



**INFILL REDEVELOPMENT (IR) SUBCOMMITTEE  
A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD (LDRAB)**

**TOPIC – PRIORITY REDEVELOPMENT AREA OVERLAY (PRAO)**

**MINUTES OF THE APRIL 8, 2010 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

**Prepared by Monica Cantor, Senior Site Planner  
William J Cross, AICP, Principal Site Planner**

On Thursday **April 8, 2010**, the Infill Redevelopment Subcommittee met at the Vista Center, Room VC-2E-12-Conference Room, at 2300 North Jog Road, West Palm Beach, Florida. The meeting convened at 2:05 p.m.

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was commenced without an official subcommittee quorum. It was noted that being a new year for the IR Subcommittee, that a new chair and vice chair would be selected at the first meeting having a quorum. It was decided to continue the meeting with the previous year Chair and Vice Chair.

**1. Attendance**

**LDRAB Members:** None.

**Industry:** William Whiteford, Jeff Brophy, Wendy Tuma, Joni Brinkman, Katherine Murray

**County Staff:** Jon MacGillis, Maryann Kwok, Autumn Sorrow, Stephanie Gregory, Monica Cantor, William Cross

**2. Amendments to the Agenda**

Not applicable.

**3. Motion to Adopt the Agenda**

Not applicable.

**4. Adoption of Prior Meeting Minutes**

Exhibits A and B – not applicable.

**B. TIMEFRAME FOR AMENDMENTS**

Mr. Cross provided copies of the timeline for PRAO ULDC amendments and critical meeting dates for the IR Subcommittee (April), the DRO Oversight Committee (April 23), LDRAB/LDRC (May 26), and BCC Hearings (June 24, July 22 and August 26). It was also noted that the Urban Center (UC) and Urban Infill (UI) rezoning was being processed on the same timeline, with a Zoning Commission hearing scheduled for July 1, 2010, and the same last two BCC hearing dates.

**C. REVIEW OF REORGANIZED/REVISED PRAO DRAFT (EXHIBIT C)**

Mr. Cross provided an updated overview of the Urban Redevelopment Area (URA) and Priority Redevelopment Area Overlay (PRAO) reiterating much of what was discussed by the subcommittee in 2009. He clarified the boundaries of the URA and the affected areas of the PRAO. It was commented that the common denominator of these two areas is the required interconnectivity per a Plan policy.

Mr. Cross responded to several questions from Mr. Whiteford regarding additional background on the planning, development and FLUA amendments for the PRAO, including: TCRPC involvement in the development of the Corridor Master Plan, related charrettes, and Planning development of Comprehensive Plan Policies. It was noted that the FLU for parcels within the PRA Corridors north of Forest Hill Blvd. were amended in 2008, with the remaining affected parcels south of Forest Hill Blvd. being amended in 2009. This included a detailed discussion of those parcels that opted out or are located within another jurisdiction, further noting that opt out parcels were not eligible for any PRA incentives, and that other jurisdictions would be required to adopt similar code provisions to qualify for TCEA considerations. It was noted that Planning staff had conducted approximately 25 hearings with the BCC on the PRAs.

William Cross noted that the incentives are based on allowing more density and intensity, eligibility for traffic concurrency relief, streamlined approvals, and a future drainage utility, among others. Maryann Kwok clarified that Zoning Division was tasked with finalizing prior efforts at developing code for the PRAs in early 2010, and that the Zoning Division was not involved in the original meetings and process. She clarified that the rezoning is similar to

previous rezoning done to the Westgate area and Agricultural Reserve area. The notice of the rezoning is going to be regular mail letter. If property owner wants to change the Special District they can come later and apply for it.

Joni Brinkman, who indicated that she was involved in several meetings with Planning staff, clarified that after the fact many property owners realized about the new FLU designation due in part to the notification mailed to the business and not to the owners\*. If owners want to opt-out and change their FLU designation to what they had before, they can come to the process but not sure if Planning will support it.

