



## **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRAC)**

**FRIDAY, MAY 9, 2014, 2:00 PM-4:00 PM**

**PZ&B – VISTA CENTER**

**2300 NORTH JOG RD., WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33411**

**2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM (VC-2E-12)**

### **AGENDA**

- A. REVIEW OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2014 MINUTES - (ATTACHMENT 1)**
- B. ULDC UPDATES – BILL  
USE REGULATIONS PROJECT – COMMERCIAL KICK OFF MEETING 5/15/14**
- C. REVIEW DRAC OPEN TASK LIST- (ATTACHMENT 2) - WENDY**
- D. TYPE 1B VARIANCES – We love the online submittal process. The online system is great but you can't save a partially complete section. You can save an entire section if it is complete but not a portion of it. I also have not been able to print a "draft" of what is completed. These may be more IT issues but they would help us when preparing for the submittal.- SCOTT MOSOLF**
- E. DRO CERTIFICATION ISSUES BEING ADDED AFTER DRO - We have noticed that certification issues are being added during the follow-up period after the DRO meeting. Luckily we noticed the issue and were able to address the item and get certified. Can there be a policy that a phone call or at least an e-mail be sent to the agent if a certification issue is added after DRO? That way we could get a notification email/phone call when issues are added.- SCOTT MOSOLF**
- F. ARCHITECTURE REVIEW UPDATE - Can we get an update on the architectural review? Is the project manager reviewing all of their projects for compliance with the Arch Review standards? I understand there is a new staff member that is an architect, is she going to review Arch Review items? What is the latest with the request that Zoning Commission has made to increase the requirements for architectural review?- SCOTT MOSOLF**
- G. RESULT LETTER- I was looking at this result letter (as an example) and noticed that they really don't clearly indicate what is actually approved. Those of us who deal with these on a regular basis but I could see where others who aren't familiar with them would not be able to easily understand that this is the approval letter for the Final Site Plan/Final Regulating Plan. Over the past couple years, I've also noticed that I've become more involved in the legalities of the real estate transactions and financing, thus dealing with lenders and attorneys who are looking closer at the documentation for a project. With all that said, I'm suggesting that you add some language to the result letters that can be more easily understood by anyone. Sample suggestion is attached. - (Attachment 3) - BRADLEY MILLER**

#### **H. NEW PROCESS FOR MINOR CONDITION MODIFICATION**

Purpose: To make minor modifications to no more than 3 approved conditions of approval that effect 3 or fewer DRO agencies and has no effect to the approved Site Plan.

##### **Process:**

1. Applicant's responsibility to meet individually with the anticipated effected DRO agencies to discuss the proposed modification.
2. Upon applicant request, be put on DRO agenda to present the proposed revision to the full DRO and confirm the number of effected agencies.
3. If there are 3 or fewer agencies that need to review it, then the proposed modification can be submitted formally during the follow up period for that DRO meeting for certification. Submittal requirements include an explanation and justification statement of the proposed modification.

**Fee:** Zoning - EAC base fee (currently \$850.58) + Each DRO Agency - \$100/agency-  
**BRADLEY MILLER**

#### **I. REGULATING PLAN (TECHNICAL MANUAL)**

Eliminate the requirement of showing details for buffers (get Rodney to come to DRAC meeting to address), parking, dumpsters, signs that are already shown in Code. Details required for anything that is above and beyond code to comply with conditions or special conditions-**BRADLEY MILER**

#### **J. REVIEW WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE APPLICATION (Zoning/Agency Review Process)**

Reviewers looking outside the scope of the application - affected area, agency/zoning Reviews - **BRADLEY MILLER**

#### **K. OFF THE BOARD/EXPEDITED (DROE) PROCESS-** We're not allowed to make ANY revision to the plan other than required by condition of approval, so comments/certification issues from DRO reviewers should not require any revision either. The review should be confirmation of compliance with the conditions of approval. - **BRADLEY MILLER**

