



AGENDA
PALM BEACH COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
PUBLIC HEARING

Wednesday, April 26, 2017

9:30 a.m. 6th Floor

Jane M. Thompson Memorial Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

- A. Roll Call
- B. Opening Prayer and Pledge of Allegiance
- C. Proof of Publication - Motion to receive and file
- D. Notice: This agenda includes Comprehensive Plan hearings and Zoning hearings. The Zoning hearing agenda items are 3.A.2, 3.A.4 and 3.A.7

Zoning hearings are quasi-judicial in nature and must be conducted to afford all parties due process. The Board of County Commissioners has adopted Procedures for conduct of Quasi-Judicial Hearings to govern the conduct of such proceedings. The Procedures include the following requirements:

Any communication with commissioners, which occurs outside the public hearing, must be fully disclosed at the hearing.

Applicants and persons attending the hearing may question commissioners regarding their disclosures. Such questions shall be limited solely to the disclosures made at the hearing or the written communications made a part of the record at the hearing.

Any person representing a group or organization must provide documentation that the person representing the group has the actual authority to do so regarding the matter before the Commission.

Any person who wishes to speak at the hearing will be sworn in and may be subject to cross-examination.

The Applicant and County staff may cross-examine witnesses. Any other persons attending the hearing may submit cross -examination questions, including follow up questions, to the Mayor, who will conduct the examination. The scope of cross-examination is limited to the facts alleged by the witness in relation to the application.

Public comment is encouraged and all relevant information should be presented to the commission in order that a fair and appropriate decision can be made.

E. Swearing In – County Attorney

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

- A. Additions, Deletions, Substitutions
- B. Postponements
- C. Adoption of Agenda

3. PUBLIC HEARING –17-B Adoption & Zoning Applications (Pages 3-10)

4. PUBLIC HEARING –17-C Transmittal (Pages 11-13)

5. REGULAR AGENDA (Page 14)

6. COMMENTS (Page 14)

7. ADJOURNMENT (Page 14)

3. PUBLIC HEARING –Round 17-B & Zoning Adoption

The Department of Economic Opportunity reviewed this amendment under the Expedited Review process and issued no objections or comments. See front cover for copies.

3.A. Privately Proposed Amendment and Zoning Applications

Name	Description
<u>3.A.1</u> <u>Johns Glades</u> <u>West MLU</u> <u>(LGA 2017-003)</u> District 5	Current: Low Residential, 3 units per acre (LR-3)
	Proposed: Multiple Land Use, with Commercial High and High Residential, 8 units per acre (MLU, with CH, HR-8)
	Size: 37.99 acres
	Location: Southwest corner of Glades Road and 95th Avenue
	Private Text Amendment Summary: The traffic impacts resulting from this amendment would significantly impact four roadway segments that are anticipated to be failing level of service in 2040. To meet Policy 3.5-d, the site would need to be limited to 54,000 s.f. of commercial and 304 residential units. The applicant has requested an exemption from this policy to allow the site to develop with up to approximately 170,000 square feet of commercial and 304 units, plus additional workforce housing units, stating that the additional commercial is necessary to achieve the dynamic for this project.
	Staff Assessment: The request is for an infill, mixed use, 'entertainment destination' on one of the few remaining large vacant tracts of land in West Boca. The proposed amendment with conditions of approval and Conceptual Plan demonstrates that the land uses will be functionally integrated, provide for a variety of housing in the area, be compatible with the surrounding land uses and meet all policy requirements of the Comprehensive Plan with the exception of the long range traffic requirements of Policy 3.5-d. To offset any potential negative impacts, the MLU designation allows the County to impose mitigation measures. Therefore, the Planning Division has proposed conditions of approval as follows: to limit the majority of the potential traffic impacts to off peak hours, to provide additional workforce housing, to ensure that a mix of uses is established, and to require that the rezoning and amendment public hearings are held concurrently.
	Staff Recommendation: <i>Approval with conditions</i>
	LPA Recommendation: <i>Approval with conditions</i> , motion by Thomas Dennis, seconded by Judy Daversa, passed in a 7-0 vote at the October 21st public hearing. There was minimal board discussion. Three members of the public spoke in support citing enhancement of high end dining, entertainment, and retail opportunities and reducing travel time to reach those opportunities. An attorney for the adjacent commercial property to west spoke in opposition and requested a postponement citing that they did not receive adequate notification.

