



## **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRAC)**

**November 1, 2019 @ 2 – 3 PM**

**PZ&B – VISTA CENTER, 2300 NORTH JOG RD.,  
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33411  
2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM (VC-2E-12)**

### **AGENDA**

#### **Member Items:**

- 1. Review Minutes – GLADYS**  
August 16, 2019 Minutes (Attachment 1)
- 2. DRO Issues**
  - a. Must be based upon ULDC requirements and must provide specific ULDC citations in description.
  - b. If Staff has preferences regarding justification, site plan, etc. then those can be comments.
- 3. Sufficiency Review**
  - a. 30 days? 15 days? 10 days?
  - b. New checklists
- 4. ZAR Process**
  - a. A majority of applications are being deemed insufficient at time of initial submittal.
  - b. Minor site plan amendments required due to building permit comments.
  - c. Only reviewing affected area.
  - d. Distribution list for review – how are ZAR applications assigned to DRO agencies
- 5. Landscape Comments**
  - a. Requiring ZAR applications, including tree disposition plans.
  - b. Comments being raised late in review process.
  - c. Zoning vs. ERM trees and impacts on tree disposition plans.
- 6. Staff Training** – seeing an inconsistency in reviews and issues
- 7. PAC**
  - a. Timing of submittal of applications; based on date of intake or sufficiency

#### **Staff Items:**

- 1. DRAC 2019 Task List – Jon (Attachment 2)**
- 2. Follow up on items discussed on 8/16 related to HB 7103 – Jon/Monica/Bill (Handout)**
- 3. Final Version of Sufficiency Checklist - Monica (Attachments 3A and 3B)**
- 4. ULDC Amendment Update – Wendy**
  - a. Status of ULDC Supplement 26
  - b. 2019-02 Round Adoption January 30, 2020

#### **General**

- 1. Topics for next meeting – GLADYS**
- 2. ADJOURN**



**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRAC)**  
**FRIDAY, AUGUST 16, 2019 2:00 PM-4:00 PM**  
**PZ&B – VISTA CENTER**  
**2300 NORTH JOG RD., WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33411**  
**HEARING ROOM CHAMBER (VC-1E-60)**

**MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER:** At 2:00 p.m.

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Members Present:** Gladys DiGirolamo, Lauren McClellan, Collene Walter, Pat Lentini, Bill Whiteford, Scott Mosolf, Kevin McGinley, Jon Schmidt.

**Interested Parties:** Evelyn Pacheco, Ailish Villalobos, Josh Nichols, Yoan Machado, Josh Long.

**County Staff:** Zoning Division: Jon MacGillis, Maryann Kwok, William Cross, Monica Cantor, Wendy Hernandez, Adam Mendenhall, Barbara Pinkston, Melissa Matos, Carrie Rechenmacher, Meredith Leigh, Ryan Vandenburg, Carolina Valera, Jan Rodriguez, Carlos Torres, Albert Jacob, Lorraine Fuster, Diego Penaloza, Donna Adelsperger, Brenya Martinez; Miriam De Santiago; Nancy Frontany, Lindsey Walter, Marissa Da Bres; Planning Division: Sussan Gash; Land Development: Scott Cantor; Facilities: Eric McClellan, Isami Ayala-Collazo.

**AGENDA**

**MEMBER ITEMS**

**1. REVIEW MINUTES**

Gladys DiGirolamo opened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. No issue or changes were made to the minutes from the previous meeting minutes.

Gladys DiGirolamo agree with the request from Jon MacGillis to reorder the agenda and take Items 5 and 3 first so Division Staff, who attended for these items, can leave if they wish.

**5. IMPLEMENTATION OF HB 7103**

Zoning Staff prepared a table (Attachment A "Public Hearing and DRO Applications Procedures Implementation of House Bill 7103"-handout at meeting) with questions raised by Agents at the July 26, 2019 Informational Meeting and responses prepared by staff.

