



AGENDA
PALM BEACH COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
PUBLIC HEARING

**Comprehensive Amendment Round 14-3 and
Unified Land Development Code Amendments**

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 27, 2014

9:30 a.m. 6th Floor

Jane M. Thomson 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 proof of publication

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

- A. Additions, Deletions, Substitutions
- B. Adoption

3. PUBLIC HEARING (Page 2 - 4)

4. COMMENTS (Page 4)

5. ADJOURNMENT (Page 5)

3. PUBLIC HEARING - AMENDMENT ROUND 14-3

3.A. Privately Proposed Future Land Use Atlas & Text Amendments

Name	Description
<p>3.A.1</p> <p>Minto West Agricultural Enclave (LGA 2014-007)</p> <p>District: 6</p> <p>Web Links:</p> <p>Staff Report with Exhibits 1 to 25</p> <p>Exhibit 26 Municipal & Organization Comments</p> <p>Exhibit 27 Public Opposition</p> <p>Exhibit 28 Public Support</p>	<p>FLUA Amendment Summary:</p> <p>To modify the Future Land Use Atlas to revise previously adopted conditions of approval, including the Conceptual Plan and Implementing Principles, on a 3,735.43 acre site with Agricultural Enclave (AGE) future land use designation, and to change the future land use designation on 53.17 acres from Rural Residential, 1 unit per 10 acres (RR-10) to AGE. Changes to intensity and density are summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the residential density from 0.80 du/acre (2,996 units) to a maximum of 1.20 du/acre (4,546 units) for net increase of 1550 units; • Increase the non-residential intensity from a maximum of 235,000 sq. ft. of commercial uses to a maximum of 500,000 sq. ft. retail, 1.5 million of economic development uses (office, light industrial and research and development) and 200,000 sq. ft. of Civic uses, and to allow a 150-room hotel and a 3,000 student college. <p>Text Amendment Summary:</p> <p>To modify the Agricultural Enclave provisions in the Comprehensive Plan to revise the Introduction & Administration, Future Land Use, and Transportation Elements, and the Map Series as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise policies and definitions; • Update references related to the Agricultural Lands and Practices Act; • Expand and update the list of Rural Parkways; and • Modify the Map Series to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Designate 53.17 acres as a Limited Urban Service Area on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Service Areas Map LU 2.1; ▪ Managed Growth Tier System Map LU 1.1; ○ Update Rural Parkways on the Thoroughfare Right of Way Identification Map TE 14.1. <p>Location: East and west of Seminole Pratt Whitney Blvd., south of 60th St. N. and north of 50th St. N. and Sycamore, and West of 140th Avenue North</p> <p>Staff Assessment: The proposed amendment, including the staff proposed text changes and FLUA amendment with Conceptual Plan and Implementing Principles, coupled with the use of the Traditional Town Development zoning district includes appropriate new urbanism concepts pursuant to the Agricultural Enclave statute. The amendments have been tailored to incorporate the provisions of the Agricultural Enclave while preserving the integrity of the County’s Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the amendment will address regional deficiencies through the provision of public benefits for residents of the Central Western Communities.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: <i>Approve - Transmit</i></p>

Name	Description
	<p>LPA Recommendation: <i>Denial</i>, motion by Dr. Vinikoor, seconded by Mr. Brake, passed in a 12-1 vote (with Ms. Levitt-Moccia dissenting) at the August 8, 2014 public hearing. The motion included the addition of Conditions F & G shown in Exhibit 1 at the recommendation of staff. The Commission expressed support for the overall design concept proposed, but also discussed compatibility with the existing Rural and Exurban Tiers, the proposed intensity of the non-residential development, the lack of analysis on traffic, the need for quantifiable public benefits and commitments from the developer to addressing those issues. The agent for the applicant made a presentation and answered those questions. Representatives from the Indian Trail Improvement District (ITID) made a presentation opposing the project. Approximately 41 members of the public submitted comment cards in opposition, citing traffic and drainage impacts, the timing of improvements, change of character, and support for the existing approval. One member of the public submitted a card and spoke in support.</p>
<p>MOTION:</p>	<p>To <i>transmit</i> the amendment</p>

