



Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners
Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing Results
May 2, 2018

2.A. Additions, Deletions, Substitutions, Postponements

4.A.1 Clint Moore CLF/Allegro (LGA 2017-007) (withdrawn prior to hearing)

4.A.3 RaceTrac Boynton & Acme Dairy (LGA 2018-006)

Motion to deny postponement, motion by Comm. Kerner, seconded by Comm. Burdick, passed in a 7 to 0 vote. Board discussion included comments regarding the commercial cap, the piecemeal aspect, supporting the residents, and the inappropriateness of the location for commercial. A representative from COBWRA and a representative of five of the neighboring homeowner associations spoke in opposition to the postponement citing that the amendment was out of character, unwarranted, piecemeal, exceeded the commercial cap, and inappropriate for an additional gas station. The applicant withdrew the application following approval of the motion.

4.B.3 Lake Worth Royale (LGA 2018-015)

Motion to approve postponement, motion by Comm. Kerner, seconded by Comm. Abrams, passed in a 5 to 2 vote (with Comm. Burdick, and Comm. Berger dissenting). An initial motion to deny postponement made by Comm. Burdick, seconded by Comm. Berger, failed in a 3 to 4 vote. There was minimal discussion and no public comment.

2.B. Approval of the Agenda

Motion to reorder Items under 4.C. to beginning of Transmittal Hearing, motion for approval by Comm. Berger, seconded by Comm. Burdick, passed in a 7 to 0 vote.

3. PUBLIC HEARING – Round 18-B Adoption

3.A. Proposed County Initiated Amendments

3.A.1 Housing Element Update

Staff Recommendation. *Approval*

Planning Commission/LPA Recommendation. *Approval*, motion by Michael Peragine, seconded by Angella Vann passed in a 11-0 vote. There was minimal Board discussion and no public comment.

BCC Transmittal Action: *Approval*, motion by Commissioner Berger, seconded by Commissioner Burdick passed in a 7-0 vote at the January 31, 2018 public hearing. There was minimal discussion and no members of the public spoke.

BCC Action: *Motion to adopt an ordinance* for the Housing Element amendment by Comm. Burdick, seconded by Comm. Bernard, passed in a 7 to 0 vote at the May 2nd public hearing. There was minimal Board discussion. One member of the public spoke regarding the workforce housing need data provided in the staff report.

4. PUBLIC HEARING - Round 18-C Transmittal

4.C. Future Land Use Amendments outside the Urban Suburban Tier (reordered)

4.C.1 Central Park Commerce Center II (LGA 2018-027)

Staff Recommendation. *Approval*

Planning Commission/LPA Recommendation. *Approval*, motion by Michael Peragine, seconded by Barbara Roth passed in a 12-0 vote at the April 13th public hearing. One Board member questioned the need for the time extension, and another sought clarification on the data center. There was minimal discussion and no public comment.

BCC Action: To *approve transmittal* of the Central Park Commerce Center II amendment, motion by Comm. Abrams, seconded by Comm. Valeche, passed in a 7 to 0 vote at the May 2nd public hearing. There was minimal discussion. Two members of the public spoke in opposition.

4.C.2 Entrada Commons (LGA 2018-012)

Staff Recommendation. *Approval*

Planning Commission/LPA Recommendation. *Approval*, motion by Michael Peragine, seconded by Lori Vinikoor, passed in a 12 to 0 vote at the April 13th public hearing. Board members questioned the maximum floor area ratio allowed on the adjacent Sluggett property to the west and whether the public notice adequately indicated that the site was on the northeast corner. There was no public comment.

BCC Action: To *approve transmittal* of the Entrada Commons amendment, motion by Comm. Abrams, seconded by Comm. Berger, passed in a 7 to 0 vote at the May 2nd public hearing. There was minimal discussion and no public comment.