Adam Mendenhall began the presentation by referring to Attachment A and reading each question and staff's response. The following items were further discussed:

- Pertaining to the submittal of an updated survey as one of the sufficiency items, Gladys DiGirolamo noted that a survey was not needed if the site was recently platted and no changes were done to the site. Staff replied that Survey was not present at the meeting but based on recent discussion on the topic that was accepted by Survey.
- Question relating to whether a letter determining the distance to utilities is required by the Health Department, Collene Walter indicated that based on previous discussion on the topic with Kenny Wilson, DRO representative of the Health Department, it will be acceptable to provide a copy of the Utility Bill of the subject property to demonstrate the site has already water and sewer. Zoning Staff will contact Kenny Wilson to confirm that.
- Monica Cantor clarified for Committee Members, Collene Walter and Gladys DiGirolamo that once the 2020 Zoning Calendar is finalized, a list summarizing the submittal and resubmittal dates for both the Public Hearing and DRO applications will be emailed to the DRAC members.

- Jon MacGillis clarified that Zoning Staff will consider reducing the 30-day period for sufficiency determination (pursuant to the HB 7103), but he advised that staff/agents tried out the new procedures under a 3-month trial period. Staff further clarified that applications accepted in July, August and September are not subject to the revised Sufficiency Checklist.
- Monica Cantor explained that the new Sufficiency Checklist will be implemented for the November Intake. However, the Insufficiency Letters will include those additional items from other agencies that will be considered as insufficiency once the new Checklist is implemented in November.
- Carlos Torres noted that, the question from Agents related to “different dates” for comment/issues showing on the Agents ePZB screen are related to the date the Project Manager enters them. Adam Mendenhall indicated that every time an application is resubmitted, it is routed to all DRO Agencies to verify comments/issues and finalize them. Jon MacGillis also mentioned that all agencies need to see the updated documents every time they are submitted to ensure changes are in compliance as new modifications may trigger new issues. He pointed out that he was testing with the Building Division acknowledgement Form 130 to avoid scheduling that Division to review resubmitted applications. He clarified that if other agencies want to do that, they may look for a similar option once staff has time to consider and implement.
- Adam Mendenhall indicated that ePZB will be updated to ensure comment dates will reflect the date the comments are finalized in ePZB.
- Further clarification will be needed in the “Application Checklist and Naming Guide” to assist the Agents and Applicants determining the documents required for some of the Zoning applications. Gladys DiGirolamo noted that the Checklist includes a general statement noting “as applicable” but requested more predictability if possible to clarify what that means. Maryann Kwok indicated she will be checking into this request to ensure Checklist is updated as well as the Zoning Technical Manual.
- Regarding DROE applications, Collene Walter asked why applications are subject again to the Sufficiency Checklist if the application is just being processed by Zoning. Donna Adelsperger explained that Zoning Techs have been instructed to carry forward in ePZB the approved legal description, approved survey and warranty deeds from the Public Hearing Application into the DROE applications. It was requested to include also the Traffic and Drainage Studies. Collene Walter asked if the Health Department water and sewer Utility letter to hookup or the Utility Bill can also be carried forward, to which staff response yes. Lauren McClellan asked if the 10 days of sufficiency determination is used in the PAC concurrent and PAC with no questions, can also that timeframe be applied to the DROE. Jon MacGillis noted staff will check and confirm if this can be done with minor tweaks as part of the final revision of these procedures.
- Collene Walter asked if any anticipated changes are taking place to the Document Naming Convention. She would like to see the new Health Department Utility Letter or Utility Bill, to be added to this list. Staff agreed that they will add this item to the list.
- Lauren McClellan asked if a final determination on a new Sufficiency Fee or Refund Fee is still be considered to be added. Adam Mendenhall clarified that at this point staff is only looking to review the Refund PPM that will address a refund related to Sufficiency Review.
- Jon MacGillis reiterated that November Intake is the month in which the revised Sufficiency Checklist will be implemented.