#### **L. SUBMITTING FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN (FSBP) -** After ZC approval and prior to BCC approval, we are allowed to submit the FMP if no opposition at ZC. I would like to explore the possibility of submitting a FSBP for a portion of the overall project at the same time with the understanding that the FMP would go directly to the next DRO meeting where the FSBP would go to the following DRO meeting. Since comments for regular intake are not due until after the following DRO meeting (where the FMP would get approved) why not allow the FSBP to be submitted early? - (**Attachment 4**) - **GLADYS DIGIROLAMO**

#### **M. SPECIAL PERMIT PROCESS-**recently processed a Special Event Permit for an tent. The process included a building permit and coordination of inspections by Building, Fire and Code Enforcement. I found the process very confusing and extremely time consuming. I am appreciative to Zoning and all Departments for their assistance in helping me navigate the special permit process. Unfortunately, I was the first to process a Special permit through the new process. I am hopeful that my experience was used to work out any bugs. But not real clear if changes were finalized for this process. - **JAN POLSON**

#### **N. ADJOURNMENT**



**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRAC)  
MINUTES OF THE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 07, 2014 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING  
PZ&B – VISTA CENTER  
2300 NORTH JOG RD., WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33411  
2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM (VC-2E-12)  
Time: 2:00 pm to 3:00 pm**

**PREPARED BY ZONING DIVISION STAFF**

**1. CALL TO ORDER.**

Chairman Scott Mosolf called the meeting to order at 2.10 pm.

**Members Present –**

Scott Mosolf – UDKS – Chair  
Gladys DiGirolamo – GL Homes - Vice Chair  
Chris Barry - UDKS  
Bradley Miller - Miller Planning  
Doug Murry - Land Design South  
Pat Lentini – GHO

**Members Absent –**

Collene Walter - UDKS  
Bill Whiteford - Team Plan  
Jon Schmidt - Jon Schmidt & Associates  
Jan Polson - Cotleur & Hearing  
Kevin McGinley - Land Research Management  
Jeff Brophy - Land Design South

**Interested Parties –**

None

**Zoning/ Engineering -**

Jon MacGillis, Zoning Director  
Maryann Kwok, Chief Planner, Zoning Division  
Wendy Hernandez, Zoning Manager – Community Development Section (CD)  
William Cross, Principal Site Planner, Zoning Division  
Carrie Rechenmacher, Senior Site Planner, CD Section  
Carol Glasser, Site Planner II, CD Section  
Laura Brown, Secretary, Administration Section  
Jan Rodriguez, Senior Site Planner, Administrative Review/Public Information Section  
Roger Ramdeen, Site Planner II, CD Section  
Lauren Dennis, Site Planner II, CR Section  
Joanne M Keller, Land Development Director

## AGENDA

### A. REVIEW OF THE OCTOBER 22, 2013 MINUTES - (ATTACHMENT 1)

There were no comments/changes to the minutes. Minutes were adopted as presented. Staff will publish the adopted version to the Zoning DRAC Web Page.

### B. ULDC UPDATES – BILL

#### 1. ROUND 2013-02 ADOPTION

Bill Cross, Principal Site Planner, provided an overview of the 2013-02 amendments that were adopted on January 30, 2014. Highlighted the two Privately Initiated Amendments for Cell Tower (stealth and camouflage on golf course) and accessory structure for RV Parks

#### 2. ROUND 2014-01 KEY TOPICS

For the 2014-01 Round, Mr. Cross highlighted the proposed amendment going to BCC for initiation at the February 27, 2014 Zoning BCC Hearing. He said the BCC Memo for the 2014-01 initiation will be posted to the Zoning Web Page along with the Zoning February BCC Zoning Agenda and backup.

