



**ZONING COMMISSION
AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA
APRIL 3, 2025**

CONSENT AGENDA

B. Zoning Applications

2. [DOA-2024-01246 The Cagigas Organization \(2005-00346\)](#)

AMEND – To modify Development Order Amendment Conditions of Approval in Exhibit C as shown with the deleted text struck out and added text underlined:

ZONING - LANDSCAPING-LANDSCAPE - STANDARDS

3. All palms required to be planted on the property by this approval shall meet the following minimum standards at installation:

- a. palm heights: twelve (12) feet clear trunk;
- b. clusters: staggered heights twelve (12) to eighteen (18) feet; and,
- c. credit may be given for existing or relocated palms provided they meet current ULDC requirements. (BLDG PERMIT: LANDSCAPE-Zoning)

~~4.~~ A group of three (3) or more palms may not supersede the requirement for a canopy tree in that location, unless specified herein. (BLDGPMT: ZONING - Zoning) (Previous ZONING - LANDSCAPING Condition 3 of Resolution R-2006-286, Control No.2005-00346)

~~4.~~ 5. Field adjustment of plant material locations may be permitted to provide pedestrian sidewalks/bike paths and to accommodate transverse utility or drainage easements crossings and existing vegetation. (BLDGPMT: ZONING - Zoning) (Previous ZONING - LANDSCAPING Condition 4 of Resolution R-2006- 286, Control No.2005-00346)

ZONING - LANDSCAPING-LANDSCAPING – INTERIOR

~~5.4.~~ The main central walkway shall be paved ...*{omitted for brevity}*

3. [Z/CA-2024-01593 Nash Trail \(1978-00229\)](#)

AMEND – To modify Development Order Amendment Conditions of Approval in Exhibit C as shown with the deleted text struck out and added text underlined:

ENGINEERING

2. The Property Owner shall improve Nash Trail from 52nd Drive South to Haverhill Road in accordance with Palm Beach County's Land Development Design Standards for a Local Street, or as approved by the County Engineer. Any and all costs associated with the construction shall be paid by the Property Owner. These costs shall include, but are not limited to, utility relocations and acquisition of any additional required right-of-way.

- a. Permits required from Palm Beach County for this construction shall be obtained prior to the issuance of the first building permit. (BLDGPMT: MONITORING - Engineering)
- b. Construction shall be completed prior to issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy. (CO: MONITORING - Engineering)

c. Alternatively, prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy, the Property Owner may provide documentation to the Land Development Division demonstrating that Nash Trail has been improved to Land Development Design Standards for a local street, and any permit to improve said right-of-way has been certified as complete and passed the final inspection (CO: MONITORING – Engineering).

~~5. Property Owner shall construct a minimum 5 foot wide concrete sidewalk along the west side of 52nd Drive South from Nash Trail to the terminus for 52nd Drive South. Any and all costs associated with the construction shall be paid by the Property Owner. These costs shall include, but are not limited to, utility relocations and acquisition of any additional required right-of-way. The sidewalk shall be completed prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy. If approved by the County Engineer, the Property Owner may submit payment in lieu of construction in an amount approved by the County Engineer and the condition shall be considered satisfied. (CO: MONITORING – Engineering)~~

~~5. 6.~~ Prior to issuance of the first building permit, the Property Owner shall plat ... {omitted for brevity}

REGULAR AGENDA

B. Zoning Applications

4. [CA-2023-01791 Southland Water Resource \(2023-00122\)](#)

AMEND – To modify Class A Conditional Use Conditions of Approval in Exhibit C as shown with the deleted text struck out and added text underlined:

ENVIRONMENTAL

2. Maximum depth of all excavations shall be no more than 15 feet below the Ordinary Water Level (OWL) or consistent with the FDEP Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) specifications, not to exceed 15 feet below OWL. The elevation of the OWL shall be determined and a ground surface elevation survey (certified by a FL licensed surveyor or FL licensed ~~surveyor~~ engineer) for each proposed sub-phase shall be provided to ERM and approved by County Water Resource Engineer prior to any site work. (BLDGPMT: ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT - Environmental Resources Management)

8. Pursuant to Art.4.B.10.B.8.a.. Administration and Enforcement [Administrative Waiver from Construction Criteria for Agricultural, WCAA, Type 2, and Type 3 Excavations], ~~the~~ NIC Administrative Waiver for littoral planting relief request shall include an alternative plan with a contribution to the Pollution Recovery Trust Fund of twice the amount calculated by the formula for a guarantee located in Art. 4.B.10.B.7.d.5)c), Littoral Zones and for review and approval by the Director of ERM prior to NIC and Administrative Waiver approval. The cash out amounts shall be done in three sub[1]phases (initial NIC for sub-phases 1 – 4 and NIC modifications for the two remaining sub-phases 5 - 8 and 9 -13, respectively) and will be based on the average of the two current market rates at that time.(BLDGPMT: ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT - Environmental Resources Management)

11. Applicant shall provide a natural resource extraction fee pursuant to Article 4.B.10 and ~~modified in~~ PBC PPM # EV-O-314 "Calculating the Annual Escalator Rate for Type III Excavations". This is to be calculated annually from data provided in the Annual Report which is submitted to ERM by January 31 of the succeeding year. Payment shall be provided to ERM by February 15 of that same year and rates are expected to escalate annually. To receive these funds, ERM has defined a separate account for natural resource extraction fees. The funds will be used for environmental enhancement and compliance and monitoring activities which include, but are not limited to: Purchase land; restore land to a more natural state; and, enhance the flora and fauna of already preserved natural areas. In the event the legislature of the State of Florida or the County imposes, by legislation, ordinance, or other means, an extraction fee, tax, or charge, then this natural resources extraction fee shall be reduced by the same amount. (DATE/ONGOING: MONITORING - Environmental Resources Management)

ADD – To add to the Staff Report the attached letter

Richard Grosso, Esq.
Richard Grosso, P.A.
6919 W. Broward Blvd.
Plantation, FL 33317
Mailbox 142
richardgrosso1979@gmail.com
954-801-5662
richardgrossopa.com

via email to:

Chairwoman Cheri Pavlik
Palm Beach County Zoning Commission

March 28, 2025

Re: Southland Mining Project and Comprehensive Plan Compliance

Dear Chairwoman Pavlik,

I write on behalf of Friends of the Everglades, to object to the proposed Southland Mining Project that is on the Commission’s April 3, 2024 agenda, and to ask the Commission to recommend its denial. As presented in the County Staff’s Assessment and Recommendation, the proposed permit does not qualify for approval under Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Policy 2.3–e.3, which strictly limits mining in the EAA to specified uses.