Jon MacGillis noted that additional changes were made to the Sufficiency Checklist presented at the July 27 Public Information Meeting based on input from attendees. Jon MacGillis requested Monica Cantor to point out what items were revised or deleted from the Checklist. Monica Cantor identified the changes as follows: Zoning Division Items: no longer asking for the Status of Conditions from Monitoring (simply submit the Resolution(s) marked up as to status consistent with current practice); Land Development does not require the FDOT letter to determine sufficiency and the hash tag code in the drainage statement has been removed; Planning Division added 2 new items, one requiring the submittal of the Land Use Ordinance(s) (Planning On Call can assist Agent) and a second to include the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) forms and pricing; and, Traffic removed requirement for all fees to be paid at time of sufficiency review related to trips.

Walter asked for clarification on what type of Plans is the Planning Division expected to receive under item #4. Sussan Gash from Planning responded by indicating that Multiple Land Use (MLU) or Indian Trail Grove (ITG) have Conceptual Plans. She said since Lisa Amara would be best person in Planning to get clarification of this requirement, it will be better to follow up on this question. Maryann Kwok clarified the Conceptual Plans are only for Land Use Amendments that do not have a corresponding Zoning application that requires Site Plans. Collene Walter suggested further clarification before adding it to the list.

It was clarified by Donna Adelsperger that the Health Department is only looking to have a Pre-Submittal Meeting with the applicant when there is a Day Care proposed. DRAC Members suggested that Sufficiency Checklist should be modified to read clear. Zoning Staff will be checking with the Health Department if that is the intent to reflect in the checklist.

Maryann Kwok also requested to double-check with Parks and Recreation Department if there is any need to make an application insufficient if the justification statement is not addressing recreation, or if that instead could be a certification or approval issue. Monica Cantor, stated she would follow up with Jean Mathews.

In concluding review of the Revised Sufficiency Checklist, Jon MacGillis request DRAC member to send any final revisions or comment to Monica Cantor within the next 2 weeks so the final Sufficiency Checklist can be finalized and published for the November Intake of new applications.

Having no more questions or further discussion, Gladys DiGirolamo proceeded to move to item #2 in the agenda.

## **2. PPM ZO-O-029 (MODIFICATIONS TO APPROVED PLANS) UPDATE**

Monica Cantor noted that DRAC member met with Zoning Staff recently to review and update the items in the Zoning PPM ZO-O-029 as part of the DRAC Task Team created to review the DRO and ZAR administrative amendment thresholds in Art. 2.C.

Adam Mendenhall clarified the PPM identifies what structures and equipment are not required to be updated administratively in the approved Zoning Plans, and Monica Cantor noted that once the revised PPM is finalized with Task Team Members and Zoning and Building Division Staff, it will be made available to DRAC member as well as posted to the Zoning Webpage. She further pointed out that training with Building Division Staff will be necessary to ensure smooth implementation of the amendments to the PPM to avoid referrals to the Zoning Division or delay building permit process.

## **3. ZONING PROCEDURE CHANGES**

All questions in this item were address under Attachment A in agenda item # 5.

## **STAFF ITEMS**

### **4. REVIEW DRAC TASK LIST-OPEN TASKS**

Jon MacGillis indicated that there are two items pending in the list, the first one relates to Type 2 Variance, and the second one to update PCN in Site Plans.

Related to Type 2 Variance, Collene Walter noted that she wanted to make sure no additional time was going to be added for the Type 2 Variance process. Staff indicated that in early 2019 changes were made to the Zoning Calendar to address the issue, however, with the revised changes to the calendar to implement the House Bill (HB) 7103, the timeline for Variances is back to be approved within the same month it is submitted provided no delays and all issues are addressed. William Cross confirmed that the time should be shorten now based on revised calendar to address the HB.

