



**AGENDA**  
**PALM BEACH COUNTY**  
**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**  
**PUBLIC HEARING**

**Comprehensive Amendment Round 14-3,  
Unified Land Development Code Amendments, and  
Official Zoning Map Amendments**

**WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2014**

**9:30 a.m. 6<sup>th</sup> 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 - 5)**

**4. COMMENTS (Page 6)**

**5. ADJOURNMENT (Page 6)**

### 3. PUBLIC HEARING

#### 3.A. AMENDMENT ROUND 14-3 Future Land Use Atlas & Text Amendments

Name	Description
<p><b>3.A.1</b></p> <p><b>Minto West Agricultural Enclave (LGA 2014-007)</b></p> <p><b>District: 6</b></p> <p><b>Web Links:</b></p> <p><a href="#">Staff Report with Exhibits 1 to 25</a></p> <p><a href="#">Exhibit 26 Municipal &amp; Organization Comments</a></p> <p><a href="#">Exhibit 27 Public Opposition Pre Transmittal</a></p> <p><a href="#">Exhibit 28 Public Support Pre Transmittal</a></p> <p><a href="#">Exhibit 29 Letters Post Transmittal</a></p> <p><a href="#">Exhibit 30 State Agency Comments</a></p>	<p><b>FLUA Amendment Summary:</b>            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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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, and add 1,050,000 sq. ft. of light industrial and research and development, 450,000 sq. ft. of commercial office uses and 200,000 sq. ft. of Civic uses, and to allow a 150-room hotel and a 3,000 student college.</li> </ul> <p><b>Text Amendment Summary:</b>            To modify the Agricultural Enclave provisions in the Comprehensive Plan to revise the Introduction &amp; Administration, Future Land Use, and Transportation Elements, and the Map Series as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise policies and definitions;</li> <li>• Update references related to the Agricultural Lands and Practices Act;</li> <li>• Expand and update the list of Rural Parkways; and</li> <li>• Modify the Map Series to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Designate 53.17 acres as a Limited Urban Service Area on:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Service Areas Map LU 2.1;</li> <li>▪ Managed Growth Tier System Map LU 1.1;</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Update Rural Parkways on the Thoroughfare Right of Way Identification Map TE 14.1.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Location:</b> East and west of Seminole Pratt Whitney Blvd., south of 60<sup>th</sup> St. N. and north of 50<sup>th</sup> St. N. and Sycamore, and West of 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue North</p> <p><b>Staff Assessment:</b> 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><b>Staff Recommendation: <i>Approve</i></b></p>

Name	Description
<p><b>3.A.1</b> <b>Minto West</b> <b>Agricultural</b> <b>Enclave</b> <b>(LGA 2014-007)</b></p> <p><b>Continued...</b></p>	<p><b>LPA Recommendation: <i>Denial</i></b>, 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 &amp; 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 ITID made a presentation opposing the project. Approx. 41 members of the public submitted 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 spoke in support.</p> <p><b>Board of County Commissioners Transmittal Public Hearing: <i>Transmit</i></b>, motion by Comm. Vana, seconded by Comm. Valeche, passed in a 5-2 vote (with Comm. Santamaria and Comm. Burdick dissenting) at the Aug. 27th hearing. The motion included adding Condition H shown in Exhibit 1 at the recommendation of staff. Board discussion focused on traffic issues such as the non-residential and residential land use balance and phasing, impact fee determination and the cost to the County of needed improvements to the roadway network. The Board also discussed other impacts on public facilities and services such as water and wastewater, as well as schools. Approx. 46 members of the public spoke opposition, citing change of lifestyle while supporting the density and intensity allowed in the existing approval. Representatives from the Indian Trail Improvement District (ITID) and Alerts of PBC, Inc. each made a presentation opposing the project. One member of the public spoke in support citing benefits of the new plan.</p> <p><b>State Review Comments:</b> The DEO reviewed this amendment under the Expedited Review process and issued a letter dated October 2nd stating they had no objections or comments. State review agency letters and staff response are in Exh. 30. The TCRPC provided recommendations pertaining to roadway impacts, intergovernmental coordination, the conceptual plan, and other urban design features pertaining to a zoning approval. The FDOT recommended that an analysis of the access and mobility needs for the Central Western Communities be undertaken, to have input on proportionate share payments pertaining to state facilities, and that a long-term study for the SR-80 Corridor is anticipated within the next few years. The other agencies made comments related to permits, the concurrent zoning request, and/or the site planning.</p> <p><b>Changes Since Transmittal:</b> Minor changes to polices since Transmittal have been made, largely to clarify references to Policy 2.2.5-d rather than the Agricultural Enclave statute. Revisions to the Conceptual Plan and Implementing Principles have been made, consistent with the BCC transmitted condition requiring specific changes, and also to clarify items needed per the ULDC and rezoning requirements.</p>
<p><b>Conduct Public Hearing on 3.A.1</b></p>	

