



DRO OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (DROOC) MEETING – AGENDA
FRIDAY, MAY 2, 2008, 2:00 – 4:00 P.M.
PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING
VISTA CENTER 2300 NORTH JOG ROAD
2ND FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM (VC-2E-12)

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

- A. REVIEW 03/20/2008 MINUTES – (ATTACHMENT A)**
- B. UPDATE ON DRO COMMENT RESPONSE SCREEN**
- C. TRAFFIC PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (TPS) REVIEW FEES – NICK UHREN (ATTACHMENT B)**
 - 1) How TPS Review Fees fit into the Zoning Review Process
- D. INFILL/REDEVELOPMENT UPDATE**
 - 1) Update on Projects
 - 2) Input on Ideas on process
- E. REVIEW AND COMMENTS ON RECENT PAST AND PROPOSED CHANGES TO APPLICATION PROCESSES**
 - 1) Submittal Format – “drop and run”
 - 2) Insufficiency Notifications
 - 3) Type II Variances on DRO for agency review ONLY (no change in processing times)
 - a) Opportunity to proceed on “make or break” Type II Variances at risk
 - 4) Agency Review/Zoning Review Site Plan Amendment Processes
 - 5) Stand alone/Concurrency Applications
- F. LANDSCAPE SECTION**
 - 1) DRO Review – receive comments directly from, and respond directly to, Landscape Section
 - 2) Landscape Code vs. Conditions of Approval
 - 3) ULDC Landscape Code Amendments – status of subcommittee for pervious area and landscape (DROOC vs. LDRAB?)
 - 4) Regulating Plan and Buffer Details – required only at time of Final plan approval
- G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**
 - 1) Type II Variances on DRO Agenda for Agency comments
 - 2) New PPM on Public Notices for ZC/BCC Postponed-Application Postponement-Handout
 - 3) Staffing month May-October 2008 for CD
- H. TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2008 (BROWN BAG?)**
- I. ADJOURNMENT**

ATTACHMENT A

PENDING DROOC MEMBER APPROVAL DROOC MEETING MINUTES – 3-20-08

Prepared by Jon MacGillis, ASLA Zoning Director

The Meeting began @ 1:00 p.m.

Members In Attendance: [\(See attached Sign In Sheet\)](#) DROOC Members, ITS, ISS, Zoning staff

Staff: ITS, ISS, Zoning staff

Items discussed on Agenda:

Mr. MacGillis opened meeting by stating this meeting was to focus on the DRO Comment Screen in ePZB. Zoning staff have been working with ITS/ISS staff to improve the existing screens that applicants have access to in order to responses to comments online. The screens we will see at this meeting are still in proto-type stage to ensure we work out all business practices before implementing screen changes. Jon further stated that the issue of opening and closing comments is something staff is still working on to ensure we make it work for both county staff and applicants.

Jon introduced Lois Erickson, Fernando Cevallos, and Carol Ann Ready, who have been programming the changes. Jon turned the floor over to Lois to provide a demo on the proposed screen changes. Lois provided a handout and went over what both staff see on their screens and what applicants would see.

DROOC members asked questions related to the new screens such as: what they would see in their office on the Web screens, what and when could they update comments, log on access by their staff, printing capabilities, and timing for implementation. Various staff provided responses to these questions.

Overall, members were pleased with the proposed changes and agreed it would enhance the existing system for everyone using it. Staff indicated it would be early summer, perhaps earlier before these changes would be release for applicants to use.

Jon asked Collene Walter, Chair, if the next DROOC meeting in May would be a DROOC meeting or a Brown Bag. Collene stated she didn't feel we needed a Brown Bag at this time since not many new changes have been made to the process to warrant one. She said she has items for a DROOC Agenda in May and would forward them to Jon for review. Jon also indicated that at the beginning of each DRO meeting the chairperson would update applicants and staff of changes to process, ULDC, etc to keep everyone informed of improvements to the process. Members agreed this would be a good idea.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.



**Department of Engineering
and Public Works**

P.O. Box 21229

West Palm Beach, FL 33416-1229

(561) 684-4000

www.pbcgov.com



**Palm Beach County
Board of County
Commissioners**

Addie L. Greene, Chairperson

Jeff Koons, Vice Chair

Karen T. Marcus

Robert J. Kanjian

Mary McCarty

Burt Aaronson

Jess R. Santamaria

County Administrator

Robert Weisman

April 22, 2008

Traffic Engineers
Developers Agents
City Officials

RE: TRAFFIC PERFORMANCE STANDARDS REVIEW FEES

Dear Interested Party:

On April 15, 2008, the Board of County Commissioners established fees for the review of traffic impact studies. The fees will take effect for all new traffic studies that are submitted on or after May 1, 2008. The established fees are as follows:

A fee of \$0.80 per net daily trip with a minimum fee of \$150 to defray the cost for processing the review of a Traffic Impact Study for compliance with Article 12 of the Unified Land Development Code (ULDC).

A fee of \$0.40 per net daily trip with a minimum fee of \$75 to defray the cost for processing the review of a Land Use Traffic Study for compliance with Policy 3.5(d) of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Some interesting questions have already been raised regarding the calculation and submittal of fees. I have tried to address these questions and provide examples in the attached document.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dan Weisberg".

Dan Weisberg, P.E.
Director, Traffic Division

Enclosures

File: TPS Review

F:\TRAFFIC\DIW\Correspondence\2008\LTR (Engineers) TPS review Fee.doc

*"An Equal Opportunity
Affirmative Action Employer"*

TRAFFIC PERFORMANCE STANDARDS REVIEW FEES

FEE CALCULATION

1. A fee of \$0.80 per net daily trip with a minimum fee of \$150 to defray the cost for processing the review of a Traffic Impact Study for compliance with Article 12 of the Unified Land Development Code (ULDC).