#### 3. 2013-2014 ULDC USE PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. Cross stated that staff will be providing the BCC at the February 27, 2014 Zoning BCC Hearing an update on the status of the 2013-14 ULDC Use Regulation Project. Staff has completed the Industrial and Recreational Uses and currently working on Residential. The Online Web Survey for Industrial Uses is now open on the Zoning Web Page. Staff has identified several issues that they are seeking BCC input/direction on and how to proceed on these topics.

#### 4. ART. 2, DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCEDURES – DRAC FEEDBACK

Lauren Dennis, Site Planner II, explained the scope of Art. 2 code amendments. Staff is reviewing the DRO process and will be seeking DRAC input on those proposed recommendations later this year. Bill Cross commented that it would be the 2014-2 ULDC Round of amendments and the scope is relatively limited on what staff is proposing to amend. Maryann Kwok suggested that DRAC input and comments be rolled into input on the Technical Manual listed under H. below.

### C. REVIEW DRAC OPEN TASK- (ATTACHMENT 2) - WENDY

Wendy Hernandez, Zoning Manager, provided updates on the “DRAC Open Tasks”. She stated the Planning Staff are still working on the *School Concurrency* issue, but should have some closure in the next couple of months. She stated that the **Insufficiency Check List and Certification Chart** is on Agenda later for discussion, but Staff did make modifications to the chart to explain the reasons for staff finding and applicant insufficient or key reasons for Zoning not certifying the application. **DROE applications and first time Architecture Review**-Wendy clarified that if the applicant submits architectural elevations as part of their application and staff reviews them then, they can do DROE and architecture together; however, staff cannot process elevations that were not submitted as part of the public hearing application. With respect to the **Type II Variance and timeline**, Wendy stated that at the next DRAC she would like to discuss the process since the timeline has issues that need to be addressed.

**D. APPLICATION/INSUFFICIENCY REVISED CHECKLIST 1-29-14 - (ATTACHMENT 3) - WENDY/CARRIE**

Carrie Rechenmacher, Senior Site Planner, provided the status on the update to the checklist. Scott Moslof, Chair, asked Carrie if she could highlight the changes for the DRAC members. She explained that it was mostly clarification of the existing reasons to make it more objective reasons for not finding an application sufficient or able to certify it.

**E. SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC HEARING/DRO – IS SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENT “COVER SHEET” CURRENT? – (ATTACHMENT 4) – COLLENE WALTER**

Jon MacGillis clarified that this inquiry about submittal requirements came from Collene Walter. She wanted confirmation of whether reduced site plans/surveys are still required with new submittals. The checklist indicates they do, can staff explain how to proceed? Wendy agreed the Submittal Check List requirements needs to be updated to reflect current practice. No reduced site plans or surveys are required to be submitted. Additionally, she is working with staff to reduce the number of forms, consolidating where we can to reduce required Resubmittals and inconsistencies.

**F. OFF THE BOARD SUBMITTALS DROE AND INITIAL ARCHITECTURE REVIEW – (ATTACHMENT 5) – PAT LENTINI**

Pat Lentini explained her request relative to this topic. She wants to know if you submitted architectural elevations with your public hearing application can you still do a DROE. The answer is yes. Wendy explained the process. If you submit Architecture as part of public hearing process, it is okay to proceed off the BCC with a DROE application. If Architectural elevations are not part of the public hearing review, then applicant must submit a Full DRO application. Carrie clarified that renderings are not counted as Architectural elevations. Wendy said she would meet with Pat Lentini on her specific projects to ensure that it can be processed as DROE.