On March 24, 2025, I submitted a letter to County Staff detailing the reasons why the application did not qualify for approval under the terms of the Comprehensive Plan. A March 6, 2025 letter from the Everglades Law Center had also explained in detail why the proposal did not qualify for approval as a water resource project under Policy 2.3–e.3. These letters were included in the Appendix to the Staff recommendation, but it did specifically address the arguments raised in those letters, both of which I attach for your convenience.

The staff’s recommendation of approval fails to demonstrate that the proposed mine would “only” be used for the three purposes for which Policy 2.3–e.3 allows mining in the EAA. Neither does the Staff Report demonstrate that the mine will “*provide* viable alternative technologies for water management” on a site “identified by the South Florida Water Management District”.

As to the first point, Future Land Use Policy 2.3–e.3 allows mining in Agricultural Production Future Land Use designation:

“only to support public roadway projects or agricultural activities, or water management projects associated with ecosystem restoration, regional water supply or flood protection, on sites identified by the South Florida Water Management District or the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers **where such uses provide** viable alternative technologies for water management.” (emphasis added)

This policy has been strictly interpreted by the Fourth District Court of Appeals to preclude the approval of a mine that will be used for anything other than the three specified allowable uses – even when the mine will also be put to allowable uses.¹ Thus, any mine that will be used for any other purpose – for instance general commercial sale of excavated material – is prohibited by the Comprehensive Plan. A mine that will excavate material for general commercial sales is prohibited, even if some of those sales are to be used for road – building. The same is true for a mine that may be put to a water ecosystem restoration, regional water supply or flood protection use at some time in the future after it is used for general commercial extraction and sale, agricultural activity or roadway projects.

The staff's recommendation for the Southland permit states that the applicant has represented that the mine will be used for two allowable purposes – roadway projects and water management projects. Even assuming that strict proof of these facts existed (which is not shown by the Staff Report) – **the Staff Report includes no statement or mandatory condition precluding the use of the mine for general commercial aggregate mining in addition to any roadway or water management purposes.**

Instead, the Staff Report simply requires after the fact documentation that the “reclaimed” mine will be used for water management purposes. First, that the mine might be put to that purpose as part of its “reclamation” – i.e., only after the applicant has excavated the aggregate for sale – obviously contemplates that this purpose might be served decades into the future.² Next, while the Staff Report states that “the Applicant has made several *representations* to Planning staff ... that *indicate the mined aggregate material will be ... used for public roadway projects*”,³ staff also concedes that:

“the Applicant has not provided any documentation that the FDOT has any interest in the aggregate”. (Staff Report, p. 9).

This is facially inadequate to prove compliance with the Policy, and the recommended “monitoring report” that the applicant would provide only after the mine is approved and under excavation cannot overcome the fact that the applicant has not demonstrated compliance with the Plan now, as it must, prior to approval. See, *US Sugar Corp. v. 1000 Friends of Florida*, 134 So. 3d 1052 (Fla. 4th DCA 2013)(holding an applicant bears the burden of proving compliance with a comprehensive plan).

¹ The relevant appellate court decisions - *1000 Friends of Fla., Inc. v. Palm Beach County and Bergeron Sand & Rock Mine Aggregates, Inc.*, 69 So. 3d 1123 (Fla. 4th DCA 2011); *1000 Friends of Fla., Inc. v. Palm Beach County and Rinker Materials of Fla., d/b/a Cemex*, 75 So. 3d 1270 (Fla. 4th DCA 2011), and *United States Sugar Corp. v. 1000 Friends of Fla.*, 134 So. 3d 1052 (Fla. 4th DCA 2013) - are available at (1) Bergeron <https://casetext.com/case/1000-friends-of-fl-v-palm-beach>; (2) South Bay (Rinker / Cemex) <https://casetext.com/case/1000-friends-of-florida>; and (3) Lake Harbor (US Sugar) - <https://casetext.com/case/us-sugar-corp-v-1000-friends-of-fla>.

² According to the applicant, a projected completion date is 2069. (Carlton Fields January 27, 2025 Excavation Operation and Construction Statement, p. 1)

³ Staff Report p. 9.

The same flaw exists relative to the claim that the mine qualifies for approval as a water resource project. The Staff Report merely references the “*potential* for this proposal to provide additional water storage” by the South Florida Water Management District.⁴ But **the recommended condition that the applicant submit post - approval documentation that the reclaimed mine will be used for a qualifying water management purposes⁵ on its face demonstrates that this showing has not yet been made.** Indeed, on the very last page of the Staff Recommendation, you will find the transcript of SFWMD Executive Director Drew Bartlett telling the SFWMD Governing during its February 14, 2025 meeting that that **District has not yet entered into a Public-Private Partnership with this applicant to construct a water management project, District staff has not yet determined “that this proposed mine would be a viable storage and treatment project that will provide regional benefits** and it will not impact the construction or operation of the EAA Reservoir project”, and that, if it does so in the future, “staff will bring the project to the Board for your consideration.” The use of this mine as a qualifying water management project is speculative – a potential project at best.

In short, the applicant has not proven that the mine will in fact be used for road building or qualifying water management purposes. It has proffered no binding commitments from FDOT or other roadbuilding agencies to purchase any, let alone all, of the excavated material, and the SFWMD has not determined that the project will meet the terms of Policy 2.3–e.3 regarding water management projects.

Finally, even if these facial deficiencies did not exist, the permit **must still be denied because nowhere does the Staff report state or condition approval on the exclusive use of the mined aggregate for water management or road -building projects.** As was the case with the three judicially - invalidated mining permits referenced above, if any part of the excavated aggregate from this mine will be used for general commercial sale – any purpose other than roadbuilding, qualifying water management projects, or agricultural operation - it must be denied. The Staff Report fails to address this issue, and does not include a condition prohibiting the use of the mine for any purpose other than the three enumerated purposes allowed by Policy 2.3–e.3.

In sum, this proposed mine, as presented, does not qualify for approval under the Comprehensive Plan and implementing Land Development Code provisions.

Sincerely,



Richard Grosso

Cc: Commissioner Christopher Kammerer
Commissioner Claudia Mendoza
Commissioner Sam Caliendo

⁴ Staff Report, p. 8.

⁵ Staff Report p. 21.

