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## RE: Boynton Beach Place - Revised FLUA Amendment Policy 3.5-d Review Round 2022-23-B

Dear Dr. Ortega:
Palm Beach County Traffic Division has reviewed the Land Use Plan Amendment Application Traffic Study for the proposed Future Land Use Amendment for the above-referenced project, revised on April 3, 2024, pursuant to Policy 3.5-d of the Land Use Element of the Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan. The project is summarized as follows:

| Location: | North side of Boynton Beach Boulevard, east of Jog Road |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCN: | 00-42-45-22-00-000-5030 |  |
| Acres: | 8.86 Acres |  |
|  | Current FLU | Proposed FLU |
| FLU: | (Commercial High (CH) on 3.96 <br> acres <br> And <br> Commercial Low Office (CL-O) on 4.9 acres)/Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) | Commercial Low (CL)/Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR- 5) |
| Zoning: | Single Family Residential (RS) | Multiple Use Plan Development (MUPD) |
| Density/ Intensity: | 0.5 FAR for 3.96 acres And 0.5 FAR for 4.9 acres | 0.5 FAR for 8.86 acres |
| Maximum Potential: | Medical Office $($ Stand-Alone $)=$ 106,722 SF <br> Shop Plaza (40-150ksf) w/Sup Market $=86,249$ SF | $\begin{gathered} \text { Medical Office }(\text { Stand-Alone })= \\ 192,971 \mathrm{SF} \end{gathered}$ |
| Proposed Potential: | None | Mini-Warehouse/SS $=200,000$ SF Automobile Sales (New) $=2,500$ SF Coffee/Donut Shop + DT $=1,200$ SF Automobile Care Center $=7,500$ SF |
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|  |  | Carwash (Automated) $=1$ Lane |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net Daily Trips: | -959 (maximum - current) <br> $-7,347$ (maximum - proposed) |  |
| Net PH <br> Trips: | 538 (425/113) AM, 682 (173/510) PM (maximum) 98 (55/43) AM, 86 (42/44) PM (proposed) |  |
| *Maximum indicates typical FAR and maximum trip generator. Proposed indicates the specific uses and intensities/densities anticipated in the zoning application. |  |  |

Based on the review, the Traffic Division has concluded that the proposed amendment will have a negligible impact on traffic. The Long Range analysis suggests reduced impact, while Test 2 analysis shows insignificance on the roadway network. These findings meet Policy 3.5-d of the Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Element at the proposed potential intensity shown above. As such, a condition of approval is required to restrict this amendment to the proposed development potential or use(s) generating equivalent trips.

Please contact me at 561-684-4030 or email me at DSimeus@pbcgov.org with any questions.

Sincerely,


Dominique Simeus, P.E.
Professional Engineer
Traffic Division

[^0]

Boynton Beach Place MUPD Palm beach County, florida CN 1997-00004 ROUND $23-B$

Future Land Use Atlas Amendment Policy 3.5-d Traffic Study

## Prepared for: <br> Job-Man Development LLC

Prepared by:
JFO GROUP INC
COA Number 32276
6671 W Indiantown Road
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## 1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

JFO Group Inc has been retained to prepare a traffic study for the proposed Future Land Use designation at the Boynton Beach Place Property. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate the traffic impact of the proposed Future Land Use change to determine compliance with the PBC - Future Land Use Atlas (FLUA) Amendment requirements. This analysis includes Test 2 - Five Year Analysis (2029) and Long Range Analysis (2045).

There is a proposal for a Future Land Use change on $\pm 8.86$ acres located north of Boynton Beach Boulevard, just east of Jog Road in unincorporated Palm Beach County (PBC), Florida. There is a proposal to change the current Future Land Use from the current Commercial High (CH) with underlying Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) on 3.96 acres and Commercial Low Office (CL-O) with underlying Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) on 4.90 acres to Commercial Low (CL) with underlying Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) on 8.86 acres.


Figure 1: Project Location

Property Control Number associated with this project is 00-42-45-22-00-000-5030. Exhibit 1 includes a copy of the property data from the PBC Property Appraiser's office for the site while Exhibit 2 includes a copy of the latest survey and FLU designation. Figure 1 shows an aerial location of the site in relation to the transportation network.

