

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Fort Pierce City Planning Board  
THRU: Director of Development *RT*  
FROM: Planning Coordinator *WC*  
SUBJECT: Preliminary Planned Unit Development  
DATE: March 9, 2004

---

Owner: Max Ambach and Sons and Company  
21218 St. Andrews Blvd., Suite 414  
Boca Raton, FL 33433

Applicant: Mr. Todd Fabbri  
580 village Boulevard, Suite 120  
West Palm Beach, FL 33409

Representative: Jon Schmidt and Associates, Inc.  
333 Southern Boulevard, Suite 200  
West Palm Beach, FL 33405

Requested Action: Approval of a Preliminary  
Planned Unit Development (PUD)  
known as Longwood Gardens.

Location: The remaining west parcels of the  
Villages of Longwood that have not  
been developed.

Existing Zoning: PUD, Planned Unit Development.

Existing Land Use: Undeveloped property.

Comprehensive Plan: The Future Land Use Element of the  
Comprehensive Plan designates the  
parcel as Rm, Medium Density  
Residential and Cg, General  
Commercial. The proposed  
development is consistent with the  
Comprehensive Plan.

Code Compliance: All site plan approvals are subject  
to permit reviews consistent with  
the Florida Building Code and  
Chapter 17 of the Fort Pierce Code  
of Ordinances.

Public Utilities: Water and sewer services are available.

Public Services: Sanitation, police and fire protection services are available.

**Analysis:**

The request is for the approval of a Preliminary PUD approval known as Longwood Gardens. Total acreage of the project is 15.8 acres and it is the remaining parcels that were previously part of the Villages of Longwood PUD.

The project is a multi-family development which consists of three-story buildings with twenty four (24) units in each building. One, two and three bedroom units will be offered.

The total number of units is 264 and averages 16.7 dwelling units per acre. A clubhouse and pool will be centrally located within the community to serve residents.

The development of the property will be partially financed by the Florida Housing Finance Corporation and will be dedicated to the Affordable Housing Market. The assigned affordability designation will run for the life of the property.

Prospective tenants are required to pass employment verification, financial and credit confirmations and criminal background checks in order to be approved as a prospective occupant.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Planned Unit Development known as Longwood Gardens.

S.P.  
Longwood Commons  
08-4-03

City Clerk  
08-4-03  
~~WITHDRAWN~~

**SITE PLAN REPORT**

**DATE (PLANNING BOARD) July 8, 2003**  
**(COMMISSION MEETING) August 4, 2003**

**REQUEST** Approval of a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) known as Longwood Commons Apartments.

**LOCATION** Remaining west parcels of the Villages of Longwood that have not been developed.

**LEGAL** Tax ID # 2416-504-0199-050-6; 2416-504-0199-000/1 & 2416-504-0199-200/3 (See attached copies of Property Appraiser's Property Record Card.)

**PROPERTY SIZE** 15.8 acres

**OWNER** Max Ambach and Sons and Company

**APPLICANT** Triad Housing Partners, LLC

**REPRESENTATIVE** David Schultz

- 
- ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Memo from Planning Coordinator
  2. Application w/Legal
  3. Location/zoning maps
  4. Site Plan

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Fort Pierce City Planning Board  
THRU: Director of Development  
FROM: Planning Coordinator *WC*  
SUBJECT: Preliminary Planned Unit Development  
DATE: June 3, 2003

---

Owner: Max Ambach and Sons and Company  
21218 St. Andrews Blvd., Suite 414  
Boca Raton, FL 33433

Applicant: Triad Housing Partners, LLC  
Mr. David Shultz  
One Oakwood Blvd., Suite 195  
Hollywood, FL 33020

Requested Action: Approval of a Preliminary  
Planned Unit Development (PUD)  
known as Longwood Commons  
Apartments.

Location: The remaining west parcels of the  
Villages of Longwood that have not  
been developed.

Existing Zoning: PUD, Planned Unit Development.

Existing Land Use: Undeveloped property.

Comprehensive Plan: The Future Land Use Element of the  
Comprehensive Plan designates the  
parcel as Rm, Medium Density  
Residential and Cg, General  
Commercial. The proposed  
development is consistent with the  
Comprehensive Plan designation.

Special Information:

Public Utilities: Water and sewer services are  
available.

Public Services: Sanitation, police and fire  
protection services are available.

**Analysis:**

The request is for the approval of a Preliminary PUD approval known as Longwood Commons Apartments. Total acreage of the project is 15.8 acres and it is the remaining parcels that were previously part of the Villages of Longwood PUD.