Commissioner Lori Vinikoor
Commissioner William Reicherter
Commissioner Susan Kennedy
Commissioner James Williams
Lisa Amara, PBC Planning, Zoning and Building Department
Whitney Carroll, Executive Director, PBC Planning, Zoning and Building Department
Thuy Shutt, PBC Planning Director
Deborah Drum, PBC Environmental Resources Management Director
Joseph Verdone, Esq., Carlton Fields
Eve Samples, Executive Director, Friends of the Everglades
Lisa Interlandi, Esq., Everglades Law Center
Jessica Pinsky, Captains for Clean Water

Richard Grosso, Esq.
Richard Grosso, P.A.
6919 W. Broward Blvd.
Plantation, FL 33317
Mailbox 142
richardgrosso1979@gmail.com
954-801-5662
richardgrossopa.com

via email to: LAmara@pbc.gov

March 24, 2025

Lisa Amara
Zoning Director
Palm Beach County
2300 N Jog Road
West Palm Beach, FL 33411-2741

Re: Southland Mining Project and Comprehensive Plan Compliance

Dear Ms. Amara,

I write on behalf of Friends of the Everglades, to object to the proposed Southland Mining Project, and to specifically address its compliance with the policy in the Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan that only allows mining in the EAA for certain uses. Specifically, the Plan's **Future Land Use Policy 2.3–e.3** strictly limits mining in the EAA to specified uses:

“Within the Agricultural Production Future Land Use designation, **mining may be permitted *only* to support public roadway projects or agricultural activities, or water management projects** associated with ecosystem restoration, regional water supply or flood protection, on sites identified by the South Florida Water Management District or the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers **where such uses provide** viable alternative technologies for water management.” (emphasis added)

This policy has been strictly interpreted by the Fourth District Court of Appeals to preclude the approval of a mine that will used for anything other than the three specified allowable uses. The appellate court decisions are *1000 Friends of Fla., Inc. v. Palm Beach County and Bergeron Sand & Rock Mine Aggregates, Inc.*, 69 So. 3d 1123 (Fla. 4th DCA 2011); *1000 Friends of Fla., Inc. v. Palm Beach County and Rinker Materials of Fla., d/b/a Cemex*, 75 So. 3d 1270 (Fla. 4th DCA 2011), and *United States Sugar Corp. v. 1000 Friends of Fla.*, 134 So. 3d 1052 (Fla. 4th DCA 2013). Those appellate decisions are available here:

Bergeron <https://casetext.com/case/1000-friends-of-fl-v-palm-beach>

South Bay (Rinker / Cemex) <https://casetext.com/case/1000-friends-of-florida>

Lake Harbor (US Sugar) - <https://casetext.com/case/us-sugar-corp-v-1000-friends-of-fla>

Thus, it is clear that any mine that will be used for any other purpose – for instance general commercial sale of excavated material – is prohibited by the Comprehensive Plan. For example, a mine that will excavate material for general commercial sales is prohibited, even if some of those sales are to be used for road – building. The same is true for a mine that may be put to a water ecosystem restoration, regional water supply or flood protection use at some time in the future after it is used for general commercial extraction and sale, agricultural activity or roadway projects.

As a result, given that an applicant for a development permit bears the burden of proving its compliance with the Comprehensive Plan,¹ the Southland applicant must provide strict proof that the mine would be strictly limited to the three allowable purposes, and no other.

We understand that this applicant is basing its proposal on the assertion that the mine will qualify for approval under **Policy 2.3–e.3**, which allows mining in the EAA for “water management projects associated with ecosystem restoration, regional water supply or flood protection, on sites identified by the South Florida Water Management District or the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers **where such uses *provide viable alternative technologies for water management.***” (emphasis added)

We would emphasize the language in the policy - “where such uses *provide*”. This requirement is stated in the present tense. We note that the letter submitted to the County by the Everglades Law Center on March 6, 2025 explains clearly that the use of any excavation undertaken under this application for a qualifying water management project **remains speculative – a potential project at best.**

Given that the applicant bears the burden of overcoming the “strict scrutiny” standard to prove that a development permit application is consistent with a comprehensive plan,² the correspondence the County has received from the South Florida Water Management District and the other statements by the applicant in support of the application, fall short of demonstrating compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

We appreciate the County’s consideration, ask that this letter be made part of the file for this matter, and urge the County to deny the application.

Sincerely,



Richard Grosso

Cc: Whitney Carroll, Executive Director, PBC Planning, Zoning and Building Department
Thuy Shutt, PBC Planning Director
Deborah Drum, PBC Environmental Resources Management Director

¹ *US Sugar Corp. v. 1000 Friends of Florida*, 134 So. 3d 1052 (Fla. 4th DCA 2013)

² *Brevard Co v. Snyder*, 627 So.2d 469, 475-476 (Fla. 1993)

Patrick Rutter, PBC Deputy County Administrator
Drew Bartlett, SFWMD Executive Director
SFWMD Governing Board
Jessica Pinsky, Captains for Clean Water
Eve Samples, Executive Director, Friends of the Everglades
Lisa Interlandi, Everglades Law Center



March 6, 2025

Lisa Amara
Zoning Director
Palm Beach County
2300 N Jog Road
West Palm Beach, FL 33411-2741

Subject: Southland Project and Comprehensive Plan Compliance

Dear Ms. Amara,

On behalf of Friends of the Everglades, we write to provide important context regarding the Southland Project and its compliance with the mining criteria for the Everglades Agricultural Area (“EAA”) under Palm Beach County’s Comprehensive Plan. We urge the County not to advance this project until the South Florida Water Management District (“SFWMD” or “District”) has completed its evaluation pursuant to the District’s Unsolicited Proposal Process and Section 255.065 Florida Statutes, and to recognize only the execution of a Comprehensive Project Agreement, if any, as evidence that the District has identified the project as a viable water resource initiative.

In November 2024, the Everglades Coalition, an alliance of nearly 60 local, state, and national organizations dedicated to restoring America’s Everglades, wrote to SFWMD ([letter attached](#)) to express concerns that the Southland Project could set a harmful precedent for private, commercial mining operations being framed as public water resource projects, potentially undermining the integrity of Everglades restoration efforts while opening the door for similar proposals in the future. The Coalition letter also noted that while the Southland Project was initially submitted to SFWMD as an unsolicited proposal in July of 2024, it was later withdrawn by the applicant in September of 2024 before any public discussion or formal evaluation by the District. Given the lack of review, the Coalition urged SFWMD to withhold issuing a “Letter of Project Identification” for the project until a full, transparent evaluation is conducted to assess its long-term impacts on restoration, water availability, and regional water management.

On December 24, 2024, Southland resubmitted its unsolicited project proposal to SFWMD, and on December 31, 2024, SFWMD responded with a letter to project representative Matt Eidson, stating that the project would “likely” provide viable alternative technologies for water management and treatment. However, the letter also made clear that further engagement, technical review, coordination with Palm Beach County and the Florida

Department of Environmental Protection, as well as potentially significant project modifications would be necessary before SFWMD would make any final determination regarding its support of the project.

