

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY**

Meeting Date: December 19, 2007

Division: Housing & Community Development

Bulk Item: Yes \_\_\_ No X

Department: Housing & Community Development

Staff Contact Person: Lisa Tennyson – 292-4462

---

**AGENDA ITEM WORDING:** Presentation by Habitat for Humanity of Key West and the Lower Keys, responding developer for Affordable/Workforce Housing Development RFP 2007-01H for Cudjoe Parcel (RE:#178350) between US 1 and Lafitte Drive, approximately MM 22; and direction to staff.

---

**ITEM BACKGROUND:** On October 19, 2005, the Board authorized staff to advertise a Request for Qualifications for contractors to build workforce rental units at US 1 and Burton Drive in Tavernier, approximately MM 92; between US 1 and Lafitte Drive, Cudjoe Key, approximately MM 22; corner of Emerald Drive, Sapphire Drive and US 1, Big Coppitt Key, approximately MM 10; and the Mandalay property, on First Avenue, Key Largo, near MM 98, Oceanside. On April 19, 2006, Board granted approval to negotiate a contract with Carlisle Development Group, LLC to develop affordable and employee workforce housing at the four (4) locations; however, notice was received on November 2, 2006, of Carlisle's withdrawal from the proposed public-private partnership for the Community Workforce Housing Innovation Pilot Program (CWHIP). Subsequently, the RFQ document was revised and re-advertised. The responses to the RFQ were opened on May 2, 2007, and then on July 18, 2007, the Board qualified seven (7) developers to provide housing development services and to be included on Monroe County's list of Approved Housing Development Service Providers for future affordable/workforce housing projects. A Request for Proposals was issued to the Approved Housing Development Services Providers on September 5, 2007. There was only one respondent for the Cudjoe parcel. Please see attached Staff Report regarding Cudjoe Parcel RE: #178350.

---

**PREVIOUS RELEVANT BOCC ACTION:** See Item Background.

---

**CONTRACT/AGREEMENT CHANGES:** This is not a contract.

---

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:** Please see attached Staff Report.

---

**TOTAL COST:** \_\_\_N/A\_\_\_

**BUDGETED:** Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

**COST TO COUNTY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SOURCE OF FUNDS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**REVENUE PRODUCING:** Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ **AMOUNT PER MONTH** \_\_\_ **Year** \_\_\_

**APPROVED BY:** County Atty N/A OMB/Purchasing N/A Risk Management N/A

**DOCUMENTATION:** Included X Not Required \_\_\_\_\_

**DISPOSITION:** \_\_\_\_\_

**AGENDA ITEM #** \_\_\_\_\_



*Division of Housing and Community Development*

*Staff Report*

TO: Board of County Commissioners

FROM: Lisa Tennyson, Affordable Housing Coordinator

THROUGH: James “Reggie” Paros, Director, Housing and Community Development

DATE: November 27, 2007

SUBJECT: **Developer Responses to Affordable/Workforce Housing Development RFP 2007-01H and Consideration of Award of Parcel to Developer**  
**Re: Cudjoe Key Parcel RE: #178350**

---

**I. Summary**

On August 31, 2007 HCD issued an RFP to approved developers to build affordable/workforce housing on four county-owned parcels in Monroe County. On October 12, 2007, the request closed.

This report is a discussion of the responses received for the parcel in Cudjoe Key (RE # 178350) located between US 1 and Lafitte Drive, MM 22. The parcel is zoned Suburban Commercial; it is approximately 1.15 acres. Current density will permit 16 units to be built.

For this parcel, HCD received only a single respondent: Habitat for Humanity of Key West and the Lower Keys. This respondent submitted two separate proposals for consideration. The first is a standard development model; the second proposes a “co-housing” model.

On October 25<sup>th</sup>, November 15<sup>th</sup>, and November 30<sup>th</sup>, the Evaluation Committee, consisting of a team of county employees that included the County Attorney, Division Directors of HCD and Growth Management, Affordable Housing Coordinator, and Executive Director of Land Authority, along with outside legal counsel, met to discuss and assess all responses to the RFP. The RFP specified five evaluation criteria: aesthetics and design quality; performance schedule and capacity; project financing; housing model; and estimated unit prices. Team members scored each of the responses in each of five evaluation criteria in order to make recommendations and to assist the BOCC in its own review and analysis.

The committee’s evaluation of each of Habitat’s proposals is included here, along with the committee’s scores. Planning staff was asked to preliminarily review the standard development site plan model; its report is attached.

The respondent has been invited to make a presentation to the BOCC at the December 19<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting, after which the BOCC may award the parcel to the respondent or give other direction to staff.