Mr. Cross indicated that discussions with Planning concluded that neither UC or UI would be required to be mixed use or primarily residential, unless approval of a Development Order required use of the TCEA, which may result in conditions for residential uses. As such, there are no residential minimums indicated in the code; however, residential uses are encouraged and permitted with any new PRA development.

Mr. Cross initiated a review of Exhibit C, noting that staff was soliciting suggestions for what should be permitted to apply for variances, or waivers – with a need for specific performance standards for the latter. The following is a summary of key issues that were discussed, with some being noted for further research to be revisited at the April 15, 2010 meeting:

- Page 2, Lines 1 – 4: It was suggested that the County allow more flexibility for non-conformities to encourage redevelopment of existing sites, with a need for a higher allowable percentage for maintenance and renovations than the 30% proposed.
- Page 3, Lines 1 – 34: Under the definitions, more particularly the building types, it was suggested that the mixed use building types be simplified and to clarify if a fee simple row-house (e.g. a townhouse) would still be required to meet Land Development access standards.
- Page 4, Lines 9 – 10: Review of Stoop and Porch definitions to clarify difference.
- Page 4, Lines 24 – 26: Suggested that Shy Zone was too detailed. Mr. MacGillis indicated that it would be deleted. Mr. Cross indicated that the simpler “hardscape” requirements used in LCC and IRO would be incorporated.
- Page 4, Lines 60 – 61: Modification of term “Xeriscape” for another term consistent with Art. 7
- Page 5, Line 17: Clarified that BCC approval of a Specialized Development (SD) district rezoning or conditional uses would only require a Preliminary Master Plan (i.e. Bubble Plan) and not a Preliminary Site Plan. Use IRO language.
- Page 6, Lines 37 – 38: Mr. Brophy indicated that prior Planning staff presentations suggested that DRO Final Site Plan or Subdivision Plan approval would be a basic “bubble plan.” Staff indicated that such had not been included in prior 2008 or 2009 drafts, to which several members indicated that the IR subcommittee never reviewed those in detail. Staff agreed to follow up with Planning to clarify if such was included in earlier drafts.
- Pages 6 and 7 – various as relates to Administrative Processes: Mr. Brophy inquired as to whether or not some projects could proceed directly to Building Permit as permitted uses. Mr. MacGillis indicated that the DRO approval was desired for the implementation of the code to provide a higher level of review and assistance to applicants, and also to reduce any adverse impacts to Building application processes. It was advised that pending a one year review that DRO thresholds would be considered.
- Page 8, Lines 26 – 31: Minor simplification to prior approvals and non-conformities were suggested. Staff clarified that the redundant references were important to ensure that applicant’s referred back to Art. 1.E and 1.F. It was generally agreed, that this was a good idea for the initial code.
- Page 8, Lines 44 – 46 (see also page 39, Part 15 – Workforce Housing Program: Mrs. Brinkman suggested that stepped percentages be used in lieu of the flat 15 percent requirement. Staff indicated that this was a requirement of the Plan for both the UC and UI FLU designations, and could not be amended without first amending the Plan.
- Page 8, Line 51: Delete reference to Technical Manual and clarify use of Preliminary Master Plan for any BCC approvals.
- Page 9, Lines 8 – 9: Delete reference to Architectural Elevations.
- Pages 10 and 11: It was noted that TCRPC would be developing new Frontage Types and Transect illustrations. Mr. Cross noted that for slip streets, additional research and coordination with Planning, Engineering, Fire Rescue and FDOT was ongoing.
- Page 11: Mr. Whiteford inquired as to the use of the Transect for the UC and UI. Mr. Cross explained that the current image of the Smart Code Transect was being used as a placeholder, that the sub-areas were transect based and not intended to address the full scope of the transect as applies to the natural to urban core.
- Pages 12 and 13: Mixed use building types to be consolidated with consistency achieved through the height limits for each applicable TZ sub-area.