The December 31 letter further states:

“By way of this letter, the District concludes the first step in the unsolicited proposal process. While you pursue permits, the District will continue to work with you through the next steps in the project evaluation process which includes estimating an evaluation fee, formulating evaluation criteria, and fulfilling public engagement requirements.”

The SFWMD unsolicited proposal process¹ establishes a framework for evaluation, and only upon its conclusion can the District determine whether a project qualifies as a viable water resource initiative. Because SFWMD had completed only Step 1 as of December 31, the letter cannot reasonably be considered an identification of the project as meeting that standard.

Although SFWMD has stated that no final determination has been made, Southland representatives have repeatedly characterized the December 31 letter as an endorsement of the proposal as a water resource project. This is evident in multiple comments and responses in the County’s Development Review Officer (DRO) process, as shown below.

DRO Comment: From Planning 2/13/2024: *“Please submit a revised letter from the appropriate agency that claims the project for water resources. The one submitted by the SFWMD only acknowledges the current request and that further information is required. . . The only way to clearly demonstrate compliance/consistency with the*

¹ The district’s [unsolicited proposal process](#) contains seven steps:

Steps 1-2- Entails the creation and submission of a project proposal that demonstrates how the project meets the definition of a Qualifying Project under section 255.065(1)(i), Florida Statutes, along with an application fee. In **Step 3** the District determines whether the project meets the definition of a Qualifying Project under state law, whether it will move forward with evaluating the Unsolicited Proposal, and whether the District will consider any additional proposals for a similar project. This step involves the payment of additional fees, the establishment of Evaluation Criteria to evaluate the project as well as possible Governing Board review. **Step 4** provides procedures for considering and ranking additional proposals for any similar projects and requires a public meeting for the Evaluation and Selection Committee to discuss and rank all proposals based on the specified evaluation criteria. If the District determines not to accept additional proposals, then the procedures require two public meetings before the Governing Board and / or the Evaluation and Selection Committee. As a result of the second meeting, the Committee will make a written recommendation containing the evaluation results and a Public Interest Determination Report which must be published in the Florida Administrative Register for at least 7 days. **Steps 5 -7** involve negotiating and entering into a project agreement relative to an unsolicited proposal. If additional proposals were accepted, the District may negotiate with these entities in ranked order until negotiations successfully result in an executed project agreement.

FLUE policy, is to provide the documentation that clearly states the intent of the project from the agency claiming the project for those purposes.”

Southland Response: *“See SFWMD letter from Drew Bartlett, Executive Director of the SFWMD dated 12/31/24, which confirms that the SFWMD has reviewed the proposed water resource project in accordance with the PBC Comprehensive Plan Requirements and has identified the proposed site as a water resource project having the ability to provide viable technologies for both water management and water treatment for ecosystem restoration complementary to the EAA Reservoir complex and surrounding infrastructure.”*

The December 31 letter, however, does not ‘claim the project for water resources’, nor does it indicate that SFWMD has completed its evaluation. Instead, it explicitly states that further steps are required before any such determination can be made.

More recently, in Southland’s February 13, 2025, DRO resubmittal (Minor DRO Resub 5), Planning staff again requested documentation from the appropriate agency explicitly identifying the project as a water resource initiative:

Comment 1, from Planning: Per 10-28-24 resub: *“Please submit a revised letter from the appropriate agency that claims the project for water resources. The one submitted by the SFWMD only acknowledges the current request and that further information is required...The only way to clearly demonstrate compliance / consistency with the FLUE policy, is to provide the documentation that clearly states the intent of the project from the agency claiming the project for those purposes.”*

Southland Response: *“Please see letter from Drew Bartlett to Matt Eidson dated December 31, 2024.”*

However, as noted previously, the December 31 letter does not identify the Southland project as an approved water resource project. It simply acknowledges receipt of the proposal and outlines the next steps in the evaluation process.

In another instance, Planning staff directly asked whether the project had been formally presented to the SFWMD Governing Board or included in long-range planning efforts.

DRO Comment from Planning 11/04/2024: *“Has the project been presented to the SFWMD Governing Board? Has it been added to their long range plans?”*

Southland Response: *“The project was presented to the SFWMD Governing Board in October 2023. Additionally, the subject site is identified by the SFWMD as having the ability to provide viable technologies for both water management and water treatment for ecosystem restoration consistent with the SFWMD long range plans, SB 10 and other SFWMD Everglades Restoration plans.”*

While the applicant states that the project was 'presented to the SFWMD Governing Board in October 2023,' a review of the [video](#) from this meeting (at the 44-minute mark) demonstrates that the referenced 'presentation' consisted of a single representative of the applicant speaking for approximately 1 minute and 20 seconds during general public comment about his company's internal initial evaluation of the proposed project.

This item was not publicly noticed on the agenda, there was no presentation or staff report related to the project, and there was no discussion or analysis by District staff or the Governing Board.

Furthermore, because the project has never been formally presented to the SFWMD Governing Board, approved by the District, or even evaluated by SFWMD staff, the project has not been added to any SFWMD long-range plans for Everglades restoration or otherwise—contrary to the representations of the applicant.

Due to concerns about how Southland has characterized the December 31 letter, the Coalition sent a follow-up letter to SFWMD on February 7, 2025, requesting official clarification of the District's position regarding the project. [See attached letter.](#)

At the [February 14, 2025 SFWMD governing board meeting](#), (at the 31 minute mark), Executive Director Drew Bartlett clarified the District's position on the Southland project, [\(transcript attached\)](#) and reiterated that SFWMD has not yet made a determination on the project's ultimate viability.

“After staff review and vetting, if staff concludes it is a viable storage and treatment project that will provide regional benefits and it will not impact the construction or operation of the EAA Reservoir project, the staff will bring the project to the Board for [its] consideration before entering into what's called a Comprehensive Agreement as outlined in Florida statutes.

We project that the staff review of this proposal will happen over the next year. If staff concludes that it is viable and does not conflict with the EAA Reservoir Project, only then will the District staff bring it to the Board for your consideration.”

On February 21, 2025, SFWMD formally responded to the Coalition's second letter [\(attached\)](#), reinforcing Director Bartlett's February 14, 2025 remarks and reaffirming that the District's evaluation remains ongoing and that no final determination has been made.