Pertaining to showing PCN on Site Plans, Monica Cantor indicated that staff concluded the PCN must remain on the Plan(s) as PCNs are used by County Staff, Interested Parties, and Customers when looking up the project. Also, she noted that PPM-ZO-O-029 will be including Property Control Number (PCN) update in the list of

items subject to ZAR administrative modifications of approved Site Plans.

## **5. ULDC AMENDMENTS UPDATE-WENDY HERNANDEZ**

### **a. 2019-01 Round Adoption August 23, 2019**

Wendy Hernandez stated that the 2019-01 Round and Workforce Housing Amendments are scheduled for adoption at the BCC Zoning Hearing on August 22, 2019 and ULDC Supplement 26 should be available in October, 2019. Wendy Hernandez also clarified that the First Reading for the amendments to Landscape Service may be Postponed at the August 22, BCC Zoning Hearing to October 24, 2019 due to Commission attendance conflicts with the August and September Hearing's.

### **b. 2019-02 Round Adoption January 30, 2020**

Wendy Hernandez presented the list of tentative amendments in ULDC Round 2019-02 found in Attachment 3. She indicated the following items are being started, but will continue to the 2020 amendment round:

- Article 1 Nonconformities;
- Article 2.C Amendments to Article 2.C, Administrative Modifications to addressing DRO and ZAR thresholds and the "single entities";
- Article 3 Modifications to the URA process and pdr's;
- Modifications to PDRs for parcels with the RR-2.5 FLU and AR Zoning District;
- Codification of Planning ORD 2018-031;
- Article 4 supplementary standards for uses with location and access requirements on Collector or Arterial roads; and,
- Article 4 modifications related to future land use and zoning consistency in the Glades Tier.

Collene Walter requested information on the amendment for plans submitted for Small Scale Amendments. She indicated that plans were not previously required for a water utilities project. Wendy Hernandez clarified that the code currently requires the plans and staff was proposing to amend it to delete it from Zoning and leave it under 2.H. Collene Walter asked for a follow up from Sussan Gash.

Jon MacGillis requested DRAC members to check with Monitoring for the proposed language so they get familiar with what they are proposing. Wendy Hernandez noted that the times are being modified to be more consistent and they are working to codify current practice and implementation.

Kevin McGinley asked a question about the reason for the 5 road mile location of a Fire Station in CLF and Wendy Hernandez clarified that in review of some applications the preference by the Fire Department is by road miles, rather than as the crow flies (radius).

Josh Long asked if the amendments in Art 6 Parking/Loading are still being considering that were raised by industry in 2018 for small loading spaces. Wendy Hernandez noted that is still in the amendments to provided different sizes which would possible eliminate a need for the Type I Waiver.

Wendy Hernandez noted that Attachment 3 BCC Hearing dates are different now due to recently modifications to the BCC Zoning Hearing dates recently coordinate by Zoning Staff and Commissioner's Offices. Donna Adelsperger clarified that the BCC Zoning Hearings in November are on Monday, November 25th and Thursday, December 19, 2019.

## **GENERAL ITEMS**

### **7. TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING 11-1-19**

Gladys DiGirolamo indicated that items will be added at a later time.

### **8. ADJOURN**

The DRAC meeting adjourn at 3:28 p.m.

