

EXHIBIT A

ELECTRIC FENCE SUBCOMMITTEE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD (LDRAB)

SUMMARY OF THE DECEMBER 12, 2012 MEETING

On Wednesday, December 12, 2012, a LDRAB Subcommittee meeting was held at the Vista Center, Kenneth Rogers Hearing Room, VC-1W-47 at 2300 North Jog Road, West Palm Beach, Florida.

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call

The meeting commenced at 3:40 p.m.

2. Introduction of Members, Staff and Interested Parties

LDRAB Subcommittee Member: Frank Gulisano, Barbara Katz, and Lori Vinikoor

Interested Parties: Lt. Bruce Hannan, Deputy Sheriff Karl Martin, Matthew Leger, Chris Barry, Cliff Hertz, Thuy Shutt and Cindy Gsell.

County Staff: Richard Gathright, Bryan Davis, William Cross, and Scott Rodriguez.

3. Election – Chair and Vice Chair (Optional)

Members of the Subcommittee did not elect a Chair/ Vice Chair and deferred to staff to lead discussion.

4. Amendments to the Agenda

N/A.

5. Motion to Adopt Agenda

Agenda was accepted by participants to use as is.

6. Adoption of November 26, 2012 Meeting Summary

Mr. Gulisano pointed out that the Call to Order time was incorrect in the Summary (3:40 p.m. instead of 3:00 p.m.). The Subcommittee accepted the summary with the change.

B. REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

1. Status- Staff Issues

Mr. Cross summarized staff's initial concerns with the proposed amendment to members of the subcommittee. The primary concerns included aesthetics (ROW, residential setbacks and buffering) and safety. Mr. Cross commented that a majority of the safety issues have been resolved and staff would prefer to defer enforcement to the Building Division.

2. Other Suggested Items for Consideration

Mr. Cross summarized three scenario's 1) an existing site that may or may not have a conforming landscape buffer; not to change any landscaping requirements to address aesthetics and visibility, 2) have a previously approved project that meets all landscaping requirements but the product is not compatible with landscaping; could cause a maintenance issue, and 3) new development that affects landscaping.

3. Applicant Review of Proposed Language

Ms. Gsell gave a brief presentation of the product to benefit subcommittee members not present at the November 26, 2012 meeting. This included safety and aesthetics of the product. During the brief overview of the product, members of the subcommittee asked questions and provided comments:

Ms. Shutt asked what types of fences the product is compatible with. Ms. Gsell responded by saying that any type of fence is compatible. Ms. Shutt informed the subcommittee of the requirements of the Westgate CRA and its Board and the focus of redevelopment and mixed uses. Ms. Vinikoor inquired on the size of the power source. Ms. Gsell offered that some power sources were typically the size of a car battery. Mr. Cross reiterated concerns pertaining to the WCRAO form based code as relates to

EXHIBIT A

setbacks, visibility from the ROW, screening, and signage) of ROW frontages as it pertains to industrial or commercial neighborhoods. Ms. Vinikoor asked representatives of PBSO whether or not the product was an effective deterrent. Lt. Hannan and Deputy Sheriff Martin agreed that the product is a strong deterrent. Mr. Hertz discussed the disadvantages of screening in an urban development area and comparable environments in which sales (of products on display) would be impacted.

Mr. Cross advised that research identifying municipalities lifting prohibitions on electric fences were mostly for industrial districts. In these instances, the County has regulations in place that would facilitate the product adjacent to residential districts. Commercial districts present a different set of challenges such as landscaping, ROW, etc. Commercial and industrial districts could potentially introduce an electric fence in the public realm that County staff is not comfortable with.

Ms. Gsell offered an option to lower the fence to same allowable height as the gate and to ensure buffers (to mitigate the horizontal poles on the gate) as opposed to screening. This option was open for discussion by staff. Additional discussion ensued, with Ms. Vinikoor suggesting that the aesthetics of the gate might be improved through the use of decorative gates, such as aluminum or other similar. Mr. Cross expressed potential interest by key stakeholders of urban redevelopment proponents and their concerns. Ms. Katz reiterated public safety should be a primary concern.

Mr. Cross expressed to the subcommittee that staff reviewed the applicant's proposed Code language and provided feedback regarding landscaping and buffer requirements. Mr. Barry and Mr. Hertz agreed that another meeting with staff to work out language was warranted to be discussed at the third subcommittee meeting.

C. NEXT MEETING AGENDA

Participants agreed that a third meeting was warranted. Ms. Vinikoor suggested that at the next meeting, technical examples of Code language are presented to the subcommittee. Participants agreed on January 7, 2013 as a date for the next subcommittee meeting. Mr. Gulisano suggested a change in start time from 3:30 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. to allow the subcommittee more time to review and discuss proposed language. The participants agreed.

D. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.