“We will now turn our attention to thoroughly evaluating the project proposal. If staff concludes that it is a viable storage and treatment project that will provide regional benefits, and that it will not impact the construction or operation of the EAA Reservoir Project, District staff will bring the project to the Governing Board for consideration before entering into a Comprehensive Agreement pursuant to Florida Statute.

The District will follow our Unsolicited Proposals Process, developed pursuant to the Public-Private Partnerships Statute of Florida, to consider the Southland Water Resource Project.”

In reviewing this project, SFWMD is bound by Section 255.065, Florida Statutes, which establishes extensive review and analysis obligations before an unsolicited proposal project can be approved. This includes evaluating financial feasibility, regulatory compliance, environmental impact, and long-term operational responsibilities to ensure the project serves a legitimate public purpose. Agencies are not required to approve any unsolicited proposal and may reject one at any point before executing a Comprehensive Project Agreement.

For these reasons, an executed Comprehensive Project Agreement is the only meaningful benchmark for determining whether SFWMD has identified the project as a viable water resource initiative. Until that agreement is in place, key aspects of the project—such as scope, feasibility, regulatory compliance, financial terms, and mitigation of harm—remain unresolved, and any assumption of approval would be premature.

Given the potential for project changes during SFWMD’s review, the County should also refrain from considering any form of contingent or conditional approval before the execution of the Comprehensive Project Agreement. Any early approval, even if conditional, risks becoming outdated or misaligned with the final project. Premature consideration undermines the integrity of the regulatory process, exposes the County to unnecessary controversy as well as significant legal and procedural risks, and creates the possibility of approving a project that SFWMD ultimately rejects. If negotiations between Southland and SFWMD fail before an agreement is executed, the County could find itself having approved a mining operation that the District declined to accept.

There is no benefit to the County in approving the project before an executed Comprehensive Project Agreement, nor does waiting impose harm on the applicant. Section 255.065(7)(a), Florida Statutes, explicitly requires that no development may begin until an agreement is in place, meaning that County approval prior to that point serves no practical purpose. Any premature approval would be unnecessary at best and problematic at worst, particularly if the project changes or fails to secure final approval from SFWMD.

We appreciate the thoughtful review that County staff is conducting regarding this project. While Palm Beach County retains the sole authority to determine whether the Southland Project meets the Comprehensive Plan’s strict criteria for mining within the EAA, SFWMD is responsible for evaluating unsolicited proposals for alignment with restoration and water management objectives. It is essential that SFWMD be allowed to complete its evaluation before any conclusions are drawn about the project’s viability as a water resource initiative.

Past decisions on mining in the EAA have faced intense scrutiny with outcomes that reinforce the need for a careful and thorough review. Given this history, it is all the more critical that the County ensure its decision is based on a final determination by SFWMD that the project will, in fact, serve a valuable water resource purpose and not harm adjacent restoration features. Accordingly, **we urge the County to recognize only an executed Comprehensive Project Agreement between Southland and SFWMD as sufficient evidence that the District has identified the project as a viable water resource initiative and to not grant any conditional or contingent approvals prior to that point.**

Thank you for your time and careful consideration of this matter. Please include this letter and attachments within the project file.

Sincerely,



Lisa Interlandi
Everglades Law Center
561-310-2772
lisa@evergladeslaw.org

Cc: Whitney Carroll, Executive Director, PBC Planning, Zoning and Building Department
Thuy Shutt, PBC Planning Director
Deborah Drum, PBC Environmental Resources Management Director
Patrick Rutter, PBC Deputy County Administrator
Drew Bartlett, SFWMD Executive Director
SFWMD Governing Board
Eve Samples, Executive Director, Friends of the Everglades
Richard Grosso, Esq.



EVERGLADES COALITION

November 15, 2024

Drew Bartlett
Executive Director
South Florida Water Management District
3301 Gun Club Rd,
West Palm Beach, FL 33406

Sent via email to drew.bartlett@sfwmd.gov

RE: Public-Private Partnerships and the Everglades Agricultural Area

Dear Director Bartlett,

We write on behalf of The Everglades Coalition, nearly 60 organizations dedicated to protecting and restoring America's Everglades with a 12.2-million-constituent network of followers, regarding the unsolicited proposal submitted for the "Southland Water Resource Project," a plan to mine approximately 8,631 acres north of the Everglades Agricultural Area (EAA) Reservoir and Stormwater Treatment Area (STA). While the proposal was withdrawn from the South Florida Water Management District procurement process, the applicant expressed intent to continue pursuing it, requesting the District issue a "Letter of Project Identification." This request appears to reference Policy 2.3-e of the Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan which strictly limits mining within the EAA:

*"Within the Agricultural Production Future Land Use designation, mining may be permitted **only** to support public roadway projects or agricultural activities, or water management projects associated with ecosystem restoration, regional water supply or flood protection, on sites identified by the South Florida Water Management District or the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers where such uses provide viable alternative technologies for water management." (emphasis added)*

We urge the District to NOT supply the applicant with the requested letter. First, the District has no means to properly evaluate the project. Because the Southland unsolicited proposal project was withdrawn, it has not been reviewed by District staff. A project of the type proposed has not previously been identified by the District as part of a water management project associated with ecosystem restoration, regional water supply or flood protection, and there is nothing to suggest that the applicant's request is supported by anything other than the applicant's desire to secure approval from the County of a commercial mine under the guise of a public water management project.

The Everglades Coalition is a 501(c)3 alliance of local, state, and national conservation organizations dedicated to the full protection and restoration of America's Everglades.

evergladescoalition.org

As the District identified in its October 3, 2023, correspondence to the applicant, there are many questions associated with the project that must be answered. These questions pertain to: “potential mining operations impacts, seepage impacts and appropriate buffer zones to the EAA Reservoir Project’s STA and Reservoir, determination if geology supports an in-ground reservoir, regional water availability, drought operations, and canal conveyance capacity in the Miami Canal”, as well as an understanding of the plan for long term ownership, and operations and maintenance costs.

We agree with the need to answer these questions and additionally suggest the need to evaluate and clearly understand and quantify the project’s expected benefits and/or impacts to the environment, hydrology and water quality of the region. We also urge the District, when evaluating mining projects in the EAA, to ensure the financial structure of and the economic efficiencies achieved by any such proposal are guaranteed by security bonds or other equivalent mechanisms, and that assurances are in place to hold the District’s taxpayers harmless from long-term maintenance or remediation costs for the project. The District should further evaluate the qualifications and experience of the private entity that submits the proposal and the entity’s ability to perform the project and provide assurance that the project will be completed, maintained and effective in achieving its stated objectives. None of these questions can be answered without a detailed analysis conducted by District staff which must be done before the District can determine whether the project would be viable and meet the Everglades restoration needs of the taxpaying public. To be clear, there is no indication that the District or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has identified anything similar to the project proposed in this location as a functional part of any water quality or hydrological restoration plan for the Everglades.