Name	Description
3.A.1 Johns Glades West MLU (LGA 2017-003) Continued	<p>BCC Transmittal: <i>Transmit with conditions</i>, motion by Comm. Abrams, seconded by Comm. Taylor passed in a 5-0 vote (with Comm. Valeche and Comm. Vana absent) at the October 26th public hearing. The Board discussed the Policy 3.5-d traffic exemption and enforcement of the off peak hour maximum trips condition, the support from West Boca Community Council, the existing commercial uses in the area compared to the proposed project, and the potential for housing for persons with disabilities. Twelve members of the public spoke, consisting of eight in opposition and four in support. Three of the speakers in opposition were representatives of the adjacent Westwinds of Boca shopping center. Two letters were submitted at the hearing and added to Exhibit 11.</p> <p>State Review Comments: The FDOT review letter issued technical assistance comments regarding the amendment. See staff report for discussion.</p> <p>Changes Since Transmittal: Staff and the applicant continued to discuss the conditions of the amendment and made minor modifications (see staff report).</p>
MOTION:	To <i>adopt an ordinance</i> for the Johns Glades West MLU amendment.
<u>3.A.2</u> <u>Johns Glades West MXPD</u> ZV/PDD/R-2016-00845 Control 2004-00459 District 5	<p>Title: An Official Zoning Map Amendment to a Planned Development District application of W95 Glades, Glades W95 LLC, Daniel Johns by Wantman Group Inc., Agent.</p> <p>Request: To allow a rezoning from the Agriculture Residential (AR) Zoning District to the Mixed Use Planned Development (MXPD) Zoning District.</p> <p>Title: A Requested Use of W95 Glades, Glades W95 LLC, Daniel Johns by Wantman Group Inc., Agent.</p> <p>Request: To allow an Indoor Theater.</p> <p>Title: A Requested Use of W95 Glades, Glades W95 LLC, Daniel Johns by Wantman Group Inc., Agent.</p> <p>Request: To allow a Type I Restaurant with drive-through</p> <p>Project Manager: Yoan Machado</p> <p>Size: 37.99 acres +/-</p> <p>Location: SW corner of Glades Rd and 95th Ave, 1,500 ft east of SR 7</p> <p>DISCLOSURE</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends a postponement to May 25, 2017.</p>

Name	Description
<p>3.A.2 Johns Glades West MXP</p> <p>ZV/PDD/R-2016-00845 (continued)</p>	<p>Zoning Commission Recommendation: Approved a Type II Variance to allow extended hours of operations within 250 feet of a residential district; to allow a reduction of internal trip capture ratio; to allow a reduction for front setback for Building C5.by a vote of 7-0-0.</p> <p>Zoning Commission Recommendation: Recommended Approval of an Official Zoning Map Amendment to a Planned Development District to allow a rezoning from the Agriculture Residential (AR) Zoning District to the Mixed Use Planned Development (MXP) Zoning District by a vote of 7-0-0.</p> <p>Zoning Commission Recommendation: Recommended Approval of a Requested Use to allow an Indoor Theater by a vote of 7-0-0</p> <p>Zoning Commission Recommendation: Recommended Approval of a Requested Use to allow a Type I Restaurant with drive-through by a vote of 7-0-0.</p>
<p>MOTION: To <i>postpone</i> to May 25, 2017.</p>	
<p><u>3.A.3</u></p> <p><u>Horizon</u> <u>Composting</u> <u>(LGA 2017-012)</u></p> <p>District 6</p>	<p>Current: Agricultural Production (AP)</p> <p>Proposed: Agricultural Production with an underlying Special Agriculture (AP/SA)</p> <p>Size: 31.60 acres</p> <p>Location: North side of CR-880, 6.75 miles west of SR-80</p> <p>Staff Assessment: The proposed amendment is the first site to seek approval for an equestrian waste recycling facility through the recently adopted Equestrian Waste Recycling Program. Such Facilities would recycle equestrian waste into reusable bedding material, fertilizer, and other related products. The proposed amendment site meets the criteria established in the Comprehensive Plan for the Pilot Program.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: <i>Approval with conditions</i></p> <p>LPA Recommendation: <i>Approval with conditions</i>, motion by Neil Merin, seconded by Angela Vann passed in a 10-0 vote at the February 10th public hearing. Board discussion centered on the specifics of the recycling use, include questions regarding impacts on area land uses, permitting and environmental safety requirements, and access to the site. There was no public comment.</p>