Complete      Pending

Task	Details	Lead	Status	Date Initiated	Initiated by	Date Completed
Abandonment	Process involved when the resolution is abandoned through the BCC, even though the "Use" has been abandoned.	Jon/Wendy	Closed	1/26/2017	Kevin McGinley	5/3/19: Zoning staff addressed in 2018 with new whereas clause in the Resolution on carry prior Site Plan forward to DRO. 1/26/17: When the resolution is abandoned through the BCC, even though the use has been abandoned; Wendy conveyed the Site Plan is abandoned with the resolution. Through discussion, it was determined there needs to be more research conducted and reviewed with Zoning Staff and code on how to make this process simpler. Bill said he heard Kevin's concerns and internally staff will be working to address it. At the next DRAC Meeting staff will have an update
eZINFO Enhancment Screens for Staff, DRO Agents and DRO Agency Staff.	2019 enchancements done to: Online submittal screens, log in to eZINFO, created dashboard for Agents to see all apps in system, ehanced comment/condition screen and status of certification	Jon/Agents	Done	5/2/2019	Jon MacGillis	6/5/19 - Enhancements completed by Sanjeev and Lois. Training done by Donna on this day. Additional issues identified at the training session included: print comments letter, reference # in ZAR apps, show PM on comment screen and showing application by company. 5/3/19-Email from Jon to key DRAC Members who volunteered to do testing of enhanced screens they have until May 15 to provide input. 5/2/19 Training session 101 with Staff and Interested Parties to unveil enhancements to screens. Some of enhancements requested by DRAC Members others identified by Zoning staff to address ongoing input by Interested Parties.
Bonafide Ag Application	- Right to Farm Bonafide Ag-if classification is granted but the Zoning review process requires a DRO or Cond Use-does that exempt you from review process. - Apply for a building permit but do not have the Ag Exemption from Tax Collector Office how do you proceed.	Jon/Kevin	Open	5/3/2019	Kevin McGinley	8/12/19: Phone conversation between Kevin and Monica to indicate that staff did not receive the list of questions pertaining to this topic. Followed up with an e-mail on the same date. He is OK removing the item from this agenda. He is getting more familiar with the Agricultural exemptions and requirements which may end up having questions for the County attorney to respond if necessary. 5/3/19: Follow-up from Jon to Kevin email sent suggesting a separate meeting to address this issue. Jon requested from Kevin bullet points on his need for direction and follow-up with Kevin accordingly.
Type II - Stand Alone Variance	Timeline is now 5 months	Bill Cross	Closed	5/3/2019	Collene Walter	10/22/19 New calendar for 2020 should address no additional time to the overall review process. 5/3/19 Gladys and Lauren presented the comment from Collen to Zoning Staff during DRAC meeting.
PCN on Site Plan	Is it still needed on the S	Monica/Adam	Closed	5/3/2019	Gladys DiGirolamo	10/22/19: staff determined PCNs are necessary on site plans when doing researchs. Staff still will be required to have PCNs on Site Plans. 5/3/19: Is the PCN still needed on the Site Plan when there are still a lot of changes and issues.

**PBC ZONING DIVISION  
PUBLIC HEARING AND FULL DRO<sup>(4)</sup> APPLICATIONS  
SUFFICIENCY CHECKLIST**

[Updated 10/21/19] **EFFECTIVE 11/1/2019**

All required application forms, plans and related documents submitted to the Zoning Division, are reviewed by the Project Manager (PM) for sufficiency. The assigned PM shall utilize the Reasons for Insufficiency (listed below) to determine whether or not an application is sufficient.

1. **An Insufficient application shall not be accepted and an Insufficiency Letter will be sent to the Applicant/Agent by Staff identifying the required corrections.**
2. **The Resubmittal dates are shown on the Annual Zoning Calendar.**
3. **The first two Resubmittals are free. Additional fees will be charged on the third and subsequent resubmittal. Time extension for insufficient applications are applicable as contained in Art. 2.B.2.B.4 and Art. 2.C.2.B.4.**
4. **DRO Administrative Modifications that are not submitted on-line are subject to the following, where applicable.**