The mining application submitted to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection presents the project as both a mining operation and a water supply reservoir. It claims that water stored during the wet season would be used to support Everglades restoration. However, when those benefits would occur is not clear, as the mining operation would not be completed until approximately **45 years from now**. The application to Palm Beach County is seeking approval for an excavation construction schedule with an anticipated completion date of 2069.

We are greatly concerned about the impact and precedent of allowing private mining activities to dictate the future of Everglades restoration in the EAA. Because Palm Beach County’s Comprehensive Plan contains clear language limiting mining in the EAA — language that has been judicially tested and strictly interpreted by the courts — it would be tempting for mining companies to seek to frame their commercial mining operations as “water resource projects” in an attempt to circumvent the Plan’s limitations. If the District issues documents like the requested “Letter of Project Identification,” without analyzing a potential project’s true impacts and benefits, the EAA’s future role in Everglades restoration could be reduced to scattered excavations chosen by mining interests, with water storage becoming a possible secondary function — only available once mining operations are completed, decades from now in the far distant future. We urge the District to carefully consider the long-term implications of such proposals and to prioritize comprehensive, science-driven restoration planning.

Next, while this specific proposal is not currently active, we anticipate similar proposals may surface in the future. **We urge the District to initiate and complete, along with its federal and other partners, a restoration plan for the EAA that determines the locations, nature, size and scope of water management features necessary to complete the successful restoration of the Everglades.** Only upon completion of

The Everglades Coalition is a 501(c)3 alliance of local, state, and national conservation organizations dedicated to the full protection and restoration of America's Everglades.

evergladescoalition.org

such a plan can it be determined where and whether any mining operations can facilitate, and not dictate and limit, restoration planning. We urge the District to decline to provide piecemeal letters of support for any mining operation in the EAA until such a process and plan is complete.

We cannot allow the future of Everglades restoration planning in the EAA to be determined by commercial mining operations labeling the large holes they leave in the ground as water storage or management projects. Successful restoration of the Everglades cannot be at the mercy of the vagaries of the market for aggregate in the EAA and the self-interest of mining companies; nor is it in the public's best interests to work around mining activity that limits or substantially delays maximum Everglades restoration options.

We thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Mark Perry
Co-Chair



Kelly Cox
Co-Chair



EVERGLADES COALITION

February 7, 2025

Mr. Drew Bartlett
Executive Director
South Florida Water Management District
3301 Gun Club Road
West Palm Beach, FL 33406

Sent Via Email to dbartlett@sfwmd.gov
CC: SFWMD Governing Board

RE: Southland Water Resource Project

Dear Director Bartlett,

We write on behalf of The Everglades Coalition, nearly 60 organizations dedicated to protecting and restoring America's Everglades with a 12.2-million-constituent network of followers, requesting that the South Florida Water Management District clarify the statements made in its December 31, 2024, letter regarding the Southland Water Resource Project, which suggested that the project "will likely provide viable alternative technologies for both water management and water treatment for ecosystem restoration." As the District has not yet completed a full technical evaluation, these statements could be misinterpreted as an endorsement of the project. Additionally, we request that this matter be brought before the Governing Board for public discussion to ensure transparency and allow for stakeholder input before any further review of the project.

As you are aware, Palm Beach County's Comprehensive Plan (Policy 2.3-e) prohibits commercial mining within the Everglades Agricultural Area unless it is exclusively for one of three identified purposes¹.

*"Within the Agricultural Production Future Land Use designation, mining may be permitted only to support **public roadway projects** or **agricultural activities**, or **water management projects associated with ecosystem restoration, regional water supply or flood protection, on sites***

¹ See:

[1000 Friends of Florida and Sierra Club, v. Palm Beach County and Bergeron;](#)

[1000 Friends of Florida, Sierra Club, and Florida Wildlife Federation, v. Palm Beach County and Rinker Materials of Florida, Inc., d/b/a Cemex;](#)

[United States Sugar Corporation and SBG Farms, Inc. v. 1000 Friends of Florida, Sierra Club, Florida Wildlife Federation, and Palm Beach County, Appellees](#)

The Everglades Coalition is a 501(c)3 alliance of local, state, and national conservation organizations dedicated to the full protection and restoration of America's Everglades.

evergladescoalition.org

identified by the South Florida Water Management District or the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers where such uses provide viable alternative technologies for water management.” (emphasis added)

Since at least as early as last summer, Southland has been seeking a “Letter of Project Identification” from SFWMD to classify its mining proposal as a water management project, a necessary requirement for consideration under Palm Beach County’s Comprehensive Plan.

The Everglades Coalition wrote to the District in November 2024 requesting that no such letter be issued because Southland’s unsolicited proposal, initially submitted in July and later withdrawn in September, had not been publicly vetted, evaluated by staff, or previously identified by SFWMD as part of an authorized water management project. The Everglades Coalition did not receive a response to its letter.

Southland resubmitted its unsolicited proposal to SFWMD on December 24, 2024, and on December 31, 2024, the District responded, identifying the project as a “Qualifying Project” under Section 255.065(1)(i), Fla. Stat. (Step 1 of the SFWMD Unsolicited Proposal Process). The District’s letter went beyond the SFWMD Unsolicited Proposal Process, however. Relative to the mining restrictions in Palm Beach County’s Comprehensive Plan, it states:

Based on an initial review of the project and subsequent discussions, **the District believes that, at this time, on the identified site, connected to a District canal with the right configuration, the project will likely provide viable alternative technologies for both water management and water treatment for ecosystem restoration** complimentary to the EAA Reservoir complex and surrounding infrastructure. With a completed connection to STA 5/6, the project would provide more capacity to maintain those constructed wetlands during the dry season and complement several other concurrent water management projects currently underway. (emphasis added)

It is unclear if the District intended this correspondence to constitute the District’s official determination that the Southland project will serve as a viable water management project associated with ecosystem restoration, regional water supply, or flood protection such that it would qualify for further consideration under Palm Beach County’s Comprehensive Plan. However, the letter makes clear that significant additional technical questions about the project remain to be addressed.

The District previously identified significant unanswered questions about the project, including potential mining impacts, seepage risks, geological suitability, water availability, drought operations, canal capacity, and long-term ownership and maintenance costs. Beyond these, we are deeply concerned by the precedent of allowing mining companies to dictate the future of Everglades restoration, particularly combined with the lack of long-term restoration planning for the EAA that could identify the general location, nature, size, and scope of water management features necessary to complete the successful restoration of the Everglades.