### 3.B. Unified Land Development Code Amendments

Name	Description
<p><b>3.B.1</b></p> <p><b>Agricultural Enclave ULDC Amendments</b></p>	<p><b>Title:</b> ADOPTION HEARING - UNIFIED LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE (ULDC) AMENDMENTS: AGRICULTURAL ENCLAVE OVERLAY (AGEO) AND RELATED AMENDMENTS</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The proposed amendments will address the Agricultural Enclave Overlay (AGEO) and Traditional Development Districts (TDDs). The AGEO amendments include deletion of redundant provisions addressed by a FLUA amendment Conceptual Plan and Implementing Principles; clarification of development review procedures and plan requirements; and exceptions for a TTD in the AGEO. In addition, the TDD requirements will be updated to reflect current industry trends.</p> <p><b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Staff recommends a motion to adopt an Ordinance of the Board of County Commissioners of Palm Beach County, Florida amending the Unified Land Development Code, Ordinance 2003-067, as amended.</p> <p><b>LDRAB Recommendation/LDRC Determination:</b> On June 25, 2014, LDRAB recommended 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><b>BCC Public Hearings:</b> On July 24, 2014, the BCC approved the Request for Permission to Advertise for First Reading on August 27th. Motion to approve by Comm. Abrams, seconded by Comm. Valeche, passed 7 – 0. On August 27th, the BCC approved the First Reading and to advertise for Final Adoption on October 29th. Motion to approve by Comm. Valeche, seconded by Comm. Vana, passed 6 – 1 with Comm. Santamaria dissenting and six speakers in opposition.</p>
<p><b>Conduct Public Hearing on 3.B.1</b></p>	

### 3.C. Zoning Applications

#### Disclosure on 3.C.

Name	Description
<p><a href="#">3.C.1</a> <a href="#">Minto West Traditional Town Development (TTD) TDD/R-2014-00094</a></p> <p>Control 2006-00397</p> <p>District: 6</p>	<p><b>Title:</b> an Official Zoning Map Amendment to a Traditional Development District <b>Request:</b> to allow a rezoning from the Agriculture Residential (AR) and Public Ownership (PO) Zoning Districts to the Traditional Town Development (TTD) Zoning District</p> <p><b>Title:</b> Requested Use <b>Request:</b> to allow a College or University and to allow a Hotel</p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Minto SPW, LLC <b>Owners:</b> Minto SPW, LLC <b>Agent:</b> Cotleur &amp; Hearing, Inc.</p> <p><b>Size:</b> 3,788.60 acres +/- <b>General Location:</b> On the south side of 60th St. N. approx. 2 miles north of Okeechobee Blvd, on the east and west sides of Seminole Pratt Whitney Rd.</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The proposed rezoning would allow development of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4,546 dwelling units at a gross density of 1.20 dwelling units per acre.</li> <li>• 2.0 million sq. ft. of non-residential uses;</li> <li>• 200,000 sq. ft. of Civic uses; and</li> <li>• two Requested Uses for a 150-room Hotel and a 3,000-student College.</li> </ul> <p>The TTD Preliminary Master Plan is comprised of approx. 2,089.11 acres of open space and 1,699.49 acres of development area. The development pattern for the TTD is governed by 3 types of transects: Natural, Suburban and Urban. The TTD Development areas include a mix of Land Use allocations or pods for Planned Unit Developments; Traditional Neighborhood Developments; Multiple Use Planned Developments; and Traditional Marketplace Developments.</p> <p><b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Staff recommends approval of the requests subject to: 134 Conditions of Approval in Exhibit C-1; 1 Condition of Approval in Exhibit C-2; and 1 Condition of Approval in Exhibit C-3.</p> <p><b>Zoning Commission (ZC) Recommendation:</b> On Oct. 2, 2014, the ZC recommended Approval with a vote of 6 - 2 with 1 Commissioner abstaining.</p>
<p><b>Conduct Public Hearing on 3.C.1</b></p>	

<p><b>3.A.1 MOTION:</b></p>	<p>To <b>adopt an ordinance</b> amending the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Atlas for the Minto West Amendment (LGA 2014-007)</p>
<p><b>3.B.1 MOTION:</b></p>	<p><b>TO ADOPT AN ORDINANCE</b> AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE UNIFIED LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, ORDINANCE 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>
<p><b>3.C.1 MOTIONS:</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To <b>adopt a Resolution</b> approving an Official Zoning Map Amendment to allow a rezoning from the Agriculture Residential (AR) and Public Ownership (PO) Zoning Districts to the Traditional Town Development (TTD) Zoning District subject to the Conditions of Approval in Exhibit C-1.</li> <li>2. To <b>adopt a Resolution</b> approving a Requested Use to allow a College or University subject to the Conditions of Approval in Exhibit C-2.</li> <li>3. To <b>adopt a Resolution</b> approving a Requested Use to allow a Hotel subject to the Conditions of Approval in Exhibit C-3.</li> <li>4. To <b>approve and authorize</b> the Mayor to Execute Proportionate Fair Share Agreement</li> </ol>

**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.