Name	Description
3.A.3 Horizon Composting (LGA 2017-012) continued	<p>BCC Transmittal: <i>Transmit</i>, motion by Vice Mayor McKinlay, seconded by Comm. Valeche passed in a 7-0 vote at the February 23rd public hearing. Board discussion included comments regarding the long standing need to address equestrian waste, the illegal dumping that is occurring in the agricultural and rural areas, the roadway network for the transport of waste, distance of the site from the Glades Communities, and site design requirements to protect the environment that would be reviewed through the zoning process. Two members of the public spoke.</p> <p>State Review Comments: There were no comments regarding the amendment.</p>
MOTION:	To adopt an ordinance for the Horizon Composting amendment
<u>3.A.4</u> <u>Horizon</u> <u>Composting</u> <u>Facility</u> ZV/CB/CA-2016-01030 Control 2007-00333 District 6	<p>Title: A Class A Conditional Use application of Horizon 880 LLC by Wantman Group Inc., Agent.</p> <p>Request: To allow an Equestrian Waste Management Facility.</p> <p>Project Manager: Donna Adelsperger</p> <p>Size: 31.60 acres +/-</p> <p>Location: North of SR-880, approx. 2.5 miles east of San Senter Road.</p> <p>DISCLOSURE</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of the request subject to 21 Conditions of Approval as indicated in Exhibit C-3.</p> <p>Zoning Commission Recommendation: Approved a Type II Variance to allow a reduction in the number parking spaces; a reduction in the width of a Right-of-Way buffer for the northern approximately 1,088-feet of the western property line; elimination of the incompatibility buffer along the north property line and the north 1,081-feet of the east property line; and elimination of interior trees and shrubs by a vote of 7-0-0.</p> <p>Zoning Commission Recommendation: Approved a Class B Conditional Use to allow Chipping and Mulching by a vote of 7-0-0.</p> <p>Zoning Commission Recommendation: Recommended Approval of a Class A Conditional Use to allow an Equestrian Waste Management Facility by a vote of 7-0-0.</p>
MOTION:	To adopt a resolution approving a Class A Conditional Use to allow an Equestrian Waste Management Facility subject to the Conditions of Approval as indicated in Exhibit C-3.

Name	Description
<p><u>3.A.5.</u> <u>Delray Linton Groves</u> <u>IOTA</u> <u>(LGA 2016-029)</u> District 6</p>	<p>Current: Rural Residential, 1 unit per 10 acres</p> <p>Proposed: Western Communities Residential (WCR) for up to 0.80 dwelling units per acre (1,030 units) and up to 112,000 s.f. of commercial uses, and up to 112,123 s.f. of community uses.</p> <p>Size: 1,287.96 acres</p> <p>Location: West of 190th Avenue North, north of 60th Avenue North</p> <p>Private Text Amendment Summary: To revise the Future Land Use, and Transportation Elements, and the Map Series to add the Delray Linton Groves site to the Western Communities Residential Overlay (WCRO), specifically to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise WCRO policies and the WCR FLU designation to include the site; • Expand the list of identified Rural Parkways in TE Policy 1.4-q; and • Modify the Map Series to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revise Managed Growth Tier System Map LU 1.1 to show the boundaries of the site as a Limited Urban Service Area (LUSA); ○ Revise Service Areas Map LU 2.1 to change the site from the Rural Service Area and to a LUSA; ○ Revise Special Planning Areas Map LU 3.1 to include the site within the boundaries of the WCRO; and ○ Revise Thoroughfare Right of way Identification Map TE 14.1 to add 60th Street North as a 100-foot right-of-way from 190th Street North to the westernmost project entrance; to add Orange Boulevard as an 80-foot right-of-way from 190th Street North to the access points into the site; and to add references to rural parkways to the notes. <p>Staff Assessment: The proposed amendment allows for meaningful and predictable standards ensuring that the project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and is generally consistent with the planning concepts from the Sector Plan Remedial Amendment, the Managed Growth Tier System, the Western Communities Residential Overlay, service policy requirements, and associated policies. There are demonstrable and quantifiable public benefits not just for the future residents of the proposed project, but those that benefit residents outside of the project in the Central Western Communities. Furthermore, the amendment would be part of the WCR Policy 3.5-d to address impacts to roadway levels of service for many facilities within central western Palm Beach County, as these impacts can be addressed through specific improvements to the roadway network.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: <i>Approval with conditions</i></p> <p>LPA Recommendation: <i>Approval with conditions</i>, motion by Lori Vinikoor, seconded by Kiley Harper-Larsen, passed in a 6-1 vote (with Katherine Murray dissenting) at the October 21st public hearing. Board discussion included questions regarding whether the open space set aside will be used for drainage purposes and how the workforce housing requirement was calculated. Two representatives of the Indian Trail Improvement District (ITID) spoke regarding the drainage benefit to ITID, but also that the project would use district roads.</p>