The SFWMD unsolicited proposal process establishes a clear process for evaluation and it is at the conclusion of that process, not prior to, that the SFWMD could determine whether a project constitutes a viable water resource initiative. As SFWMD had not yet completed or even initiated this analysis, the December 31 letter contains conclusions which are premature and risk being misinterpreted as an

The Everglades Coalition is a 501(c)3 alliance of local, state, and national conservation organizations dedicated to the full protection and restoration of America's Everglades.

evergladescoalition.org

endorsement. We are aware that Southland has already submitted the December 31 letter to the Palm Beach County Zoning Department in support of its application, where it could be misconstrued as the official approval from SFWMD.

We are disappointed by the timing and lack of transparency of the unsolicited proposal's resubmittal on Christmas Eve, when SFWMD offices were closed, and SFWMD's response on New Year's Eve, as well as the failure to bring this item to the Governing Board to allow public consideration, engagement and discussion on an issue of significant public concern. The uncertainty of how the District's correspondence will be interpreted by both Southland and Palm Beach County compounds these concerns.

The Everglades Coalition requests the District immediately clarify the statements made in the December 31 letter to confirm that the ultimate determination relative to the project's viability will be made only after the District completes its full technical evaluation. Before further SFWMD review of the project, the Coalition requests that this matter be brought before the Governing Board for public discussion and to ensure that decisions regarding the project are based on a transparent evaluation with input from all stakeholders.

We thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Mark Perry
Co-Chair



Kelly Cox
Co-Chair

Transcript of SFWMD Executive Director Bartlett Comments re: Southland at SFWMD Governing Board meeting - 2/14/2025

Director Bartlett: “The first thing I'd like to do today is address the Southland Reservoir proposal, as you know last year Phillips and Jordan approached the District with a proposal to build storage on private land in the Everglades Agricultural Area.

Now, for context, in a water management system, storage is the critical component to conduct flood control without harming downstream resources, downstream water bodies. And once it's in the storage, of course, you have it during the dry season for water supply for people and the environment. So naturally when more storage opportunities present themselves the District will entertain the idea by doing our due diligence to see if those opportunities are meaningful and feasible. In this case, the District is interested in more storage and more treatment in this area to help manage Lake levels, help control harmful estuary discharge, and send more water South. However we cannot just jump into a proposal.

There is a process under state law to evaluate these proposals. It's called the Public Private Partnerships statute which provides guidance for evaluating unsolicited proposals and that's the process the District is using. The District's Unsolicited Proposals Process can be found on our website under Procurement and all the Unsolicited Proposals that the District has received can also be found on that website. I provided you a summary, a high level summary, of what that process is. I've got copies of, extra copies, if anyone in the audience would like one, but there's a more detailed explanation of that process on the website.

On that web page is the Southland Reservoir proposal and a letter written by District staff sent to Phillips and Jordan conveying where we were in our review and evaluation and the steps necessary to continue our evaluation. The letter does include language regarding the likelihood of the project that the company can use to engage Palm Beach County requirements. Palm Beach County is looking at it from a land use lens, but the Water Management District is looking at it purely from a water management lens.

Now while we have not conducted our full review, we do know that through our own experience that with the right engineering and configuration, storage and treatment can be accomplished in the area that will improve our operations for the benefit of the environment and people. Ultimately, after staff review and vetting, if staff concludes it is a viable storage and treatment project that will provide regional benefits and it will not impact the construction or operation of the EAA Reservoir project, the staff will bring the project to the Board for your consideration before entering into what's called a Comprehensive Agreement as outlined in Florida statutes.

We project that the staff review of this proposal will happen over the next year. If staff concludes that it is viable and does not conflict with the EAA Reservoir Project, only then will the District staff bring it to the Board for your consideration. At this time there's really nothing for you to review or approve. Matt Eidson from Philips and Jordan is in attendance if you have any questions regarding their proposal after I conclude my Executive Director's report. I'll be here to answer any process questions with Maricruz's support, and it just goes without saying, as always, we appreciate any engagement, any stakeholder engagement we get on any of our projects, including this project, from the public, the Board, anybody. It only makes projects better and I suspect you might get some engagement on this project. All right, that's all I have for the Southland Reservoir Proposal.”



SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

February 21, 2025

Via Email: Kelly.Cox@audubon.org and MPerry@floridaocean.org

Mr. Mark Perry
Ms. Kelly Cox
Everglades Coalition
P.O. Box 1709
Stuart, FL 34995

Subject: Southland Water Resource Project

Dear Mr. Perry, Ms. Cox, and Everglades Coalition Members:

The South Florida Water Management District (District), along with its many partners and stakeholders, has made great progress in recent years on the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP).

As you know, on January 10, 2023, Governor Ron DeSantis signed Executive Order 23-06, (*Achieving Even More Now for Florida's Environment*). With his order, the Governor called upon the District to make every effort to advance Everglades restoration projects to ensure meaningful progress over the next four years, including all CERP storage components within the Lake Okeechobee watershed. Executive Order 23-06 was issued exactly four years to the day after he signed Executive Order 19-12 (*Achieving More Now for Florida's Environment*), which resulted in record environmental funding, expedited Everglades projects, and water quality improvements.

To date, we have celebrated 75 ribbon cuttings, ground breakings, and major milestones on Everglades projects since 2019, and many of you have played a significant part in these celebrations.

The District is in receipt of the letter you sent on February 7, 2025, regarding the Southland Water Resource Project. At the February 13, 2025, Governing Board Meeting, I discussed the Southland Water Resource Project, including the letter we sent to Phillips and Jordan, Inc., as part of my remarks during the Executive Director's Report.

We will now turn our attention to thoroughly evaluating the project proposal. If staff concludes that it is a viable storage and treatment project that will provide regional benefits, and that it will not impact the construction or operation of the EAA Reservoir Project, District staff will bring the project to the Governing Board for consideration before entering into a Comprehensive Agreement pursuant to Florida Statute. The District will follow our Unsolicited Proposals Process, developed pursuant to the Public-Private Partnerships Statute of Florida, to consider

Mr. Perry, Ms. Cox, and
Everglades Coalition Members
February 21, 2025
Page 2

the Southland Water Resource Project. This process, and all unsolicited proposals submitted to the District, can be found at [SFWMD.gov/Procurement](https://www.sfwmd.gov/Procurement).