## 2. CURRENT FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION

Project trip generation rates available from the PBC Trip Generation Rates, dated July 25, 2022 were used to determine the project trip generation under the current and proposed Future Land Use designations. Table 1 shows the rates and equations used in order to determine the trip generation for Daily, AM, and PM peak hour conditions. Exhibit 3 incudes the latest Palm Beach County Trip Generation rates \& equations.

Table 1: Trip Generation Rates and Equations

| Land Use | ITE | Daily | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Code |  | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |  |
| Medical Office | 720 | T=42.97X <br> -108.01 | $79 \%$ | $21 \%$ | 3.10 | $30 \%$ | $70 \%$ | 3.93 |
| Shop Plaza (40-150ksf) <br> W/Sup Market | 821 | 94.49 | $62 \%$ | $38 \%$ | 3.53 | $48 \%$ | $52 \%$ | 9.03 |
| Shop Center (>150ksf) | 820 | 37.01 | $62 \%$ | $38 \%$ | 0.84 | $48 \%$ | $52 \%$ | 3.40 |
| Mini-Warehouse/SS | 151 | 1.45 | $59 \%$ | $41 \%$ | 0.09 | $47 \%$ | $53 \%$ | 0.15 |
| Automobile Sales (New) | 840 | 27.84 | $73 \%$ | $27 \%$ | 1.86 | $40 \%$ | $60 \%$ | 2.42 |
| Coffee/Donut Shop + <br> DT | 937 | 533.57 | $51 \%$ | $49 \%$ | 85.88 | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | 38.99 |
| Automobile Care <br> Center | 942 | 31.10 | $66 \%$ | $34 \%$ | 2.25 | $48 \%$ | $52 \%$ | 3.11 |
| Carwash (Automated) | PBC | 166.00 | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | 11.97 | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | 13.65 |

Table 2 summarizes Daily, AM and PM peak trip generation potential under the Current Future Land Use designation. The net Daily, AM and PM trips potentially generated due to the Current Future Land Use designation are 8,325, 455 (334 In/121 Out), and 789 ( $312 \mathrm{ln} / 477$ Out) trips respectively.

Table 2: Trip Generation - Current Future Land Use

| Land Use | Intensity | Daily Traffic | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Medical Office | 106,722 ${ }^{1} \mathrm{SF}$ | 4,478 | 261 | 70 | 331 | 126 | 293 | 419 |
| Shop Plaza (40-150ksf) w/Sup Market | 86,249 ${ }^{\text {² }}$ SF | 8,150 | 188 | 116 | 304 | 374 | 405 | 779 |
|  | $\Sigma$ | 12,628 | 449 | 186 | 635 | 500 | 698 | 1,198 |
| Internal Capture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medical Office |  | 448 | 12 | 7 | 19 | 13 | 29 | 42 |
| Shop Plaza (40-150ksf) w/Sup Market |  | 448 | 7 | 12 | 19 | 29 | 13 | 42 |
|  | $\Sigma$ | (896) | (19) | (19) | (38) | (42) | (42) | (84) |
| Pass By |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medical Office | 10\% | 403 | 25 | 6 | 31 | 11 | 27 | 38 |
| Shop Plaza (40-150ksf) w/Sup Marke† | 39\% | 3,004 | 71 | 40 | 111 | 135 | 152 | 287 |
|  | $\Sigma$ | $(3,407)$ | (96) | (46) | (142) | (146) | (179) | (325) |
| Net Trips (Current FLU) |  | 8,325 | 334 | 121 | 455 | 312 | 477 | 789 |

[^1]
## 3. PROPOSED FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION

There is a proposal to change the current Future Land Use from the current Commercial High (CH) with underlying Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) on 3.96 acres and Commercial Low Office (CL-O) with underlying Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) on 4.90 acres to Commercial Low (CL) with underlying Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) on 8.86 acres.

The proposed intensity for the site would allow a maximum of 192,971 SF Medical Office. Table 3 summarizes Daily, AM and PM peak hour trips potentially generated under the Maximum Intensity.

