



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: Big Coppitt Key Parcel RE: #00156320

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 Big Coppitt Key (RE # 00156320), located at the corner of Emerald Drive, Sapphire Drive and US 1, Mile Marker 10. The parcel is zoned Suburban Commercial; it is approximately .85 acres. Current density will permit 12 units to be built.

For this parcel, HCD received only a single respondent: Habitat for Humanity of Key West and the Lower Keys.

On October 25th, November 15th, and November 30th, 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 Habitat for Humanity of Key West and the Lower Keys' proposal is included here, along with the committee's scores. Planning staff was asked to preliminarily review the site plans. This report is attached.

The respondent has been invited to make a presentation to the BOCC at the December 19th 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 Big Coppitt Key Parcel

| Evaluation Criteria | Max Pts. | Habitat For Humanity of Key West and the Lower Keys <i>Big Coppitt</i> |
|--|----------|---|
| <p>Aesthetics and Quality of Design --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> <p>Average Score</p> | 20 | <p>Modular Attached Town Homes. Two different site plans offered. 12 units of all triplexes, or 10 units of a combination of duplex and triplex. (Duplex is 2-BR and 997 S.F. Triplex is. 3-BR and 1,259 S.F.) Neither site plan matches narrative in terms of unit numbers. Both site plans are minimal (do not include landscaping, parking, amenities, etc.); Narrative mentions using “Conch Architecture”, metal roofs, ft. and rear porches, pastel exteriors.</p> <p>8.3 *</p> |
| <p>Performance Schedule --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> <p>Average Score</p> | 20 | <p>No construction schedule provided. Minimal discussion- 11 months for planning review and approval, no construction time given. Will use a 5-member project team; will contract with licensed contractor for all work, but provides no details. No discussion of capacity to manage / coordinate multiple projects simultaneously. Concerns about timeframes and capacity for multiple projects.</p> <p>4.3 *</p> |
| <p>Project Financing --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> <p>Average Score</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, but no details provided. Concerns about financing sources and timeframes required to secure financing.</p> <p>No budgets or project costs/expenses provided.</p> <p>5 *</p> |
| <p>Housing Development Model Proposed --RFQ and RFP stated preference for designs that provide rental or a mix of rental and home ownership units.</p> <p>Average Score</p> | 20 | <p>Home Ownership, possibility of leasing 2 units.</p> <p>13.5</p> |
| <p>Estimated Unit Prices – RFP asked developer to provide sales prices for homes for purchase; rental</p> | 20 | <p>2 BR- \$160K 3 BR- \$190K No interest mortgages;</p> |

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----|---------------------------|
| rates for rental units. | | Rental fees not indicated |
| Average Score | | 17 |
| | | |
| Total Average Score | 100 | 48.1 |

* *This score does not reflect an average score of all members 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 proposal. However, the information submitted in its proposal 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 Big Coppitt Key*

I. Proposal

Habitat for Humanity is proposing to construct twelve (12) affordable housing units, composed of six (6) two-bedroom units and six (6) three-bedroom units, on a vacant property located along US 1 (Overseas Highway) on Big Coppitt Key.

The Applicant provided two different design schemes for the layout of the twelve (12) units. In the first scheme, the units are organized around an interior drive with a cul-de-sac. All of the units are attached “townhouses” and situated within two (2) duplexes and two (2) triplexes. In the second scheme, the units are organized along an interior drive that is parallel to US 1. All of the units are attached “townhouses” and situated within four (4) triplexes.

II. Subject Property Description

The subject property consists of one (1) parcel. The parcel is legally described as Porpoise Point Section 5, Big Coppitt Key, PB5-119, Part Tract B and is identified as Real Estate Number 00156320.000000.

According to the Property Appraiser’s records, the site consists of 36,973 ft² (0.85 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 12 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 ⁱ | Max Allowed | Amount Proposed | Percentage of Use |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Employee Housing | 18 units per buildable acre | 0.85 acres (0.68 buildable acres) | 12 units | 12 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 7,394 ft² of the 36,973 ft² of total land area must remain open space. Both schemes appear 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). Both schemes appear to be compliance with this regulation.

The development would require 18 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 within an AE – EL 10 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. Further, it would be consistent with other proposed affordable housing developments in the area that are proposing similar architectural designs.

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.

Neither design scheme provides a public area. Staff recommends that a common area for recreation and interaction is incorporated into the design. In addition, Staff would like

clarification as to what development, if any, would take place along the canal. If possible, an observation platform or other public amenity could be situated at this location so that all of the residents can view the water. However, it appears that the end of the canal is under private ownership and any dockage would be prohibited.

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.

Based on the materials submitted, Staff prefers the second design scheme where units are aligned perpendicular to US 1 along a private drive. This layout is more consistent with existing development and other affordable housing projects currently under review.