<p>3.A.5</p> <p>Delray Linton Groves IOTA (LGA 2016-029)</p> <p>Continued</p>	<p>BCC Transmittal: <i>Transmit with conditions</i>, motion by Comm. Taylor, seconded by Comm. Abrams passed in a 4-2 (with Comm. Burdick and Comm. McKinlay dissenting, and with Comm. Valeche absent) vote at the October 26th public hearing. A substitute motion by Comm. McKinlay, seconded by Comm. Burdick, for denial failed in a 2-4 vote. The Board discussion centered on the amount of residential approved in the Central Western Communities, impacts to schools, and the public benefits provided by the project. Three members of the public spoke in opposition citing too much development in the area, loss of rural character, and traffic concerns. One member of the public spoke in support citing the benefits from addressing flooding concerns and the increase in land value for adjacent properties.</p> <p>State Agency Review Comments: The Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) issued a letter dated December 1, 2016 stating that the agency had <i>“identified no comment related to important state resources and facilities within the Department’s authorized scope of review that will be adversely impacted by the amendment if adopted.”</i> However, the letter identified three technical assistance comments consistent with Section 163.3168(3), F.S. that are <i>“technical in nature and designed to ensure consistency with the provisions of Chapter 163, F.S.”</i> and that the comments will not form the basis of a challenge. In addition, comments were provided by the Florida Department of Transportation and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council. See staff report for discussion.</p> <p>Changes Since Transmittal: Subsequent to transmittal, the applicant revised the Conceptual Plan to consolidate the civic sites from three to two locations in response from a request from Property and Real Estate Management, and to relocate the equestrian trail from a location within the development to the western edge of the parcel.</p>
<p>MOTION: To <i>adopt an ordinance</i> for the Delray Linton Groves amendment</p>	

Name	Description
3.A.6 Delray Linton Groves PDD-2016-00861 Control 2007-00013 District 6	<p>Title: An Official Zoning Map Amendment to a Planned Development District application of Iota Carol LLC by Urban Design Kilday Studios, Agent.</p> <p>Request: To allow a rezoning from the Agriculture Production (AP) and Agriculture Residential (AR) Zoning Districts to the Western Communities Residential Planned Unit Development (WCR PUD) Zoning District.</p> <p>Project Manager: Roger Ramdeen</p> <p>Size: 1,287.96 acres +/-</p> <p>Location: Approximately 1 mile west of Seminole Pratt Whitney Road, bounded by 60th Street North on the south, 190th Street North on the east and Coral Street to the west.</p> <p>DISCLOSURE</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of the request subject to 87 Conditions of Approval as indicated in Exhibit C.</p> <p>Zoning Commission Recommendation: Recommended Approval of an Official Zoning Map Amendment to a Planned Development District with a vote of 6-1-0.</p>
MOTION:	To adopt a resolution approving an Official Zoning Map Amendment to a Planned Development District to allow a rezoning from the Agriculture Production (AP) and Agriculture Residential (AR) Zoning Districts to the Western Communities Residential Planned Unit Development (WCR PUD) Zoning District subject to the Conditions of Approval as indicated in Exhibit C.

3.B. Proposed County Initiated Text Amendments

Name	Description
3.B.1 School Coordinated Planning	<p>This amendment will revise the Comprehensive Plan based on the Interlocal Agreement for Coordinated School Planning entered into by the School District and the County on Dec. 15, 2015. Specifically, this amendment proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocate School Planning policies from the Public School Facilities Element (PSFE) to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element; • Delete school concurrency policies and the remainder of the PSFE; • Add, update or delete applicable definitions in the Introduction and Administration Element; • Change references within the Future Land Use and Capital Improvement Elements to be consistent with the new policies; and • Revise maps in the Map Series: the School Concurrency Service Areas Map PS 1.1, School Facility Locations Map PS 2.1, Planned Additional Capacity Map PS 3.1 and the Planned Additional Capacity Map PS 3.2.