**G. MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENTS WITHOUT EXTENSIVE REVISIONS TO MASTER/SITE PLANS- (ATTACHMENT 6) - BRADLEY MILLER**

Jon MacGillis clarified this Agenda Item came from Mr. Miller and it is Attachment 6 in the backup material. Bradley's email outlined his concern with having to update an old site plan that his client might not have the authority, also are the Applicants liable for information on the plan that is many years old and not originally prepared by their office. Wendy explained that staff and the applicant identify the "affected" area upfront on the plan so it is clear what needs updated. Carrie provided some examples of site plans to demonstrate why staff needs old plans cleaned up to the greatest extent possible when a new application comes in. She stated staff works with the applicant on this matter, as much as possible, to get a legible plan without putting too much burden on the applicant to go beyond their scope of work. Carrie said she does get comments from Agents, as they are concerned about liability for updating the entire plan which they did not originally prepared or can always confirm the information on plan, Pat agreed, clients sometimes do not give authorization to clean up entire plan. Staff explained the affected area and extent the plan needs to be cleaned up is on a case by case basis, as every plan and request is different. Staff stated that the plans need to be legible. Bradley Miller arrived as the discussion was ongoing and further

explained his concern that they do not always have consent to fix other areas of the plan beyond affected area. He is just looking for latitude in future. Jon asked Bradley and Scott if they got the answer to this topic. Scott said it seems like it is a case by case situation. Staff said yes, and they are trying to work with everyone.

**H. TECHNICAL MANUAL - TITLE 2 STATUS FOR ONGOING MEETING WITH AGENTS AND UPDATE TO MANUAL - MARYANN**

Maryann gave an update; focused on “where applicable” provisions apply and that the applicant must be familiar with when they should apply requirements to what type of Plan. Affected area – work with staff to clearly identify what needs to be on the “Plan”. Maryann stated that she will schedule a final meeting on the Technical Manual with staff and industry to tie up the remaining amendment to Title 2.

**I. JANUARY 30, 2014 BCC APPROVES NEW DRO AGENCY FEES - (ATTACHMENT 7) - JON**

Jon MacGillis stated that the BCC on January 30, 2014, adopted the three new Fees for the DRO Administrative process, and referred everyone to Attachment 7. Jan Rodriguez, Senior Site Planner, explained how the new fees are applied...so no confusion.

**J. DRAC SUBCOMMITTEE CONTACT LIST (ATTACHMENT 8)**

Scott Mosolf asked if there were any changes to the information and got no request for changes.

**K. ADD ON DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

**Bradley Miller - Fees** - Bradley explained that there is discussion among industry that fees are an issue. Jon explained that Commissioner Abrams raised this issue at last BCC Zoning Hearing. Verdenia explained that the fees are warranted, and staff has allowed reduction on certain applications when fees exceed staff time necessary to process them. Jon said staff is keeping track of requests for reduction and will share with Verdenia each quarter to see if any fees need to be adjusted by the BCC.

**Chris Barry – Resolutions** - Does the Applicant still get a copy of the Resolution to review prior to it being signed? Wendy said yes. She also explained the process and said that at time of Hearing, if no changes, the Resolution goes to the Mayor to sign. So, please ensure that you review your conditions online and notify staff at hearing if there are changes. Wendy is going to look at a letter that goes out to Applicant to ensure that the wording is correct.

**Jon MacGillis – Waivers** - meeting with Industry on their proposal for new provisions for Waivers in ULDC. Staff is open to discussing the topic. Jon asked that if anyone had good examples of ordinances with Waiver provisions to send them to staff. Also, we would like to keep DRAC members in the loop on this topic to help us review any recommended changes. Bradley Miller said, Delray has a good ordinance.