We truly appreciate the Everglades Coalition's long-standing support for expediting storage and treatment opportunities through CERP and Restoration Strategies to help the Everglades, Lake Okeechobee, and our estuaries. The District remains keenly focused on significantly advancing the largest ecosystem restoration effort in the world with truly meaningful projects that benefit the people and the environment of South Florida.

Sincerely,



Drew Bartlett
Executive Director

c: SFWMD Governing Board Members

PALM BEACH COUNTY
PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT
ZONING DIVISION



ZONING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING

Thursday, April 3, 2025

9:00 a.m., 1st Floor Vista Center,

2300 N Jog Rd, West Palm Beach, 33411

CALL TO ORDER

- A. Roll Call
- B. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance
- C. Remarks of the Chair
- D. Notice
- E. Proof of Publication
- F. Swearing In
- G. Approval of the Minutes
- H. Amendments to the Agenda
 - Presentation of Add/Delete
 - Request to Pull Items from Consent
 - Motion to adopt the Agenda
- I. Conflicts/Recusals

POSTPONEMENT/WITHDRAWALS AGENDA

CONSENT AGENDA

REGULAR AGENDA

COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

Web address: www.pbcgov.com/pzb/

Disclaimer: Agenda subject to changes at or prior to the public hearing.

AGENDA
PALM BEACH COUNTY
ZONING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING
April 3, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

- A. Roll Call – 9:00 AM.
- B. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance
- C. Remarks of the Chair

The Zoning Commission of Palm Beach County has convened at 9:00 A.M. in the Vista Center, Ken Rogers Hearing Room, VC-1W-47, 2300 N. Jog Road, West Palm Beach, FL, to consider proposed applications and staff recommendations pursuant to the Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code. The Commission takes final action regarding Class B Conditional Uses, Subdivision Variances, and Type II Variances and issues advisory recommendations on other requests. The Board of County Commissioners of Palm Beach County will conduct a public hearing at 301 N. Olive Avenue, West Palm Beach, FL, in the Jane M. Thompson Memorial Chambers, 6th Floor, on applications not subject to Zoning Commission final action.

- D. Notice

Zoning hearings are quasi-judicial in nature and must be conducted to afford all parties due process. The Board of County Commissioners has adopted Procedures for conduct of Quasi-Judicial Hearings to govern the conduct of such proceedings. The Procedures include the following:

- Any communication with commissioners, which occurs outside the public hearing, must be fully disclosed at the hearing.
- Applicants and persons attending the hearing may question commissioners regarding their disclosures. Such questions shall be limited solely to the disclosures made at the hearing or the written communications made a part of the record at the hearing.
- Any person representing a group or organization must provide documentation that the person representing the group has the actual authority to do so regarding the matter before the Commission.
- Any person who wishes to speak at the hearing will be sworn in and may be subject to cross-examination.
- The Applicant and County staff may cross-examine witnesses. Any other persons attending the hearing may submit cross-examination questions, including follow up questions, to the Chair, who will conduct the examination. The scope of cross-examination is limited to the facts alleged by the witness in relation to the application.
- Public comment is encouraged and all relevant information should be presented to the commission in order that a fair and appropriate decision can be made.

- E. Proof of Publication - **Motion** to receive and file
- F. Swearing In - County Attorney
- G. Approval of the Minutes - **Motion** to approve the March minutes
- H. Amendments to the Agenda
 - Presentation of Add/Delete
 - Request to Pull Items from Consent
 - **Motion** to adopt the Agenda
- I. Conflicts/Recusals

POSTPONEMENTS/WITHDRAWALS AGENDA

A. Postponements

1. [Z-2024-01751 Tax Collector Service Center \(2022-00101\)](#)

Zoning Application of Palm Beach County Tax Collector - Anne Gannon by JMorton Planning & Landscape Architecture

Location: Northeast corner of Lyons Road and 156th Court South

Project Manager: Santiago Zamora, Planner II

BCC District: 5

MOTION: No motion necessary. Item was administratively postponed to May 1, 2025

B. Withdrawals

- END OF POSTPONEMENTS/WITHDRAWALS AGENDA -

CONSENT AGENDA

A. DISCLOSURES for Consent Items

B. Requests to pull items from Consent

C. Zoning Applications

2. [DOA-2024-01246 The Cagigas Organization \(2005-00346\)](#)

Zoning Application of Cagigas Organization, Inc by Civil Design Engineering LLC

Location: West side of Military Trail, approx. 1,000 feet north of Lantana Road

Project Manager: Jerome Small, Senior Site Planner

BCC District: 3

DISCLOSURES

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the requests subject to the Conditions of Approval as indicated in Exhibits C.

- a. **Title:** a Development Order Amendment **Request:** to modify the overall Site Plan, relocate access point, and reconfigure the parking on 5.62 acres

MOTION: To recommend approval of item 2.a.

3. [Z/CA-2024-01593 Nash Trail \(1978-00229\)](#)

Zoning Application of Melodye S. Abell Revocable Trust, Norman Speier, Laura Fountain by Land Development Operations Lennar Homes LLC and WGINC

Location: West side of 52nd Drive South, approx. 380 feet north of Nash Trail

Project Manager: Imene Haddad, Senior Site Planner

BCC District: 3

DISCLOSURES

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the requests subject to the Conditions of Approval as indicated in Exhibits C-1 and C-2.

- a. **Title:** an Official Zoning Map Amendment **Request:** to allow a rezoning from Residential Estate (RE) to Single Family Residential (RS) on 7.57 acres

MOTION: To recommend approval of item 3.a.

- b. **Title:** a Class A Conditional Use **Request:** to allow Townhomes on 7.57 acres

MOTION: To recommend approval of item 3.b.

- END OF CONSENT AGENDA -

REGULAR AGENDA

A. Items Pulled From Consent

B. Zoning Applications

4. [CA-2023-01791 Southland Water Resource \(2023-00122\)](#)

Zoning Application of Philips and Jordan - Matt Edison by Carlton Fields P.A.

Location: South side of access easement approx. 1 mile south of Okeelanta Rd, approx. 1.3 miles east of Miami Canal Rd and 4.2 miles west of US-27

Project Manager: Imene Haddad, Senior Site Planner

BCC District: 6

DISCLOSURES

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the requests subject to the Conditions of Approval as indicated in Exhibits C.

a. **Title:** a Class A Conditional Use **Request:** to allow a Type 3B Excavation on 8,611.52 acres

MOTION: To recommend approval of item 4.a.

- END OF REGULAR AGENDA -

COMMENTS

A. COUNTY ATTORNEY

B. PLANNING DIRECTOR

C. ZONING DIRECTOR

D. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

E. COMMISSIONERS

ADJOURNMENT