Name	Description
3.B.1 School Coordinated Planning (continued)	Staff Assessment: The County has held an interlocal agreement with the School District to coordinate school facility planning since 2001 through school concurrency. The County, District and municipalities entered into a new interlocal agreement in 2015 that places the emphasis on coordination and data sharing that have been in place since 2001. The school level of service and concurrency aspect is no longer required by Florida Statutes and has not been carried forward. This amendment will incorporate the provisions of the new Interlocal Agreement into the Comprehensive Plan and eliminate language related to school concurrency.
	Staff Recommendation: <i>Approval</i>
	LPA Recommendation: <i>Approval</i>, motion by Sandra Greenberg, seconded by Katherine Murray, passed in a 9-0 vote at the November 18, 2016 public hearing. There was minimal discussion and no public comment. Staff stated that there would be a change in the Map Titles to reflect the new element location.
	BCC Transmittal: <i>Transmit</i>, motion by Comm. Bernard, seconded by Comm. Berger passed in a 7-0 vote at the January 30 th public hearing. Board discussion included comments regarding the State of Florida's preemption of local government rules and regulations. Two members of the public spoke.
	State Agency Review Comments: The FDOT provided technical assistance comments regarding the need for the School District to coordinate with FDOT regarding school siting and SIS facilities (see staff report for discussion).
MOTION:	
To <i>adopt an ordinance</i> for the School Coordinated Planning amendment.	

4. PUBLIC HEARING – Amendment Round 17-C Transmittal

4.A. County Initiated Text Amendment

Name	Description
4.A.1 Transportation Element Updates	<p>This amendment proposes an update to the Transportation Element, and related policies in Future Land Use and Intergovernmental Coordination Elements, and the Map Series. Specifically, the amendment includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of most language pertaining to the SR 7 Transit Oriented Corridor; • Deletion of several Constrained Roadways at a Lower Level of Service (CRALLS) which have expired along with revising the TCEA and CRALLS Map (TE 15.1) to reflect the deletions; and • Deletion of completed policies and other housekeeping items.
	<p>Staff Assessment: This amendment proposes to delete Comprehensive Plan policies, language, and CRALLS facilities that are no longer applicable or is obsolete due to changed conditions, expiration, or completion. There are no subsequent ULDC revisions required of this amendment.</p>
	<p>Staff Recommendation: <i>Approval</i></p>
	<p>LPA Recommendation: <i>To be provided at the hearing</i></p>
MOTION:	To <i>transmit</i> the Transportation Element Updates amendment

4.B. Privately Proposed Amendments

Name	Description
4.B.1 Morning Star MLU (LGA 2017-008) District 5	<p>Current: Agricultural Reserve (AGR)</p> <p>Proposed: Multiple Land Use with Commercial Low and High Residential, 8 units per acre, MLU (CL & HR-8) with conditions</p> <p>Size: 50.99 acres</p> <p>Location: Northeast corner of Atlantic Ave & Starkey Rd, west of Turnpike</p> <p>Private Text Amendment Summary: To revise the Future Land Use Element to allow the amendment in the Ag Reserve Tier, including to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the amount of commercial square footage in the Tier; • Eliminate the requirement that commercial be central to the Tier; • Add a new commercial mixed use intersection to the Tier; • Allow the MLU designation within ¼ mile of the added intersection; • Allow Urban Suburban Tier residential densities in Ag Reserve MLUs if 40% of units (other than CLF units) are workforce housing; • Eliminate the preserve area requirements for MLU projects with 40% of the residential units as Workforce Housing; • Exempt the amendment from the long range traffic req. in Policy 3.5-d.

