers at a dollar-for-dollar fair market value regarding expenditures for public education facilities and associated costs. Also, local governments would be prohibited from charging impact fees for affordable housing and may need to find other revenue sources to replace any waived fees.

---

<sup>52</sup> Provided money can earn interest, any amount of money is worth more the sooner it is received.

**VI. Technical Deficiencies:**

None.

**VII. Related Issues:**

None.

**VIII. Statutes Affected:**

The bill substantially amends sections 125.01055, 125.022, 163.3180, 163.31801, 166.033, and 166.04151 of the Florida Statutes.

**IX. Additional Information:**

**A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Changes:**

(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

None.

**B. Amendments:**

None.