3.B. Unified Land Development Code Amendments

Name	Description
<p><u>3.B.1</u> <u>Agricultural Enclave ULDC Amendments</u></p>	<p>Title: FIRST READING AND REQUEST TO ADVERTISE FOR ADOPTION HEARING - UNIFIED LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE (ULDC) AMENDMENTS: AGRICULTURAL ENCLAVE OVERLAY (AGEO) AND RELATED AMENDMENTS</p> <p>Summary: The proposed amendments will address the Agricultural Enclave Overlay (AGEO) and Traditional Development Districts (TDDs). The AGEO amendments generally include deletion of redundant provisions addressed by a Future Land Use Atlas (FLUA) amendment Conceptual Plan and Implementing Principles; clarification of development review procedures and plan requirements; and, exceptions for a Traditional Town Development (TTD) in the AGEO that recognizes the special circumstances of the Enclave. Also included, miscellaneous minor revisions to update the TDD requirements (originally adopted in 2003) to reflect current industry and Planning and Zoning trends, including but not limited to: timing of BCC approvals for Requested Uses within a TTD; block structure standards; spacing requirements for street trees; standards for porches and garages; and, exceptions from window requirements for certain non-residential uses.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends a motion to approve on First Reading and advertise for Adoption Hearing on October 29, 2014.</p>

Name	Description
<p>3.B.1 Agricultural Enclave ULDC Amendments (continued)</p>	<p>LDRAB Recommendation/LDRC Determination: The proposed ULDC amendments were presented to the Land Development Regulation Advisory Board (LDRAB) and the Land Development Regulation Commission (LDRC) on June 25, 2014. LDRAB Recommendation, approval as amended by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Gulisano, passed 10 – 2. The LDRAB convened as the LDRC to determine consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. Motion to approve by Mr. Puzzitiello, seconded by Mr. Carpenter, passed 12 – 0.</p> <p>BCC Public Hearings: On July 24, 2014, the BCC approved the Request for Permission to Advertise for First Reading on August 27, 2014. Motion to approve by Comm. Abrams, seconded by Comm. Valeche, passed 7 – 0.</p>
<p>MOTION:</p>	<p>To approve on First Reading and advertise for Adoption Hearing on October 29, 2014:</p> <p>AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE UNIFIED LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, ORDINANCES 2003-067 AS AMENDED, AS FOLLOWS: ARTICLE 1 - GENERAL PROVISIONS; CHAPTER I, DEFINITIONS AND ACRONYMS; ARTICLE 2 - DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCEDURES; CHAPTER A, GENERAL; ARTICLE 3 - OVERLAYS AND ZONING DISTRICTS; CHAPTER A, GENERAL; CHAPTER B, OVERLAYS; CHAPTER C, STANDARD DISTRICTS; CHAPTER E, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS (PDDs); CHAPTER F, TRADITIONAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS (TDDs); ARTICLE 5 - SUPPLEMENTARY STANDARDS; CHAPTER A, GENERAL; CHAPTER B, ACCESSORY AND TEMPORARY USES; CHAPTER F, LEGAL DOCUMENTS; ARTICLE 7 - LANDSCAPING; CHAPTER C, MGTS TIER COMPLIANCE; ARTICLE 8 - SIGNAGE; - CHAPTER G, STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC SIGN TYPES; PROVIDING FOR: INTERPRETATION OF CAPTIONS; REPEAL OF LAWS IN CONFLICT; SEVERABILITY; SAVINGS CLAUSE; INCLUSION IN THE UNIFIED LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE; AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.</p>

4. COMMENTS

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

5. 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\14-MintoWest\Reports-Agendas\2-BCCTran\Agenda-BCC-8-27-14.docx