Table 3: Trip Generation - Proposed Future Land Use (Maximum Intensity)

| Land Use | Intensity | Daily | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Medical Office | $192,971^{1} \mathrm{SF}$ | 8,184 | 472 | 126 | 598 | 227 | 531 | 758 |
| Pass by | $10 \%$ | $(818)$ | $(47)$ | $(13)$ | $(60)$ | $(54)$ | $(21)$ | $(76)$ |
| Net Trips (Proposed FLU) | $\mathbf{7 , 3 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 2}$ |  |

According to Table 3, the net Daily, AM and PM trips potentially generated due to the Proposed Future Land Use designation under the most intense ITE Land Use are 7,366, 538 (425 In/113 Out), and 682 (173 In/510 Out) trips respectively.

[^2]
## 4. PROPOSED SITE PLAN

The proposed project will replace 8.86 acres of outdoor storage with 200,000 SF MiniWarehouse/SS, 2,500 SF Automobile Sales (New), 1,200 SF Coffee/Donut Shop With DT, 7,500 SF Automobile Care Center and a 3,275 SF (One lane) Carwash.

Table 4 includes the trip generation for the project maximum as allowed by site constraints and the Unified Land Development Code (ULDC). Exhibit 4 includes the internal capture calculations for the proposed development. At the time this analysis was prepared, the applicant was not planning on applying for density bonuses under the TDR and/or WFH programs.

According to Table 4, the net Daily, AM and PM peak hour trips potentially generated due to the latest conceptual site plan are 978, 98 (55 In/43 Out) and 86 (42 In/44 Out) trips, respectively. The intensities included in the concurrent site plan application were used in order to evaluate Test 2 of the Policy 3.5-d compliance requirements.

Table 4: Trip Generation - Proposed Site Plan

| Land Use | Intensity | Daily Traffic | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Mini-Warehouse/SS | 200,000 SF | 290 | 11 | 7 | 18 | 14 | 16 | 30 |
| Automobile Sales (New) | 2,500 SF | 70 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Coffee/Donut Shop+DT | 1,200 SF | 640 | 53 | 50 | 103 | 24 | 23 | 47 |
| Automobile Care Cntr | 7,500 SF | 233 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 11 | 12 | 23 |
| Carwash (Automated) | 1 Lane | 166 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 14 |
|  | $\Sigma$ | 1,399 | 85 | 70 | 155 | 58 | 62 | 120 |
| Internal Capture |  | 5.86\% | 2.58\% |  |  | 6.67\% |  |  |
| Mini-Warehouse/SS |  | 21 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Automobile Sales (New) |  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Coffee/Donut Shop + DT |  | 21 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Automobile Care Center |  | 19 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Carwash (Automated) |  | 14 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| $\Sigma$ |  | (82) | (2) | (2) | (4) | (4) | (4) | (8) |
| Pass-By |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mini-Warehouse/SS | 10\% | 27 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Automobile Sales (New) | 15\% | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Coffee/Donut Shop+DT | 49\% | 303 | 26 | 24 | 50 | 11 | 11 | 22 |
| Automobile Care Cntr | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Carwash (Automated) | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\Sigma$ |  | (339) | (28) | (25) | (53) | (12) | (14) | (26) |
| Net Proposed Traffic |  | 978 | 55 | 43 | 98 | 42 | 44 | 86 |

## 5. TRAFFIC IMPACT

Table 5 shows a comparison of the trip generation between the Maximum Intensity under the existing and proposed FLU while Table 6 compares existing FLU and proposed site plan. As can be seen in Table 5, daily traffic generated by the Maximum Intensity under the proposed FLU is less than the traffic generated by the current FLU.