- Page 14: Simplify mixed use building types, improve illustrations for each TZ Sub-area by noting difference between elevation and plan views. Mr. Whiteford suggested that building types be permitted to be attached.
- Page 17, Lines 1 – 14: Per previously e-mailed comments from Mr. Brophy, staff concurred with the need to incorporate LCC or IRO language that makes it clear that internal street requirements (side streets) can be accommodated as part of parking tracts or accessways. Staff clarified that this was intent, and that internal streets or slip streets do not have to be platted as public or private R-O-W. Noting however, that such would still be required for the subdivision of land if lot frontage were required.
- Page 18, Lines 11 – 16: Mr. Brophy indicated that the requirement for a mix of buildings with a one acre threshold was not feasible. Mr. MacGillis indicated the requirement would be deleted.
- Page 20, Line 9: Mr. Cross explained how Zoning had increased the allowable height per floor to a starting standard of 35 feet for the first two floors, with taller buildings based upon a height of 15 feet per floor. Mr. Cross noted that language from the Miami 21 code was added to address mezzanines and that they allowed 25' as a first floor height. Mr. Whiteford suggested that the PRA allow for a 25 foot tall first floor and that subsequent floor heights be based on this factor.
- Page 20, Lines 9 – 23: It was suggested that the notation allowing for single story civic buildings read to also allow such for “structures permitted in SD districts.” Mr. Cross noted that the civic provision was necessary to be consistent with the Plan. The interior height requirement was also questioned, to which Mr. Cross indicated that it was a common FBC standard and had been adopted as part of the IRO. Mr. MacGillis indicated he had previously questioned the need for such, and it was decided it would be removed.
- Page 22, Lines 6 – 13: Staff noted that performance standards were needed for primary frontage spacing requirements.
- Page 22, all additional building standards: Mr. Brophy suggested that the physical building requirements when combined with general Art. 5.C. Architectural Requirements were too expensive, too complex and should be simplified. Mr. Cross clarified that a substantial number of earlier standards had been deleted. Mr. MacGillis indicated that he had assigned Jan Wiegand, Senior Planner for Arch. Review to work with Mr. Cross to re-evaluate these standards.
- Pages 24 and 41 – Permitted Use Schedule: Mr. Cross explained how the Non-conforming use approvals would work, and clarified that contrary to what was in this draft – that any use incorporating a vehicular drive through, filling station, car wash or other similar auto-centric use would only be permitted subject to BCC approval of a SD district rezoning.
- Page 27, Lines 11 – 14: Mr. MacGillis indicated that redundant ADA requirements and trash receptacle standards would be deleted.
- Page 27, Lines 25 – 33: Per earlier comments, Shy Zone to be deleted and replaced with generic LCC/IRO hardscape requirements.
- Page 29, Lines 9 – 17: Mrs. Tuma suggested that a waiver be permitted from the mandatory threshold of 5/1000 parking structure requirement.
- Page 29, Lines 39 – 47: Mr. Cross indicated that pending documentation from Planning to justify a flat 2/1000 parking ratio – that increased parking ratio's will be required.
- Page 30, Lines 18 – 64: Mr. Cross indicated that the discussions with Planning staff were ongoing to determine the feasibility of allowing a impervious bio-swale as a perimeter or incompatibility buffer option were non-residential uses abut existing residential neighborhoods.
- Pages 34 and 35: Mr. Cross indicated that the PRAO GIS Regulating Plan included in the draft for informational purposes would most likely be removed and only included in the Interactive ULDC. The original maps will be maintained by Zoning staff, similar to the Zoning Quad Maps.

#### **D. NEXT MEETING TOPICS (THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 2010)**

Staff indicated that many of the items noted above would be researched further, and that the next scheduled meeting would be intended for more in depth discussion on key issues raised by the subcommittee.

#### **E. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 pm.

\*At the Infill Redevelopment (IR) Sub-committee meeting held on Thursday, April 15, 2010, Bryan Davis, Principal Planner of the PBC Planning Division clarified that notification letters for the change of the Future Land Use (FLU) designation were mailed to the affected parcels property owner and delivered as regular mail.