Net daily trips shall be calculated as follows:

	gross trips
minus	internal trips
minus	pass-by trips
minus	existing use credit
minus	previous approval traffic (as defined in TPS)
minus	redevelopment credit

In other words, net daily trips are the trips assigned to the roadway network for the purpose of establishing significance. A few examples follow:

Example 1:

A 200-unit residential subdivision of vacant land will generate 2,000 gross daily trips. The review fee is $2,000 \times 0.8 = \$1,600$.

Example 2:

A new shopping center in an urban service area will be developed on a site that has an existing drive-thru bank (to be demolished).

gross trips	8,000
internal trips	0
pass-by trips	3,373
existing use credit	0
previous approval traffic	0
redevelopment credit	551 (110% of bank site)

Net trips = $8,000 - 3,373 - 551 = 4,076$. The review fee is $4,076 \times 0.8 = \$3,261$.

Example 3:

A long established industrial property will be adding 10,000 square feet of industrial. Net daily trips = 66 (70 gross – 4 pass-by). The calculated review fee is \$53, but the minimum review fee of \$150 applies.

2. A fee of \$0.40 per net daily trip with a minimum fee of \$75 to defray the cost for processing the review of a Land Use Traffic Study for compliance with Policy 3.5(d) of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Net daily trips shall be calculated as follows:

Net daily trips for the existing land use based on the maximum density/intensity
Minus Net daily trips for the proposed land use based on the maximum density/intensity

Example:

A parcel of land has a land use that will allow density of 100 single family residential dwelling units (1,000 net daily trips). The proposed land use will allow a maximum commercial intensity that would generate 6,000 net daily trips.

Increase in net daily trips = 6,000 – 1,000 = 5,000
Review fee = 5,000 x 0.4 = \$2,000

Note: Land Use Amendments in municipalities are not subject to Policy 3.5(d) of the Land Use Element of the Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan. However, if a municipality requests review of the traffic impacts by County staff the applicable review fee will be assessed.

PROCEDURE

All fees are payable to “Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners.” Fees are due upon initial submittal of a traffic study for review. There is no additional fee for subsequent reviews in response to review comments so long as the application remains active.

Unincorporated – Public Hearing/DRO/Concurrency

At this time, the Traffic Division has not established an accounting procedure with Planning, Zoning and Building Department (PZ&B) for the collection of the review fee at intake. Until that is set, please submit a check for the required traffic study review fee directly to the Traffic Division. Please note your application number and control number on the memo line of the check. Do not include the traffic study review fee in the same payment of other required PZ&B review fees.

Unincorporated – Status Report/Administrative Time Extension

Please submit a check for the required traffic study review fee along with the initial application to the Monitoring Section of PZ&B. The check will be forwarded to the Traffic Division by PZ&B along with the traffic study. Do not include the traffic study review fee in the same payment of other required PZ&B review fees.

Incorporated – Submittal to Municipality

For the municipalities that require submittal of the traffic study to the municipality who then forwards the study to Palm Beach County for review, include the required traffic study review fee along with the traffic study. The check will be forwarded to the Palm Beach County Traffic Division by the municipality along with the traffic study. Do not include the traffic study review fee in the same payment of other required municipal review fees.

Incorporated – Submittal directly to Palm Beach County

For municipalities that require County approval of traffic studies prior to application to the municipality, include the required traffic study review fee along with the traffic study submitted to the Traffic Division.

TRIP GENERATION CHANGES

Occasionally, net daily trip generation calculations change to address review comments received from Palm Beach County. The review fee will be based on the net daily trip calculation in the first submitted traffic study. Adjustments to the review fee amount paid may be considered only if the net daily trip generation calculation increases or decreases by more than 10%.



**PALM BEACH COUNTY
PLANNING, ZONING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT
ZONING DIVISION
POLICY AND PROCEDURE**

**Jon MacGillis, ASLA
Zoning Director**

PPM # ZO-O-

**Issued:
Effective:**

SUBJECT: **Courtesy Notices, Posting of Properties and Legal Ad for Postponed Items**

AUTHORITY: **Article 2.A.1.J**

PURPOSE: Clarification of procedures not addressed pursuant to ULDC within Article 2.A.1.J

BACKGROUND: To establish pocedures for public notificatation of Zoning public hearing applications that are postponed by the Zoning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. These procedures are to clarify when various forms of public notices have to be carried out by the applicant. The intent of new Public Notices is to ensure effected parties are informed of changes to original hearing date. The ULDC, Article 2 establishes three forms of notices for public hearing; courtesy notices, posting on site, and legal Ad to newspaper.

PROCEDURES: The following procedures are to clarify how the applicant and staff are to handle new notices for postponed items.

Courtesy Notices:

- 1. New notices shall be mailed in accordance with Artilce 2.A.1.J.2 . the applicant shall pay the cost of new courtesy notices.

Posting of Property:

- 1. The applicant is responsible for updating the posted sign with the new time, date and place (if applicable).
- 2. The applicant shall photograph the posting confirming that the update as been completed.
- 3. When an application is postponed by either the applicant or applicable Board for either 90 days or 3 hearing the following forms of notices should be resent at a cost to the applicant.

Legal in Newspaper:

- 1. New ad shall be placed the local newspaper with the new hearing date. The applicant shall pay the cost assoicated with the new legal ad.