**L. NEXT MEETING MAY 9, 2014**

**M. ADJOURNMENT AT 3:07**

		Complete	Pending			
Task	Details	Lead	Status	Date Initiated	Initiated by	Date Completed
<b>Concurrency Fee- School Board</b>	Fees are being charged when they aren't affected by the changes- i.e. CLF or Age Restricted Community	Wendy	Pending	5/11/2012	Kevin Ratteree	<p>4-30-14 Kevin Andrews -draft ILA completed. Presenting to IPARC on 5-29-14. 1-31-2014 Wendy spoke with Kevin in Planning a draft inter-local has been submitted to Planning for review. They will be meeting school board in ~2 weeks. They are contemplating not doing concurrency anymore, but reviewing for school requirements under Land Use and Rezoning applications. Not known at this time if fees will still be applicable, planning to follow up. After meeting in 2 weeks the document will be scheduled for presentation to School Board and BCC.</p> <p>10/22/13: Wendy: The fee being charged for Concurrency for School Board is still pending. She spoke with Planning staff and they said not change in status of the inquiry.</p> <p>08/13/2013 Planning still working with the School Board. Schools are preparing a draft document to present at the next IPARC. Draft to be submitted to Planning a couple weeks.</p> <p>06-07-13 Wendy gave DRAC update to Committee that no changes has occurred. Spoke with School Board Planning Division still working on agreement.</p> <p>11/5/2012 Need status from Planning.</p>
<b>Calendar- Variance Deadlines</b>	Resubmitted Dates and Comment Deadlines and applications do not give enough time to address issues	Wendy-CDR	Re-open	5/11/2012	Colleen Walter	<p>5-5-14 No changes - staff has not had time to discuss internally. 1/31/2014- to discuss again at DRAC meeting. Staff have issue with variance deadlines.</p> <p>Dec 20 meeting. Staff finalize if any changes possible to calendar for 2013.Effective 1/1/2013</p>

Complete

Pending

Task	Details	Lead	Status	Date Initiated	Initiated by	Date Completed
<p><b>Information on a Master Plan</b></p>	<p>Inconsistent requirements for information on a Master Plan. Some information may not be necessary. Involves Survey, DL, Planning and Zoning</p>	<p>Wendy/MMK</p>	<p>Pending</p>	<p>5/11/2012</p>	<p>Gladys</p>	<p>5/8/2014 This is on hold until CD Staff is able to hire additional staff to complete task.                      1/29/14: Maryann/CD Staff to convene one additional meeting on Tech Manual, Title 2 changes. 08/13/2013 task still pending; drafted modifications to the Technical Manual;                      06-07-13 Wendy said she met in last month with several DRAC members to address their concerns with too much information on Master Plan. Working on draft to reflect changes agreed to and once done will send out to Committee for review. Then the Technical Manual will be update.                      8/13/13 Subcommittee need to discuss Tech Manual changes. Staff to finalize the proposed changes prior to next DRAC meeting. 10/22/13:                      Wendy: Information on Master Plan-Maryann and Wendy convened a Task Team which some of the DRAC members participated on. Staff would like another meeting to follow up on the suggested changes. The changes involve coordination between Zoning and Land Development on what needs to be on the plans.</p>



**PALM BEACH COUNTY  
PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT  
ZONING DIVISION**

Miller Land Planning, Inc  
Bradley Miller  
508 E Boynton Beach Blvd  
Boyton Beach, FL 33435

**RE: DEVELOPMENT REVIEW OFFICER RESULT LETTER**

**Application No.:** DROE-2014-00080  
**Control No.:** 1983-00003  
**Application Name:** Bingo Hall  
**Applicant:** J&B Management Co. of Palm Beaches, Inc  
**Project Manager:** Joyce Lawrence, Site Planner II *JRL 2-26-14*

**Location:** Approximately 1,200 feet north of Hypoluxo Road on the west side of Military Trail.

**Request:** to finalize the Plans approved by the Board of County Commissioners for a Development Order Amendment to modify the site plan, to allow the relocation of an existing driveway; modify the parking lot; and amend a Condition of Approval (Engineering).

Prior to submittal of a building permit, there may be other permits or approvals required by the Land Development Division, and/or other governmental/regulatory agencies. Please provide a copy of this letter, a certified plan, and three (3) signed and sealed landscape plans with your building permit application.

The issuance of this Development Permit does not in any way create any rights on the part of the Applicant and/or Property Owner to obtain a permit from a state or federal agency and does not create any liability on the part of the County for issuance of the permit if the applicant fails to obtain requisite approvals or fulfill the obligations imposed by a state or federal agency or undertakes actions that result in a violation of state or federal law.