4.C.3 Lantana SR7 (LGA 2018-005)

Staff Recommendation. *Denial*

Planning Commission/LPA Recommendation. *Denial*, motion by Dagmar Brahs, seconded by Michael Peragine, passed in a 12 to 0 vote at the April 13th public hearing. Board expressed concerns regarding adding commercial uses in the Rural Tier, support for protecting the Tier, and concern that this amendment could encourage future amendments. Six members of the public spoke in opposition, including representatives from the Coalition of Boynton West Residential Associations, Thoroughbred Lakes Estates, and Lago Del Sol, citing that the proposed amendment is not appropriate in the Rural Tier and would compound existing traffic issues on Lantana Road.

BCC Action: To *deny transmittal* of the Lantana SR7 amendment, motion by Comm. Kerner, seconded by Comm. Bernard, passed in a 6 to 1 vote (with Comm. Abrams dissenting) at the May 2nd public hearing. Board discussion included questions and comments regarding the communication towers to the south and permitted uses under the current future land use. Two members of the public, including representatives from area homeowners associations, spoke in opposition to commercial uses on the subject site within the Rural Tier.

4.A. Privately Proposed Amendments in the Agricultural Reserve Tier

4.A.2 Poets Walk (LGA 2017-015)

Staff Recommendation. *Denial*

Planning Commission/LPA Recommendation. *Denial*, motion David Freudenberg, seconded by Kiley Harper-Larsen passed in a 6-5 vote (with Lori Vinikoor, Angella Vann, Michael Peragine, Edwin Ferguson, and Arthur Goldzweig dissenting). The Planning Commission also made a separate motion to recommend that the County pursue a County Initiated amendment to consider Congregate Living Residential future land use in the Ag Reserve Tier. Board discussion centered on the need for congregate living facilities, the recently adopted Congregate Living Residential future land use designation, Ag Reserve preserve requirements, and broader policy implications. There was no public comment.

BCC Action: To ***approve transmittal*** the Poet's Walk amendment, substitute motion by Comm. Abrams, seconded by Comm. Valeche, passed in a 4 to 3 vote (with Comm. Burdick, Comm. Bernard, and Comm. Berger dissenting) at the May 2nd public hearing. An initial motion for denial was made by Comm. Burdick, seconded by Comm. Bernard. Board discussion included comments regarding the need for CLF provisions in the Tier to be discussed further with regards to public benefits and the importance of preserve area requirements, and that transmittal would allow more time for the applicant to work with residents and staff and for this concept to be discussed further. Four members of the public spoke in opposition citing that the proposed use was out of character with the Ag Reserve Tier, and did not support the Tier since it did not provide a preserve area. One member of the public spoke in support of CLFs in the Ag Reserve.

4.B. Future Land Use Amendments in the Urban Suburban Tier

4.B.1 Resort Lifestyle Communities (LGA 2018-007)

Staff Recommendation. *Approval with Conditions*

Planning Commission/LPA Recommendation. *Approval*, motion by Michael Peragine, seconded by David Freudenberg, passed in a 7-3 vote (with Katharine Murray, Barbara Roth, and George Humphries dissenting). An initial motion for denial by George Humphries, seconded by Barbara Roth, failed in a 3-7 vote. Board discussion included questions regarding traffic impacts and access to the site, and comments regarding support for a diversity of lifestyles in the County, and the impacts on the rural character of Palm Beach Ranchettes. Thirteen members of the public spoke in opposition stating concerns that the proposed amendment was incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood, that the intensity and height was too high, and that the request would result in negative traffic impacts.

BCC Action: To ***approve transmittal*** of the Resort Lifestyle amendment, motion by Comm. Valeche, seconded by Comm. Kerner, passed in a 7 to 0 vote at the May 2nd public hearing. Board discussion included questions regarding the maximum density under the current future land use with housing density bonuses, and comments that transmittal would allow for state review, and that the applicant should explore affordable housing options. Five members of the public spoke in opposition citing that the use was

out of character with the Palm Beach Ranchettes community, negative traffic impacts, and that the building height was too high. Two members of the public spoke in support.