**II. RFP 2007-01H Evaluation of Responses for Development of Cudjoe Key Parcel**

Evaluation Criteria	Max Pts.	Habitat for Humanity of Key West and the Lower Keys	
		<i>Cudjoe-Standard Model</i>	<i>Cudjoe-Co-housing Model</i>
<p><b>Aesthetics and Quality of Design</b> --including design characteristics, adherence to community character, degree of green and open space, amenities, materials used, etc. RFP asked for site plans, floor plans, illustrations, color schemes.</p>	20	<p>Modular Attached Town Homes. Combination of Duplex and Triplex.(Duplex is 2-BR and 997 S.F. Triplex is. 3-BR and 1,259 S.F.) Narrative proposes 16 units, site plan shows 18 units. Minimal site plan (does not include details such as landscaping, parking, amenities, etc. as requested); narrative mentions using “Conch Architecture”, metal roofs, ft. and rear porches, pastel exteriors.</p>	<p>Proposing <u>Co-housing Model</u> (doesn’t explain the concept and site plan doesn’t indicate this model). Also using Modular Attached Town Homes. Combination of Duplex and Triplex. Narrative says 15 units, site plan shows 17 units; minimal site plan (does not include details such as landscaping, parking, amenities, etc. as requested); Narrative mentions using “Conch Architecture” , metal roofs, ft. and rear porches, pastel exteriors.</p>
<b>Average Score</b>		<b>8.3 *</b>	<b>7.7 *</b>
<p><b>Performance Schedule</b> --including the extent to which a developer exhibits capacity and commitment to complete the project in timely manner; RFP asked for construction schedule and discussion of capacity to manage development projects and complete them in timely fashion.</p>	20	<p><b>Completion End of 2009.</b> Minimal discussion. Projects 19 months for completion: 11 month for planning review and approvals and 8 months for construction. No detailed project schedule was provided. Will use a 5-member project team to oversee project; will contract with licensed contractor for all work; no details were provided. No discussion of organizational and staff capacity to manage/oversee multiple projects simultaneously should they receive award(s). Questions about timeframes for start-up and completion and capacity for multiple projects.</p>	<p><b>No construction schedule provided.</b> Minimal discussion- 11 months for planning review and approvals, a construction schedule was not provided. Will use a 5-member project team to oversee project; will contract with licensed contractor for all work; no details were provided. No discussion of their capacity to do multiple projects simultaneously should they receive award(s). Questions about timeframes for start-up and completion, and capacity for multiple projects.</p>
<b>Average Score</b>		<b>6 *</b>	<b>6 *</b>
<p><b>Project Financing</b> --RFP asked developer to discuss ability to provide sufficient financing for the project; the developer’s ability to secure necessary financing; and to provide evidence of the developer’s ability to fund the project until completion.)</p>	20	<p>Minimal discussion of project financing. Narrative mentions 2 potential funding sources: a pre-development fund and Community Contribution Tax Credit (CCTC) program –will also use volunteer labor No details provided.  No budgets or project costs/expenses provided.</p>	<p>Minimal discussion of project financing. Narrative mentions 2 potential funding sources: a pre-development fund and CCTC program –will also use volunteer labor No details provided.  No budgets or project costs/expenses provided.</p>
<b>Average Score</b>		<b>5 *</b>	<b>5 *</b>

<b>Housing Development Model Proposed</b> --RFQ and RFP stated preference for designs that provide rental or a mix of rental and home ownership units.  <b>Average Score</b>	20	Home Ownership, possibility of leasing 2 units.  <b>13.5 *</b>	Home Ownership; possibility of leasing 2 units.  <b>12.5 *</b>
<b>Estimated Unit Prices –</b> RFP asked developer to provide sales prices for homes for purchase; rental rates for rental units.  <b>Average Score</b>	20	2 BR- \$160K 3 BR- \$190K No interest mortgages; Rental fees not indicated  <b>17</b>	2 BR-\$120K 3 BR-\$140K No interest mortgages; Rental fees not indicated  <b>17</b>
<b>Total Average Score</b>	100	<b>49.8</b>	<b>48.2</b>

*\* This score does not reflect a true average score of the committee, as some committee members felt there was insufficient information to responsibly score these sections and therefore did not include a score.*

### III. Recommended Action

Habitat for Humanity of Key West and the Lower Keys was the sole respondent for this parcel. The Evaluation Committee appreciates the time and effort of Habitat for Humanity to submit its two proposals. However, the information submitted in its proposals in the Project Design, Schedule Performance, and Project Financing sections was not sufficiently responsive to enable the committee to fully or responsibly evaluate it.



## MEMORANDUM

### MONROE COUNTY PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

*We strive to be caring, professional and fair*

To: Andrew O. Trivette, Director of Growth Management  
From: Joseph Haberman, Planner  
Date: November 2, 2007  
Subject: *Comments on a proposed development by Habitat for Humanity on Cudjoe Key*

---

#### I. Proposal

Habitat for Humanity is proposing to construct sixteen (16) affordable housing units, composed of six (6) two-bedroom units and ten (10) three-bedroom units, on a vacant property located along US 1 (Overseas Highway) on Cudjoe Key.

The Applicant provided a design scheme for the layout of the sixteen (16) units. In the scheme, the units are organized parallel to US 1. All of the units would be attached “townhouses” and situated within eight (8) buildings.