The project is a multi-family development which consists of three-story buildings with twenty four (24) units in each building. One, two and three bedroom units will be offered.

The total number of units is 264 which averages out to 16.7 dwelling units per acre. A clubhouse facility will be centrally located within the community to will serve residents.

The Site Plan has been reviewed and conceptually approved by all City Departments.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Planned Unit Development known as Longwood Commons Apartments.



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FORT PIERCE CITY PLANNING BOARD HELD ON TUESDAY, JULY 8, 2003, IN THE CITY HALL FIRST FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, 100 N. U.S. #1, FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA**

**Agenda Item # 6 - Site Plan** - approval of a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) known as Longwood Commons Apartments. Owner is Max Ambach and Sons and Company.

**Staff Report** - This is a 15.8 acre parcel that was originally part of the Longwood PUD. The number of units, which is 264 were originally approved with the Longwood PUD. The site plan before you tonight is three story buildings with 24 units in each building and staff is recommending approval.

Mr. Nunn asked when they were approved, were they approved as owner-occupied as condos like most of Longwood Village is or were they approved as rental use?

Ms. Clark said I don't recall.

Ms. Brenner asked Ms. Clark do you remember the date it was approved?

Ms. Clark said we have three huge files on Longwood. I think the beginning started around 1984 and continued through, I believe, 1988.

Ms. Brenner said on the minutes from the last meeting, Mr. Becht raised the question about the right-of-way through the property. Has that been discussed about the 18<sup>th</sup> Street?

Ms. Clark said that has not been discussed since the last meeting. That South 18<sup>th</sup> Street is on the tax records as being a public right-of-way. However, this department has not seen any request for vacation or abandonment of that right-of-way.

Ms. Brenner said if I'm not mistaken, if I add up the parcels on the three pieces presented, actually the total is 13.59 which means they are asking for 15.8 and that leaves a shortage of 2.21 in the total acreage. Would that have anything to do with the right-of-way?

Ms. Clark asked are you reading that from the survey because there was language on the survey that excepted out the actual 18<sup>th</sup> Street right-of-way. So that may have been where the difference falls. Ms. Brenner said I was checking it off the property legals. That adds up to 13.59. Then they are asking for 15.8, so I wondered where the other 2.21 acres were.

Ms. Clark said I can't answer that. We went by the acreage from the application and under no circumstances we would use the Property Appraiser's listing for this.

Ms. Brenner said you are saying the 15.8 is on their proof survey?

Ms. Clark said yes from the applicant survey.

Ms. Brenner said I also had a question. According to the minutes, they are requesting funding from an affordable housing program of this State. Is that correct?

Ms. Clark said the applicant has not formally filed any paperwork with City staff as of yet. They have stated just in conversation that yes they would be applying for special finance.

Mr. Bergman said that survey does indicate that the right-of-way for 18<sup>th</sup> Street is included in that acreage. It's in the 15.8.

Ms. Brenner said but to our knowledge it is not abandoned? Ms. Clark said correct.

Mr. David Schultz said I am representing the applicant and developer of the plans developing on these Longwood Commons. To address the first issue, which is the question of the right-of-way. The right-of-way was abandoned. I believe the date was in 1987 or 1988 as part of the settlement agreement with the City. It's part of the volumes of paper that you have. I could direct staff to where exactly that was. I understand it's a question because of the tax rolls. But I wouldn't be here standing with the 15.8 acre survey if I didn't have the document signed by the City and title work proven that it's been vacated. That sort of addresses the acreage issue. One note is that our development is, although a few units less, it is not being built into the maximum density. The zoning and part of the PUD has not restricted this particular property to owner-occupied units. It is rental units and that was another question that was brought up. Development plans is three story building fashion. Our company builds entirely out of concrete block construction. We don't use any wood frame construction in our development. The design of the development puts the buildings on the interior and provides very generous courtyards for the families to interact. We put several tot lots around the development and nice landscaping. We also have pathways that take the pedestrians off the main streets and keep them inside the complex. We know we are going to be providing quality housing product on a parcel which has its zoning. We are happy to do it. We have been looking in Fort Pierce for quite awhile and we are very pleased to find this parcel by the hospital. This suited our development criteria. The project is a \$25 million project that you will be adding to the tax base of the City. I realize there are some questions that have been raised by the Board with regard to the vacation of the right-of-way. I understand the concern, but I'm not as concerned because I saw that too and I addressed it, so I understand it. And I'm happy, as I said, to direct staff exactly where in their piles of paperwork on this project that those vacation documents are.

Mr. Nunn asked are you going to be a low income housing development?