<p>4.B.1 Morning Star MLU (LGA 2017-008)</p> <p>Continued</p>	<p>Staff Assessment: The proposed amendment represents a significant departure from the Ag Reserve provisions recently evaluated and revised by the Board of County Commissioners. The proposed amendments essentially rewrite fundamental Ag Reserve provisions of the Comprehensive Plan through private text amendments, to accommodate the subject site and potentially opening the door to additional sites in the future. The site does not meet the location requirements for commercial and mixed use in the Tier, exceeds the amount of commercial allowed in the Tier, exceeds the maximum residential density, does not provide the required 60% preserve area, and violates the long range traffic requirements. In addition, the introduction of urban densities sufficiently high to support workforce housing, as proposed by the applicant, is an issue beyond the scope of one site-specific amendment, which would require BCC deliberation and policy direction in the broader context of housing policy. Given the recent adoption of Board-directed text amendment to the Ag Reserve policies in 2016, there is no basis or justification for the proposed amendments.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: <i>Denial</i></p> <p>LPA Recommendation: <i>To be provided at the hearing</i></p>
<p>MOTION: To <i>deny transmittal</i> of the Morning Star MLU amendment</p>	
<p><u>4.B.2</u></p> <p><u>Clint Moore CLF</u> <u>(LGA 2017-007)</u></p> <p>District 5</p>	<p>Current: Agricultural Reserve (AGR)</p> <p>Proposed: Institutional and Public Facilities with an underlying AGR (INST/AGR)</p> <p>Size: 12.77 acres</p> <p>Location: North side of Clint Moore Road, west of the Florida Turnpike</p> <p>Proposed Text Amendment Summary: The applicant proposes a private text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to allow the subject site to use a .45 floor area ratio (FAR) instead of density to calculate the maximum development potential on a Congregate Living Facility (CLF).</p> <p>Staff Assessment: Although CLFs are allowed in the Tier within AGR-PUDs, they are currently limited to the 1 unit per acre to calculate the maximum number of beds (2.39 beds per unit) and are required to have a 60-80% preserve area. The request for .45 FAR would yield a maximum number of beds which is equivalent to 8.5 units per acre. Considering that the modern congregate living facilities demonstrate many of the attributes of an institutional rather than residential use, the concept of utilizing non-residential intensity (floor area ratio) rather than density (units per acre) to determine the maximum development potential is worthy of consideration. County staff have been exploring alternatives to density, but have not yet completed the research to present to the Board for direction, and cannot recommend an approach using FAR at this time. Further, since this is a site specific application, the applicant is limited to requesting this concept for the subject site, and there are two additional privately proposed applications seeking similar text and FLUA changes in process. The Board initiated an amendment on January 30, 2017 for staff to address this issue on a broader scale. That report is anticipated to be presented to the Board in July of this year or later round.</p>

4.B.2 Clint Moore CLF (LGA 2016-031) continued	Staff Recommendation: <i>Denial</i>
	LPA Recommendation: <i>To be provided at the hearing</i>
MOTION: To <i>deny transmittal</i> of the Clint Moore CLF amendment	
<u>4.B.3</u> <u>Cameron West Apartments</u> <u>(LGA 2016-031)</u> District 2	Current: Commercial High/Industrial (CH/IND) on 14.69 ac. & Industrial (IND) on 17.98 ac.
	Proposed: High Residential, 12 units per acre (HR-12)
	Size: 32.67 acres
	Location: West of Jog Road, 0.25 mi. south of Meathe Drive
	Staff Assessment: This amendment represents several competing objectives, including the provision of workforce housing, the protecting industrial lands, and the protection of existing neighborhoods. The amendment would eliminate 341,741 s.f. of ‘shovel ready’ industrial square footage with valid development orders. Further, the applicant has not adequately justified the 12 units per acre designation, and there are compatibility concerns with the adjacent low density residential neighborhood. By requesting the highest density residential designation, the applicant is essentially bypassing the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program. Although the applicant expressed interest in pursuing the TDR and Workforce Housing if the amendment is approved, there is no condition of approval requiring the use of these programs.
	Staff Recommendation: <i>Denial</i>
	LPA Recommendation: <i>Deny</i> , motion by James Brake, seconded by Sandra Greenberg, passed in an 8-2 vote (with Roberta Levitt-Moccia and Harvey Arnold dissenting) at the September 9th public hearing. The Board discussion focused on the existing industrial approval, traffic impacts and potential noise issues for residential adjacent to the Turnpike. There was one member of the public who spoke in opposition citing traffic issues and concerns for three to four story apartment buildings adjacent to single family homes.
MOTION: To <i>deny transmittal</i> of the Cameron West Apartments amendment.	

5. REGULAR AGENDA

6. COMMENTS

- A. County Attorney
- B. Planning Director
- C. Zoning Director
- D. Executive Director
- E. Assistant County Administrator
- F. Commissioners

7. ADJOURNMENT

Be advised that anyone choosing to appeal any action with respect to any matter discussed by the Board of County Commissioners will need a record of the proceedings, and may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is based.

T:\Planning\AMEND\17-B\Reports-Agendas\4-BCCAdopt\Agenda-BCC-April-2017.docx