**RESULTS:** **Appro** *Final Site Plan*  
 DRO Hearing Date: **Febru** 014  
 Conditions:

**DISCLOSURE**

1. All applicable state or federal regulations shall be obtained before commencement of the development authorized Development Permit.

Final Site Plan/Final Regulating Plan

## Patricia Rice

---

**From:** Gladys Digirolamo [Gladys.Digirolamo@glhomes.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 01, 2014 11:44 AM  
**To:** Bradley D. Miller; Scott Mosolf; Wendy Hernandez N.; Chris Barry; Douglas Murray; Pat Lentini; Collene Walter; Jon E. Schmidt; Jan Polson; Jeff Brophy; LRMI - Kevin; William Whiteford  
**Cc:** Jon MacGillis; Patricia Rice; Carrie Rechenmacher; Maryann Kwok  
**Subject:** RE: May 9th DRAC meeting agenda items

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Good morning DRAC and staff: In addition to the listed items below, I would also like to elaborate on Bradley's DROE issue. After ZC approval and prior to BCC approval, we are allowed to submit the FMP if no opposition at ZC. I would like to explore the possibility of submitting a FSBP for a portion of the overall project at the same time with the understanding that the FMP would go directly to the next DRO meeting where the FSBP would go to the following DRO meeting. Since comments for regular intake are not due until after the following DRO meeting (where the FMP would get approved) why not allow the FSBP to be submitted early? For instance:

May 1<sup>st</sup> – ZC Receives unanimous approval for the overall Master Plan (no opposition)  
May 21<sup>st</sup> - Submit FMP and FSBP  
May 22<sup>nd</sup> – BCC approval for overall Master Plan  
June 11<sup>th</sup> – DRO approval for FMP “off the board”  
June 13<sup>th</sup> - Receive comments for FSBP  
June 23<sup>rd</sup> – Resubmittal of FSBP (address any outstanding comments)  
July 9<sup>th</sup> – DRO approval for FSBP

Thank you for your considerations in this matter.  
Gladys

---

**From:** Bradley D. Miller [mailto:bradley@mlpc.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 30, 2014 10:55 AM  
**To:** Scott Mosolf; Wendy Hernandez N.; Gladys Digirolamo; Chris Barry; Douglas Murray; Pat Lentini; Collene Walter; Jon E. Schmidt; Jan Polson; Jeff Brophy; LRMI - Kevin; William Whiteford  
**Cc:** Jon MacGillis; Patricia Rice; Carrie Rechenmacher; Maryann Kwok  
**Subject:** RE: May 9th DRAC meeting agenda items

In addition to what Scott indicated below (and I attached my example result letter that was referenced), I have some other items for us to discuss:

### 1. New Process for Minor Condition Modification

Purpose: To make minor modifications to no more than 3 approved conditions of approval that effect 3 or fewer DRO agencies and has no effect to the approved Site Plan.

Process:

1. Applicant's responsibility to meet individually with the anticipated effected DRO agencies to discuss the proposed modification.
2. Upon applicant request, be put on DRO agenda to present the proposed revision to the full DRO and confirm the number of effected agencies.

3. If there are 3 or less agencies that need to review it, then the proposed modification can be submitted formally during the follow up period for that DRO meeting for certification. Submittal requirements include an explanation and justification statement of the proposed modification.

Fee: Zoning - EAC base fee (currently \$850.58) + Each DRO Agency - \$100/agency.

2. Regulating Plan (Technical Manual)

- eliminate the requirement of showing details for buffers (get Rodney to come to DRAC meeting to address), parking, dumpsters, signs that are already shown in Code.
- details required for anything that is above and beyond code to comply with conditions or special conditions

3. Review within the scope of the application (Zoning/Agency Review Process)

- reviewers looking outside the scope of the application - affected area, agency/zoning reviews

4. Off The Board/Expedited (DROE) Process

- we're not allowed to make ANY revision to the plan other than required by condition of approval, so comments/certification issues from DRO reviewers should not require any revision either. The review should be confirmation of compliance with the conditions of approval.