REASONS FOR INSUFFICIENCY				
ZONING (Z)				
Sufficient?		Item #	Description	Clarification/Comment
No	Yes			
<b>A. Any one of the following items shall result in an application being deemed insufficient; AND/OR listed in B.</b>				
		1	Failure to meet with Staff for a Pre-Application Conference (PAC) or Pre-Application Appointment (PAA) before submitting an application that required a PAC or PAA <a href="#">[Article 2.]</a> .	Unless addressed in a separate meeting and agreed upon by both parties that this meeting would suffice; or, due to scheduling conflicts that Zoning Director confirms a meeting cannot be arranged in time for the applicants submittal schedule.
		2	Missing, incomplete or inconsistent information on the documents: Forms, Plans, Justification Statement and/or supporting documents.	Missing required forms consistent with the application request(s) <a href="#">[Application checklist and naming guide]</a>
		3	Forms and Plans are not legible.	
		4	Missing request or incorrect requests based on the submitted documents.	Incorrect requests that are not in compliance with Article 4, Use Regulations. (e.g. approval process inconsistent with the Use Matrix, exceeds the BCC/DRO Threshold or it is a prohibited use.)
		5	Missing Frontage and Access as required in specific sections of Art. 3 and Art. 4.	
		6	Shared parking must have Traffic sign off before submittal.	
		7	Missing Consent	
		8	Missing Disclosure Forms (Public Hearing applications only).	
		9	Fees not consistent with the number of request(s).	
<b>B. Five or more of the items below results in an application being deemed insufficient:</b>				
		1	Missing or incorrect Property Control Number(s) (PCN).	
		2	Incorrect or Inconsistent Square Footage (Related to building or overall site) or density.	
		3	Wrong FLU designation and/or Zoning District or the two are inconsistent throughout documents submitted.	
		4	Minimum buffer widths not identified.	
		5	Surrounding properties or structures within 100 feet of subject site not identified.	
		6	Uses and accessory uses not identified, are not correct or incomplete.	
		7	Dimensions and/or acreage on Survey and Site Plan do not match.	
		8	Status of all previous Conditions of Approval and/or compliance with time and events not addressed	Mark Conditions as Completed, Ongoing, etc. in the pdf version of the Resolution.
LAND DEVELOPMENT (LD)				
Sufficient?		Item #	Description	
No	Yes			
		1	Drainage statement missing or not electronically signed and sealed.	
		2	Self-signed drainage statement does not have a valid signature report.	
		3	Point of legal positive outfall and drainage basin in drainage statement not identified.	
		4	Peak hour turning movements and ADT for existing and proposed driveways (for subdivision plans at the proposed right of way intersections) not shown.	
		5	Dimensions missing:	
		5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From centerline of right-of-way to property line</li> </ul>	
		5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Driveway width, throat, radius returns</li> </ul>	
		5.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property line (bearings and distances)</li> </ul>	
		5.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centerline geometrics (subdivision plan only)</li> </ul>	

**PBC ZONING DIVISION  
PUBLIC HEARING AND FULL DRO<sup>(4)</sup> APPLICATIONS  
SUFFICIENCY CHECKLIST**

[Updated 10/21/19] **EFFECTIVE 11/1/2019**

PLANNING (P)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Proposed square footage or density exceeds maximums allowed by the Comprehensive Plan (and there is no FLUA amendment)
		2	Incorrect or inconsistent density/intensity as it relates to existing and proposed building square footage or overall site and as summarized in Justification Statement or application materials.
		3	Workforce Housing Program (WHP) Letter of Determination from the Planning Division missing.
		4	Prior Land Use Ordinance's with conditions and applicable plans missing.
		5	Completed Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) forms with accurate number of TDR's and corresponding pricing missing or blank.
SURVEY (S)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Boundary Survey not electronically signed and sealed.
		2	Boundary Survey and/or Title Information more than 12 months old.
		3	Boundary Survey not provided or does not reflect the title information.
TRAFFIC (T)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Traffic Statement/Study missing or not electronically signed and sealed.
COUNTY ATTORNEY (CA)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Missing, incomplete, improperly signed and notarized, or illegible Warranty Deed.
ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (ERM)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Vegetation Survey missing; if property supports existing native vegetation [Art. 7.E.1-3, Existing Native Vegetation] [Relates to response in Section 8 of the General Application form].
HEALTH DEPARTMENT (HD)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Missing a letter related to Dust Control to the Health Department (if new construction is proposed).
		2	Missing a letter from Utilities Staff to the Health Department stating the distance to the nearest water and wastewater service pipe and type (gravity, force main, etc); or missing a copy of the utility bill if the site is connected to water and wastewater.
		3	The applicant did not have a meeting with the Health Department for the proposed Day Care.
PROPERTY AND REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT (PREM)			
Sufficient?		Item #	Description
No	Yes		
		1	Planned Unit Development (PUD) has 2% Civic: 1) Required and shown on the Plan(s); 2) Not required (State reasons); or 3) Already Provided (state reasons) in Justification Statement.

