



DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRAC)

SEPTEMBER 23, 2:00 PM - 4:00 PM

PZ&B – VISTA CENTER

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

2ND FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM (VC-2E-12)

MINUTES

PREPARED BY ZONING DIVISION STAFF

CALL TO ORDER

Gladys DiGirolamo – GL Homes – Chair called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT –

Gladys DiGirolamo, GL Homes - Chair
Collene Walter, UDKS
Bradley Miller, Miller Planning
Lauren McClellan-Morton Planning, Landscape Architecture
Patricia Lentini, GHO
Jeff Brophy, The Wantman Group
Yexsy Schomberg, Cotleur & Hearing

ZONING/ENGINEERING/PLANNING/BUILDING -

Jon MacGillis, Zoning Director
Joanne Keller, Director Land Development
Wendy Hernandez, Zoning Manager
Barbara Pinkston, Principal Site Planner, Zoning Division
Carrie Rechenmacher, Senior Site Planner, CD Section
Roger Ramdeen, Sr. Site Planner II, CD Section
Carolina Valera, Sr. Site Planner, CD Section
Zubida Persaud, Site Plan Tech, Zoning Administration
Jan Rodriguez, Sr. Site Planner, AR/PI Section
Melissa Matos, Sr. Site Planner, Arch Review Section

1) REVIEW OF THE MAY 6, 2016 MINUTES - GLADYS

No changes to minutes. Gladys DiGirolamo made a motion to approve, Colleen Walters, second the motion.

2) REVIEW DRAC OPEN TASK LIST - GLADYS

- **DRO ONLINE SUBMITTAL FOR TYPE I VARIANCES AND DRO ADMINISTRATIVE ADMENDMENTS - ALAN**

Jon stated that the Electronic Online application submittal is now implemented for Variances and Administrative Amendments. Everyone can start using it. Pat Lentini said that she had used it and it was easy to use. Jan Rodriguez, Senior

Site Planner, Admin Review, stated that there were some internal technical issues that are currently being worked out by ISS. Gladys inquired whether the consent forms are still needed for the online submittal applications and should they be attached. Staff confirmed yes, that they can be uploaded online along with other attachments. Collene asked is it still optional to submit in person or does it have to be only online submittals. Jon clarified that at this time you can apply via email or online, but at some point in 2017 we will go to only online submittals.

- **DESIGN GUIDELINES 2016-01 ROUND REMOVED FROM ULDC– JON**

Jon explained that the standards for Design Guidelines was removed from the ULDC in round 2016-01 amendments and Code staff are currently working on Round 2016-02 in which Staff is working on language that will eliminate the requirements for the Regulating Plan. He further clarified that an applicant may submit Design Guidelines and/or Regulating Plans by request only if they feel the need to do so for a particular project, but it is not needed.

Yexsy was concerned that the information on the Regulating Plan was useful and sometimes her client requires them. Jon reconfirmed that the applicant can still submit a Regulating Plan for review for staff, but it will be optional. Jon stated often the information on the Regulation Plans was standard templates of signs, buffers, benches, dumpster enclosures and in certain cases conflicted with code and or conditions. By making this plan now optional it will save the applicant and staff review time.

- **DRO PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE AND DRO CONCURRENT REVIEW UPDATES- WENDY**

Wendy stated this was previously discussed in a separate meeting in August 2016 with certain DRAC Members who attended. It is now implemented. She reviewed the process again and indicated that more applicants are using the Concurrent application process. Wendy said it is successful so far especially with subdivision review. Pat Lentini asked if a Concurrent Application was submitted, would it automatically be placed on the DRO meeting Agenda? Wendy clarified that a Pre-application Conference (PAC) is required so that specific direction can be given for the submittal of the Concurrent Application. This allows for all questions and issues to be worked out before the Concurrent application is submitted. Once the Concurrent Application is submitted then it would automatically be placed on the next DRO Agenda. The new process also allows for applicants to submit a Concurrent Review application without a PAC, must submit Form #112 to be placed on DRO Agenda.

Yexsy asked what is the latest that the request can be submitted to be placed on the DRO Agenda? Wendy clarified that the request must be submitted before 12 noon the Friday before the DRO meeting.

3) ULDC UPDATES – BILL (BILL NOT PRESENT)

Jon provided an overview of ULDC hot topics and the status of the ULDC Use Regulations Project. He also stated staff is currently researching a new use Equestrian as part of the Use Regulation Project. He indicated that agents and interested parties can attend the Use Regulations Project Forum meeting scheduled for October 13, 2016 from 5:30 pm to 8 pm in the Hearing room #47 on the first floor.

Jon also stated that the Round 2016-01 adoption was approved on 9-22-16 by the BCC and is now on the Web (refer to Ordinance 2016-042) and at some point Bill will be scheduling a training session for Interested Parties, contact him for information. Jon said that staff is now working on 2016-02 amendment. Collene asked about changes in the recent amendment to parking requirements, specifically that there was no longer an option to use 25 feet wide drive isle, it is now 26 feet. Jon said that 26' was a change with the recent amendment in 2016-01. Note- Bill *relayed this concern after the DRAC meeting and said he will add a note to the parking chart allowing the 25' as an option.*

Also, in 2016-02 Round-Reasonable Accommodations will be amended to have a time limitation of one year to use the approval or lose it. Staff is also working on the procedures for URA opt out and development regulations amendments, with the recent Comprehensive Plan Amendment in August 2016 which allows applicant to revert back to prior FLU and Zoning district. Jon stated that a memo on URA procedural changes will be finalized in early October after Zoning and Planning discussion. It will be posted to the Zoning Press Releases once issued.