- 4.B.2 Lenox North Beach (LGA 2018-002).** This is a privately proposed future land use (FLU) amendment as summarized below.

Staff Recommendation. *Approval with Conditions*

Planning Commission/LPA Recommendation. *Denial*, motion by Neil Merin, seconded by Cara Capp, passed in a 10 to 2 vote (with Angella Vann and Marcia Hayden dissenting) at the April 13th public hearing. Board discussion included comments regarding the higher density than adjacent land uses, that a mixed use project would be more appropriate using the existing density and intensity, and that the area was on the fringe of the urban area and not appropriate for a density increase. Twenty two members of public and representatives from the Town of Juno Beach spoke in opposition, citing that the proposed high density is not compatible with the area, would generate negative traffic impacts, not consistent with the scale/mass of the area, and creates issues with hurricane evacuation.

BCC Action: To *approve transmittal* of the Lenox North Beach amendment, motion by Comm. Bernard, seconded by Comm. Abrams, passed in a 5 to 2 vote (with Comm. Valeche and Comm. Berger dissenting) at the May 2nd public hearing. Board discussion included comments regarding the decline in demand for commercial shopping centers, that the request was for higher density than the adjacent uses, but similar to some of the housing in Juno Beach, and that transmittal would allow more time for the applicant to work with the residents. Thirty-three members of the public and the Town of Juno Beach spoke in opposition citing that the proposed ‘hyper-density’ would result in negative traffic and hurricane evacuation impacts, that there was a lack of infrastructure and services, and the building height was too high. One member of the public spoke in support citing the need for more housing.

5. REGULAR AGENDA

- 5.A. Proposed County Initiated Amendments.** These three items were presented for public comment collectively. There were 17 total public speakers, some commenting on more than one of these items.

60th Street North Thoroughfare Right of Way Identification Map

BCC Action: *Not to initiate*, motion by Comm. Burdick, seconded by Comm. Bernard, passed in a 7 to 0 vote at the May 2nd public hearing. Board discussion included comments regarding need to consider the rural character of the area. Five members of the public spoke in opposition to widening 60th Street North.

Congregate Living Facilities in the Agricultural Reserve Tier

BCC Action. The Board directed staff to continue working on this concept through the adoption public hearing for the Poet’s Walk amendment. Ten members of the public spoke regarding this item. Opposition comments included the need to preserve land in the Tier rather than develop, and that strict regulations should be developed if CLFs are to be allowed. Support comments included the need for these uses and that they can be designed in a manner consistent with the Tier.

Allowable uses in Preserve areas of AGR-PUDs in the Agricultural Reserve Tier

BCC Action. *To not initiate changes to Ag Reserve Preserve language in the Plan*, motion by Comm. Abrams, seconded by Comm. Burdick, passed in a 7 to 0 vote at the May 2nd public hearing. The Board directed staff to continue working with stakeholders to ensure that the residential lifestyle in Heritage Farms is preserved and to explore allowing a feed store use (Hole in the Wall) in the Ag Reserve AGR-PUD preserves. Seven members of the public spoke. Several members of the public spoke in support of preserving agricultural lands in the Ag Reserve and protecting the Heritage Farms rural neighborhood. Several representatives of the landscape industry requested that the County staff continue dialogue on exploring uses allowed in the AGR-PUD preserve areas through the ULDC landscaper project.

6. COMMENTS

- A. County Attorney – No comments
- B. Planning Director – No comments
- C. Zoning Director – No comments
- D. Executive Director – No comments
- E. Assistant County Administrator – No comments
- F. Commissioners – No comments

7. ADJOURNMENT

T:\Planning\AMEND\18-C\Reports-Agendas\2-BCCTran\Agenda-BCC-May2-2018.docx