Mr. David Reich said one of the options we are pursuing with financing is called Tax Exempt Bond Finance. That carries a below market rate interest. Also we will be raising \$13 million worth of private equity investment. Between those two sources we'll be funding \$25 to \$26 million. We are building tax exempt bond finance housing. It is a program with which Florida Housing Finance Corporation administers tax exempt bond. It is not a Section 8 project, it is not a Section 8 development. It is what they call Florida Housing Finance Corporation Tax Exempt Bonds. The Federal tax bonds that are issued by the State of Florida.

Mr. Nunn said so you said you are building a \$25 million development. The taxation on that will be

on the true development value, not based on, because I know that's low income housing. If you get money for low income housing, that's not how the property tax is based. It's based on the income of the resident.

Mr. Reich said we pay full market values, appraised market value of our land taxes.

Mr. Bergman asked what's your target income for your attendants?

Mr. Reich said we would expect that the income generated by the residents in the rental community here will probably be in the mid to high 30's.

Mr. Bergman said so that's the expected income of your tenants?

Mr. Reich said that's the expected income of the population that will be renters.

Mr. Knott said I have a couple of quick questions. I see you have one, two and three bedroom units. What's the full area?

Mr. Schultz said roughly about 775 square feet on the one bedroom, 1065 on the two bedroom and 1280 on the three bedroom unit. They are two bedroom, two bath units; three bedroom, two bath units and one bedroom, one bath unit. They will have washers and dryers in the units.

Mr. Knott asked what would you be renting them for?

Mr. Schultz said we would estimate 65 cents to 75 cents a foot. A three bedroom would come out to roughly \$850. That's a little on the high end. That's a price which has cable television included.

Mr. Knott asked what is your construction schedule?

Mr. Schultz said we do not build in phases. We build the entire project at once. Generally a project like this takes us about 15 months for completion, at the long end. We own our own construction company. We do our own project management. We do our own management of our development once it's completed. We do not hire third parties to manage our construction. We don't hire third parties to manage our units. We own every unit we've ever built and continue. We have over 2000 units that we own. We have projects in Stuart, projects in Sebastian, projects in Tampa, projects in Broward County, projects in Dade County and we are continuing our development. We are a young group of people that intend to manage every product that we build and do it with pride. We stay involved in our project.

Mr. Reich said with the home ownership one of the things that we offer all of our residents, anywhere we develop, is a 5% of the rent we get back to them to go and buy a home, when they leave us, assuming they are in good standing. Obviously if they were not paying their rent, we wouldn't do that. But if they are in good standing after they have been with us for two years, we accept advice to move out. We credit them 5% of the rent to buy a home.

Mr. Schultz said it is not a mandatory program by anyone. This is a try-it housing project. It's a force savings plan, 5% of the rent gets cut to go to the house they buy. That is something we do as the company.

Mr. Reich said one of the other things specifically about the financing, by nature of the tax exempt bond finance, we are long term owners. We are not here to be a merchant builder, to build them, as my partner, David, has explained by nature of us also doing the management, we have on site management and we are not managing from a distance. We'll have full time employees and development of this size will probably command six full time employees, between maintenance, landscape and actual on site management.

Mr. Knott asked how come you could not make it last month.

Mr. Schultz said I take full responsibility for not having been here. I missed the notification.

Mr. Nunn asked what are your projected rents for one, two and three?

Mr. Schultz said our projected rents are between 65 cents and 75 cents a foot. I will calculate each unit and tell you after it's calculated.

Mr. Nunn asked do you do any under occupied type building also?

Mr. Reich said yes, we've done some townhouse owner-occupied for sale.

Mr. Nunn asked the project in Stuart, is it the same basically as this or is it an occupied?

Mr. Reich said we have two projects there. One is owner occupied townhomes. One is one and two bedroom apartment houses. They happen to be adjacent to one another.

Mr. Nunn asked why did you decide to do rental here or not do a combination since, I believe most of Longwood Village what's developed there now is owner-occupied townhouses and condos?

Mr. Schultz said we found that developments with the quality of our building construction and the type of roofing systems and the types of finishes that we do, we are unsuccessful to make the development under the number of 160 to 180 units financially feasible. That's in Dade and Broward County where our smallest developments are. In order to make this deal financially feasible, you need to add units. The numbers don't pencil at a combination of sale. Number one you have two different sets of documents, you have twice a week fees, you have twice a month costs.

Mr. Nunn said so the reason not to do the whole thing as an inner occupied is the same reason the numbers don't work for you here. You just get more units out of it this way, is that the bottom line?

Mr. Reich said certainly you get more density out of building an apartment building than you would a townhouse development. What we did was we identified this from the beginning as a multi-family site. That's the way we've always pursued it. I believe it was originally zoned for more units and

we came back and said we think we've pushing at 264.