4) LANDSCAPE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING UPDATES-BARBARA

Barbara stated that Zoning met with Patrick Rutter to discuss the inquiry we received from certain individuals regarding a possible countywide shortage of 12' native trees. They were asking if there was any relief from this requirement. The recently amended ALP Type 1 Waiver to allow 75% of the total required trees to be reduced in height by 25% (refer to Ord 2016-042), also Type 2 Variances may be applied for to allow relief from the minimum standards, if needed. So at this time no further action will be taken.

No other update on Landscape.

5) NEW ITEMS

- **SUBDIVISION PLAN VS. SITE PLAN-WHEN IS A SUBDIVISION PLAN NOT REQUIRED AND A SITE PLAN SUFFICIENT TO COMPLY WITH ARTICLE 2, FOR LOT COMBINATION - LAND DEVELOPMENT/ZONING**

Joanne explained why and when someone would use Article 11 provision. A memo was sent out to DRO members on August 9th, 2016 (handout was provided at DRAC Meeting) to explain where a Certified Abstracted Boundary Survey may be used in place of the Final Subdivision Plan. The applicant must first contact Land Development and obtain confirmation that the project is able to utilize this procedure. Yexsy stated that she places a note on the final site plan of the project that has gained approval to use the Abstracted Survey so that Zoning would have record of the approval.

- **REGULATION PLAN-2016-02 TO REMOVE FROM ULDC AS A REQUIREMENT CAN BE A CONDITION OF APPROVAL-BILL**

This was discussed under Design Guidelines above. Code staff is working on amending the requirement for the Regulation Plan, and will only be optional when adopted in January 2017.

6) COMMITTEE MEMBER TOPICS:

- **DRO MEETING PROCEDURES**

Wendy reviewed the memo that was provided at today's meeting regarding how various topics are handled at the DRO meetings. She reiterated that anyone can

speak at the hearings, but if major issues need to be resolved then the item should be placed in "Workshop" so that in depth discussions can occur.

Colleen said that her staff was confused with applications that were in Workshop and asked if the application will still be certified. Wendy clarified that yes the application can still be certified at the same time the issues can be resolved in Workshop. Wendy explained that the biggest issue for the applicant was to determine which issues are major and which are minor. Major issues should send the application to Workshop and minor issues will allow certification with the expectation that the minor issues will be fixed before final approval. Jeff indicated that he had a recent application that staff refused to add to Workshop, he did not give reason. Colleen asked that clarification on Workshop procedures should be added to the memo. Collene also asked if at permitting a DRO Agency Review can be done at the same time. Jon said that he would need to check if it is allowed in Code.

Other Topics Discussed:

Colleen asked whether DROE applications may be submitted with Type 1 Waivers; can this be added to the application or is this a separate application process. Wendy responded that Type 1 Waivers are included in the analysis and justification for the waivers on the Off-the-Board approval process.

Gladys asked if application documents could be submitted on a flash drive instead of a CD disc, a question put to her by her staff. Jon replied that this is possible but staff will keep the flash drive.

Lauren McClellan brought up the issue about having more than one application being processed at the same time, such as an Administrative Amendment and a DRO application, in which AR/PI Staff has indicated that Amendments cannot be accepted while project is in DRO. Jon responded that protocol is in place for Wendy and Alan to discuss the same project when applications are in both their Sections. They need to ensure changes being made on one application are reflecting on the other so not to present conflicts. Wendy stated this seems to be working for the most part when amendments are minor and applicant makes it known to staff more than one application in Zoning processes. However, there may be times where the amendment is exceptionally minor, but if major change we cannot allow concurrent applications in Adm Review and CD Sections. Just let Jon and Wendy know of the situation and we will assess the request on a case by case basis.

Jon asked members if there were any issues with the posting of the approved mylars, whether they were accessible in a timely manner. The consensus was that this is working satisfactory; mylars are posted within one week.

7) TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING-GLADYS

Gladys brought up the issue with Survey on when is the entire Survey is necessary for the application, sometimes the affected area only refers to one quad, she did not think that the entire survey for the PUD should be submitted with the application. Glen from surveying will be contacted and a representative from Survey will be asked to attend the next meeting, if still an issue.

Colleen brought up the issue about submitting blanket Consent forms in which all

boxes are checked. Colleen reported that as per Zoning Project Managers each consent form is only valid for the specific project. Jon said staff will look into this issue.

Gladys asked about Resolutions – agents/applicants should be receiving BCC Staff report with conditions instead they receive only the revised conditions prior to resolutions filed.

8) ADJOURN

MEETING ADJORNED AT 3:22 PM

DRAFT