Table 5: Net Traffic Impact - Maximum Intensity

| Future Land Use <br> Designation | Daily | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Current FLU | 8,325 | 334 | 121 | 455 | 312 | 477 | 789 |
| Maximum Intensity | 7,366 | 425 | 113 | 538 | 173 | 510 | 682 |
| Net New Trips | $\mathbf{( 9 5 9 )}$ | $\mathbf{9 1}$ | $\mathbf{( 8 )}$ | $\mathbf{8 3}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 3 9 )}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{( 1 0 7 )}$ |

Table 6: Net Traffic Impact - Proposed Intensity

| Future Land Use <br> Designation | Daily | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Current FLU | 8,325 | 334 | 121 | 455 | 312 | 477 | 789 |
| Concurrent Site Plan | 978 | 55 | 43 | 98 | 42 | 44 | 86 |
| Net New Trips | $\mathbf{( 7 , 3 4 7 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 2 7 9 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 7 8 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 3 5 7 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 2 7 0 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 4 3 3 )}$ | $\mathbf{( 7 0 3 )}$ |

Pursuant to the Test 2 - Five Year Analysis (2029) requirements and according to the ULDC, Article 12 - Chapter B, Section 2.B, based on the peak hour trips from Table 4, a 1-mile Radius of Development Influence (RDI) needs to be considered for traffic impact analysis for the Maximum Intensity allowed under the ULDC. Trip distribution and assignment incorporates the characteristics of the proposed site plan and the surrounding network configuration. Figure 2 includes project trip distribution on all roadway links included within a 1 -mile RDI for the proposed land use.

Furthermore, given the net trip generation characteristics from Table 5 for Long Range Analysis (2045), and according to FLUE Policy 3.5-d of the Comprehensive Plan, the first accessible link was considered for traffic impact analysis for the Maximum Intensity allowed under the proposed FLU.


## 6. TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

This section evaluates two traffic scenarios for the proposed land use change under the Maximum Intensity: Test 2 - Five Year Analysis (2029) and Long Range Analysis (2045).

### 6.1 Test 2 - Five Year Analysis (2029)

Test 2 directs to compare the peak hour directional traffic volumes on each significant Link to the thresholds in Table 12.B.2.C-4, 2A: LOS E Link Service Volumes. If total traffic is equal to or lower than the thresholds, the project shall pass. Table 7 determines these significance levels for the Maximum Intensity allowed under the proposed site plan and according to the ULDC.

According to Table 12.b.2.D-7 3A from the PBC Traffic Performance Standards - Article 12 of the PBC Unified Land Development Code and given the trip generation characteristics from Table 4, a 1-mile Radius of Development Influence needs to be considered for Test 2 traffic impact analysis of the Maximum Intensity. Links included within the RDI with more than three percent (3\%) of the adopted LOS thresholds and links outside the RDI where net trips are greater than five percent (5\%), as defined in Table 12.B.C-4 2A: LOS E Link Service Volumes, Peak Hour Traffic, shall meet the adopted LOS.

Link analyses shall be carried out at the end of the fifth year of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Five-Year Transportation Improvement Program in effect at the time of traffic analysis submittal. The road network assumed in this analysis shall be the existing road network, and State and County Five-Year Road Program improvements with construction scheduled to commence before the end of the Five-Year analysis period. At the time of this submittal, PBC - Five-Year Transportation Improvement Program adopted for Fiscal Year 2024 does not show any improvements within the RDI.

As shown in Table 7, all links within the RDI have an impact of less than three percent (3\%). Test 2 has been met.

Table 7: Test 2 - Five Year Analysis Significance - Proposed Intensity (Site Plan)

| Roadway | From | то | Ln | Number of Existing and Proposed Traffic Signals - 1 | Length (miles) | Signalized intersections per mile | Class | LOS Capacity | Traffic Assignment | Project Traffic | Traffic Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jog Rd | Woolbright Rd | Boynton Beach Blvd | 6D | 2 | 1.10 | 1.82 | Class I | 2,940 | 20.0\% | 11 | 0.37\% |
| Jog Rd | Boynton Beach Blvd | Gateway Blvd | 6D | 1 | 1.20 | 0.83 | Class I | 2,940 | 20.0\% | 11 | 0.37\% |
| El Clair Ranch Rd | Boynton Beach Blvd | Woolbright Rd | 2 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | Class I | 880 | 9.0\% | 5 | 0.57\% |
| Boynton Beach Blvd | Hagen Ranch Rd | Jog Rd | 6D | 2 | 1.02 | 1.96 | Class I | 2,940 | 30.0\% | 17 | 0.58\% |
| Boynton Beach Blvd | Jog Rd | Site |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70.0\% | 39 | 1.33\% |
| Boynton Beach Blvd | Site | El Clair Ranch Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.0\% | 17 | 0.58\% |
| Boynton Beach Blvd | El Clair Ranch Rd | Military Tr | 6D | 3 | 1.00 | 3.00 | Class II | 2,830 | 21.0\% | 12 | 0.42\% |


| AM |  | PM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IN | OUT | IN | OUT |
| 55 | 43 | 42 | 44 |