Bradley



---

**From:** Scott Mosolf [<mailto:SMosolf@udkstudios.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 30, 2014 10:15 AM

**To:** Wendy Hernandez N.; 'Gladys Digirolamo'; Chris Barry; Bradley D. Miller; Douglas Murray; Pat Lentini; Collene Walter; Jon E. Schmidt; Jan Polson; Jeff Brophy; LRMI - Kevin; William Whiteford

**Cc:** Jon MacGillis; Patricia Rice; Carrie Rechenmacher; Maryann Kwok

**Subject:** RE: May 9th DRAC meeting agenda items

Wendy,

Thanks for organizing the agenda and reaching out to us to get our input.

We have 3 items that we would like to discuss if possible:

- **Type 1B Variances** – We love the online submittal process. The online system is great but you can't save a partially complete section. You can save an entire section if it is complete but not a portion of it. I also have not been able to print a "draft" of what is completed. These may be more IT issues but they would help us when preparing for the submittal.
- **DRO Certification Issues being added after DRO** - We have noticed that certification issues are being added during the follow-up period after the DRO meeting. Luckily we noticed the issue and were able to address the item and get certified. Can there be a policy that an phone call or at least an e-mail be sent to the agent if a

certification issue is added after DRO? That way we could get a notification email/phone call when issues are added.

- **Architecture Review Update** - Can we get an update on the architectural review? Is the project manager reviewing all of their projects for compliance with the Arch Review standards? I understand there is a new staff member that is an architect, is she going to review Arch Review items? What is the latest with the request that Zoning Commission has made to increase the requirements for architectural review?

Also, I know Bradley Miller had the following request about the certification letters:

Jon/Wendy - I was looking at this result letter (as an example) and noticed that they really don't clearly indicate what is actually approved. Those of us who deal with these on a regular basis but I could see where others who aren't familiar with them would not be able to easily understand that this is the approval letter for the Final Site Plan/Final Regulating Plan. Over the past couple years, I've also noticed that I've become more involved in the legalities of the real estate transactions and financing, thus dealing with lenders and attorneys who are looking closer at the documentation for a project. With all that said, I'm suggesting that you add some language to the result letters that can be more easily understood by anyone. Sample suggestion is attached.

Feel free to call or reply if you have any questions or comments.

Thanks,  
Scott

Scott Mosolf ASLA, PLA  
Project Manager

**urban design kil day** The Offices at CityPlace North  
477 S. Rosemary Avenue, Suite 225  
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401  
ph. (561) 366.1100  
f. (561) 366.1111  
www.udkstudios.com

---

STUDIOS *Urban Planning and Design | Landscape Architecture | Communication Graphics*

Please be aware that when we send electronic data out of our office, we do not have control over how the information is subsequently used. We request that you do not provide this electronic file to any third party.

---

**From:** Wendy Hernandez N. [<mailto:wnhernan@pbcgov.org>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 30, 2014 8:45 AM  
**To:** Scott Mosolf; 'Gladys Digirolamo'; Chris Barry; Bradley D. Miller; Douglas Murray; Pat Lentini; Collene Walter; Jon E. Schmidt; Jan Polson; Jeff Brophy; LRMI - Kevin; William Whiteford  
**Cc:** Jon MacGillis; Patricia Rice; Carrie Rechenmacher; Maryann Kwok  
**Subject:** May 9th DRAC meeting agenda items

Our next DRAC meeting is quickly approaching (5/9). We are working on the agenda and were wondering if there are any items you would like to discuss so that we may add them. Please let us know.

Thank you.  
Wendy

Under Florida law, e-mail addresses are public records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.