Mr. Schultz said the rental on the one bedroom is \$600; the two bedroom roughly \$763 and \$880 on the three bedroom.

Ms. Brenner asked could you please tell us the name of your place in Sebastian?

Mr. Schultz said Pelican Isles. A project that we are going to start construction in three months. We purchased 32 acres there across from City Hall. We came into the City with a proposal and we offered to..they originally had a street...there's a street that the City has a grant. They received a \$800,000 Federal Grant to improve Louisiana Avenue. Our project bordered that street and we were planning 150 apartment homes and 25 townhomes there. The City had a concern that we were going to be pruning this new street that they were fixing with Federal Funds. What we agreed to do was build roughly about a half mile of new roadway of right-of-way that the City owned. It's a new road that we're building for the City Hall power line road. They own the right-of-way for it and wanted it built and we agreed to build it. Not as a requirement of anything, but because we wanted it to service our community. We thought it was a better access and we've gone through five different Commission meetings asking questions.

Ms. Brenner what are the ones in Stuart?

Mr. Schultz said Stuart Oaks and Catalina Club. Stuart Oaks is the rental one.

Ms. Brenner asked if you multiply out all these units that you've got in here, how many people are we talking about living in here if its fully rented out?

Mr. Schultz and Mr. Reich said it would be roughly 528.

Ms. Brenner asked is there going to be covered parking or is it all going to be exposed parking?

Mr. Schultz said right now we haven't designed covered parking. We haven't designed that. If that was a necessity amended by the Planning Board or City Commission, we would certainly look into that. We've the long term owners. Anything that enhances our property and keeps everyone happy, we are willing to do.

Ms. Brenner said reduce the density?

Mr. Schultz said we have reduced the density a little bit to design what we believe to be a very, very well design, very urban feeling development here. We've taken your eyes on the streets design, we've taken private corridors for the residents, we've taken neighborly and friendly and pedestrian friendly designs here. We taken just about every new urbanism concept that you could design on the site. This site happens to work very well for that. If you start cutting down some units, you are going to take away from defensible spaces, you are going to take away from pedestrian straight walk ways. You are taking away from the feeling of the design. I understand your question. That's one issue. The second issue is financing. You start to run into an issue of, you have fewer units to stretch

your cost. If I could charge \$1,200 for a 1200 square foot unit, I'd be more than happy to cut density down. This is a way that we can put \$25 million tax base on. The records with putting a project that raises \$13 million of private equity coming into site plan made sense.

Ms. Jean Cornelisse said I am not against growth in Fort Pierce. I work at Lawnwood and the only thing that concerns me is that it's difficult right now to get out of 25<sup>th</sup> Street when you are coming through that development area and you are trying to go onto 25<sup>th</sup>. I think we could probably look at having to put a light here sometime. The other thing is, even if figured that two people have a car, you are looking at that many more cars in that general area. I can understand this sounds like a fabulous program and I am not opposing it, but I just am bringing that as an issue that needs to be thought of.

Mr. Nunn asked, Wendy is that a point at which you require a traffic impact study because this certainly looks like a development that should have a traffic impact study?

Ms. Clark said that is at the discretion of the Director of Development and it has always been my understanding that at the time the Hospital, as well as the Villages of Longwood and the Pines, were being developed that those roadways were designed and proved in order to support the proposed traffic for all of those developments.

Mr. Bergman said that was when they were probably designed as quad perplexes, not three story multi-family.

Ms. Clark said keep in mind that the number of units has not changed. Originally this 15 acres was part of the Villages of Longwood PUD. For whatever reason, that 15 acres was never developed, so this developer is coming in with the same number that was previously proposed in the 80's - the 264. Originally back in the 80's it was planned for, it was never built. So now these developers are coming in with the same number of units.

Mr. Knott said Wendy this is a preliminary and will be coming back? But the elevations they have submitted, is staff content?

Ms. Clark said yes.

Mr. Knott said I couldn't see an elevator. Is it required for a three story?

Mr. Enns said I don't think you have too as long as your handicapped is downstairs.

Mr. Knott said the final thing is traffic. I agree with what Wendy is saying that the original project was approved at a certain density. But that was a lifetime ago and driving styles and patterns have changed, I think in the last 15 to 20 years since that was approved. I would be willing to make a motion to approve it subject to a traffic study being done.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. KNOTT TO APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE STAFF REQUIRE**

**A TRAFFIC STUDY FOR THE INTERSECTIONS. Seconded by Ms. Benton. Unanimously approved by roll call vote.**