RDI: 1-Mile

### 6.2 Long Range Analysis (2045)

At the time of this submittal, the latest long-range transportation model available from the Palm Beach Transportation Planning Agency was based on the Southeast Regional Planning Model (SERPM) version 8.503, revised on September 18, 2020. Exhibit 4 includes excerpts from the 2045 LRTP for the first accessible link. Adjusted ${ }^{1}$ traffic volumes from the Palm Beach TPA were used in this analysis.

Exhibit 6 includes the Active Amendments Map in the area showing that there are no active FLUA amendments in the project vicinity.

As shown in Table 8, the Proposed Future Land Use change will not generate a significant impact in 2045.

[^3]Table 8: Level of Service - 2045 Conditions - Maximum Intensity

| Road | From | To | Lanes | Capacity | 2045 Volume 1 | Active FLUAs | Traffic Assignment | Project Traffic | Total Traffic | V/C | \% Impact | Significant Impact? ${ }^{2}$ | Meets LOS 'D'? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boynton Beach Blvd | Jog Rd | Site | 6D | 50,300 | 49,800 | 0 | 70.0\% | 0 | 49,800 | 0.99 | 0.00\% | NO | YES |
|  | Site | El Clair Ranch Rd |  |  |  | 0 | 30.0\% | 0 | 49,800 | 0.99 | 0.00\% | NO | YES |

Net Daily Traffic: 0
${ }^{1} 2045$ volumes are included in Exhibit 4.
${ }^{2}$ A project has significant traffic: (1) when net trip increase will impact FIHS and SIS facilities which are already exceeding the adopted LOS or cause the adopted LOS for FIHS or SIS facilities to be exceeded; and/or (2) where net trip increase impacting roads not on the FIHS or SIS is greater than one percent (1\%) for volume to capacity ratio $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) of 1.4 or more, two percent ( $2 \%$ ) for $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ of 1.2 or more and three percent ( $3 \%$ ) for $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ of less than 1.2 of the level of service "D" capacity on an AADT basis of the link affected up to the limits set forth in this table. The laneage shall be as shown on the MPO's latest adopted LRTP.

## 7. CONCLUSION

There is a proposal for a Future Land Use change designation on $\pm 8.86$ acres located north of Boynton Beach Boulevard, just east of Jog Road in unincorporated Palm Beach County (PBC), Florida. The proposal is to change the current Future Land Use from the current Commercial High (CH) with underlying Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) on 3.96 acres and Commercial Low Office (CL-O) with underlying Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) on 4.90 acres to Commercial Low (CL) with underlying Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) on 8.86 acres.

The current Future Land Use allows 106,722 SF Medical Office and 86,249 SF Retail. The proposed Future Land Use change would allow a maximum density and intensity of 192,971 SF Medical Office. At the time of this submittal, the applicant was not planning on applying for density bonuses under the TDR and/or WFH programs.

This Policy 3.5-d traffic analysis is associated with a concurrent site plan application for the Boynton Beach Place property to replace 8.86 acres of outdoor storage with 200,000 SF MiniWarehouse/SS, 2,500 SF Automobile Sales (New), 1,200 SF Coffee/Donut Shop With DT, 7,500 SF Automobile Care Center and a 3,275 SF (One lane) Carwash.

Exhibit 7 includes a copy of Part $A$ and $B$ of the Development Potential Form - Future Land Use Atlas Amendment Application.

The proposed changes to the Boynton Beach Place property have been evaluated following FLUE Policy 3.5-d of the PBC Comprehensive Plan. This analysis shows the proposed Future Land Use Amendment will be in compliance with Policy 3.5-d of the Land Use Element of the PBC Comprehensive Plan.