**ATTACHMENT 3B**  
**PBC ZONING DIVISION**  
**APPLICATION SUFFICIENCY CHECKLIST**  
**ZONING AGENCY REVIEW (ZAR) ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATIONS**  
(Updated on 10/07/19)

All required application forms, plans and related documents (Documents) submitted to the Zoning Division, are reviewed by the Project Manager (PM) for sufficiency. The assigned PM shall utilize the Reasons for Insufficiency below to determine whether or not an application is sufficient.

1. An insufficient application shall not be accepted and a rejection notice will be sent to the Applicant/Agent identifying the required corrections.
2. Weekly on-line resubmittals are available between Monday 5:00 p.m. to Tuesday 11:59 a.m.

REASONS FOR INSUFFICIENCY			
Sufficient?		Step 1 – Primary Details	Description
No	Yes		
		<b>Property Control Number (PCN) Information:</b>	Missing or incorrect PCN
		<b>Applicant Information:</b>	Incomplete or incorrect Applicant information
		<b>Agent Information:</b>	Incomplete or incorrect Agent information
		<b>Step 2 – Request Details</b>	
		<b>Request Summary:</b>	Missing information or summary provided does not relate to the Request(s)
		<b>Current Resolution(s) for Project:</b>	Incorrect or missing Resolution Number(s)
		<b>Submitted Plans and Number of Modifications or Variance Request:</b>	Incorrect Plan Type is selected (must be consistent with the approved Plan noted in ePlans)
			Incorrect Exhibit Number or Page Number (must be consistent with the approved Plan noted in ePlans)
			Multiple requests are entered in the same-modification request. (Every request shall be entered individually in this field)
			Proposed modification(s) exceeds the threshold of the ULDC Table 2.C.5.B – Administrative Modifications to Prior Development Orders (DOs) or Conditions of Approval
			Proposed variance(s) exceeds the Variance Request Limitations indicated in Article 2.C.5.D.3. of the ULDC.
		<b>Concurrency:</b>	The request includes square footage increase or a new use which impacts concurrency. Applicant checked “No”
			Concurrency Table information is incomplete or inconsistent with the proposed request .
		<b>Step 3 - Documents</b>	
		<b>Attachments (Plans, Studies and Forms:</b>	Missing or incomplete Forms (such as, Consent form, Affidavit of Completeness and Accuracy, Warranty Deed, etc.) as applicable;
			Missing applicable Plans (such as, Final Site Plan, Final Subdivision Plan, Final Sign Plan, etc.) associated to the request. (Note: Plans that have multiple pages must be submitted as a set, even if some of the pages have no proposed modifications)
			Forms, Plans or supporting documents have illegible information
			Provided Plans are degraded than the approved Plans available on-line
			Documents are not labeled consistent with the Zoning Naming Guide
			Document attached is inconsistent with the document type selected
			The area of modification is not within the provided PCN (1)
			Plans are not identifying proposed changes with red clouds (1)
			Stamp boxes have not been cleared of text on all pages (1)
			Provided Survey, Traffic Study or Drainage statement is not electronically signed and sealed per the Technical Manual.

(1) Not required for Type 1 Variances