#### II. Subject Property Description

The subject property consists of four (4) parcels. The parcels are legally described as Block 8, Lots 8, 9 and 11, Cutthroat Harbor Estates, Cudjoe Key, Monroe County, PB4-169 and identified as Real Estate Numbers 00178350.000000, 00178360.000000, 00178370.000000 & 00178380.000000.



According to the Property Appraiser’s records, the site consists of 50,000 ft<sup>2</sup> (1.15 acres) of total land area. However, no boundary survey providing a total amount of upland area was provided to confirm this total.

#### III. Brief Review of the Site Plan

The property has a Land Use District designation of Sub Urban Commercial (SC), a Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designation of Mixed Use / Commercial (MC), and a Tier

designation of Tier III. The development of employee housing is consistent with the purposes of the SC District (MCC Sec. 9.5-206) and the MC future land use category (Policy 101.4.5).

In the SC District, residential developments involving 6 to 18 units and designated as employee housing may be permitted with minor conditional use approval (MCC Sec. 9.5-235). At this time, affordable housing other than employee housing is not a permitted use in the SC District. Employee housing means a dwelling unit that is intended to serve as affordable, permanent housing for working households, which derive at least 70 percent of their household income from gainful employment in Monroe County and meet the requirements for affordable housing as per MCC Sections 9.5-4 (A-5) and 9.5-266.

The development of 16 employee housing units on the site would require conditional use approval. Conditional uses are those uses which are generally compatible with the other land uses permitted, but require individual review of their location, design and configuration and the imposition of conditions in order to ensure the appropriateness of the use at a particular location.

The owner of a parcel of land shall be entitled to develop employee housing on parcels of land classified as SC at an intensity up to a maximum net residential density of 18 dwelling units per acre (MCC Sec. 9.5-266(a)). Further, for employee housing, the maximum net residential density allowed per district shall not require transferable development rights (TDR's). Therefore, under the residential density regulations, the site could accommodate up to 12 employee housing units on the site.

### Development Potential

Land Use	Max Net Density	Size of Site <sup>1</sup>	Max Allowed	Amount Proposed	Percentage of Use
Employee Housing	18 units per buildable acre	1.15 acres (0.92 buildable acres)	16 units	16 units	100.0%

- i. The land area totals used in the above calculations are based on the Property Appraiser's records. The total amount of upland must be confirmed with a sealed boundary survey.

There is a required open space ratio of 0.20 or 20 percent in the SC District. Therefore, at least 10,000 ft<sup>2</sup> of the 50,000 ft<sup>2</sup> of total land area must remain open space. The proposed site plan appears to be compliance with this regulation.

The required non-shoreline setbacks in the SC District are as follows: Front yard – 25 feet; Rear yard – 10 feet; and Side yard – 10/15 feet (where 10 feet is the required side yard for one side and 15 feet is the minimum combined total of both side yards). The proposed site plan appears to be compliance with this regulation.

The development would require 24 off-street parking spaces, or 1.5 spaces per employee housing unit. The proposed garages would each have a capacity of 2 vehicles.

No landscape plan was available for review.

#### **IV. Brief Review of the Units and Sale Prices**

The site is designated partially within an AE – EL 10 flood zone and partially within an AE – EL 11 flood zone on FEMA’s flood insurance rate maps. All new structures must be built to standards that meet or exceed those for flood protection. The enclosed garages on the ground levels of the employee housing units may not be in compliance with the floodplain management regulations. These enclosures would require approval from the floodplain administrator.

No building shall be developed that exceeds a maximum height of 35 feet (MCC Sec. 9.5-283). The elevations indicate that the structures will be in compliance with this regulation.

In order for an applicant to be entitled to the incentives for employee housing outlined in MCC Sec. 9.5-266, the owner must ensure that all of the provisions and standards set forth in MCC Sec. 9.5-266(a)(6) are met. No information was provided that would indicate whether or not the units would be in compliance with these regulations.

The proposed sale prices of \$160,000 and \$190,000 would be compliance. Maximum sales price of owner occupied affordable housing unit is a price not exceeding three and three-quarters (3.75) times the annual median household income for Monroe County for a one (1) bedroom or efficiency unit, four and one-quarter (4.25) times the annual median household income for Monroe County for a two (2) bedroom unit, and four and three-quarters (4.75) times the annual median household income for Monroe County for a three (3) or more bedroom unit (MCC Sec. 9.5-4 (M-6.3)).

#### **V. Conclusion**

Although not required, the use of “Conch” style architecture would contribute to the architectural quality of the area. The style would provide visual interest and the variations in façade elements would reduce the apparent mass of the attached townhouse structures.

In addition, the Applicant is proposing to utilize “green” construction features. These features would help the residential units conserve energy and therefore be more environmental friendly than conventional construction.

The proposed site plan does not indicate that a public area will be provided. However, there is a large open area in the center of the site. Staff recommends that this area be designated as a common area for recreation and interaction.

Staff recommends a bike path along US 1. However, if a bike path is not completed as part of the development, Staff requests that the design embraces the Overseas Heritage Trail through the incorporation of trail amenities.