The Boynton Beach Place property received Policy 3.5-d approval on August 31, 2023 for Commercial High (CH)/Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) on 8.89 Acres. Exhibit 8 includes a copy of the previous 3.5-d approval. This revised traffic analysis is being provided to change the FLUA request to Commercial Low (CL)/Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) on 8.86 acres.


Exhibit 1: Property Appraiser

Boynton Beach Place - Palm Beach County Policy 3.5 D T: (561) GO2-JFOG•www.jfogroupinc.com•info@jfo.us
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Property Detail
Location Address 6345 bOYnton beach bLVD Municipality UNINCORPORATED
Parcel Control Number 00-42-45-22-00-000-5030
Subdivision

Official Records Book 33181
Page 1775
Sale Date DEC-2021

Legal Description 22-45-42 W 1/2 OF E 1/2 OF SW 1/4 OF SE 1/4 (LESS SLY 113.07 FT SR 804 R/W)

## Owner Information

owners
LAKE PARK 1100 LLC

## Mailing address

3100 SW 15TH ST
DEERFIELD BEACH FL 334428188

| Sales Information |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sales Date | Price | OR Book/Page | Sale Type | Owner |
| DEC-2021 | \$8,500,000 | $33181 / 01775$ | WARRANTY DEED | LAKE PARK 1100 LLC |
| DEC-2013 | \$0 | 26545/01534 | WARranty deed | kEREKES LAND TRUST PROPERTIES EAST LLC |
| JUN-2004 | \$621,635 | 17185/00950 | WARranty deed | KEREKES LAND TRUST No 9 |
| JAN-1995 | \$625,000 | 08592/01100 | WARRANTY DEED | KENNELLY John b |
| SEP-1990 | \$750,000 | 06583/01640 | WARRANTY DEED |  |
| JAN-1978 | \$175,000 | 02887/01661 |  |  |
| JAN-1975 | \$100 | 02488/01169 | WARRANTY DEED |  |
| Exemption Information |  |  |  |  |
| No Exemption information available |  |  |  |  |

Property Information
Number of Units 0
*Total Square Feet 0
Use Code 4800 - WAREH/DIST TERM
Zoning MUPD - MULTIPLE USE PLANNED DEV' ( 00 -UNINCORPORATED $)$

| Appraisals |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Year | 2023 | 2022 | 2021 |
| Improvement Value | \$174,577 | \$151,985 | \$0 |
| Land Value | \$7,315,037 | \$6,966,702 | \$3,483,351 |
| Total Market Value | \$7,489,614 | \$7,118,687 | \$3,483,351 |
| All values are as of January 1st each year |  |  |  |
| Assessed and Taxable Values |  |  |  |
| Tax Year | 2023 | 2022 | 2021 |
| Assessed Value | \$7,489,614 | \$7,118,687 | \$3,405,477 |
| Exemption Amount | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Taxable Value | \$7,489,614 | \$7,118,687 | \$3,405,477 |
| Taxes |  |  |  |
| Tax Year | 2023 | 2022 | 2021 |
| Ad Valorem | \$122,976 | \$119,865 | \$59,685 |
| Non Ad Valorem | \$3,681 | \$3,530 | \$3,380 |
| Total tax | \$126,657 | \$123,395 | \$63,065 |

Dorothy Jacks, CFA, AAS PALM BEACH COUNTY PROPERTY APPRAISER www.pbcgov.org/PAPA
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EXhibit 2: Survey \& FLUA

Boynton Beach Place - Palm Beach County Policy 3.5 D T: (561) GO2-JFOG•www.jfogroupinc.com•info@jfo.us
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## Exhibit 3: PBC Trip Generation Rates
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Palm Beach County Trip Generation Rates
(Must be used with traffic studies submitted to the County on or after 9/1/2022. However, immediate use is highly recommended)

| Gr | Landuse | ITE Code | Unit | Daily Rate/Equation | Pass-By \% | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | In/Out | Rate/Equation | In/Out | Rate/Equation |
|  | General Light Industrial | 110 | 1000 S.F. | 4.87 | 10\% | 88/12 | 0.74 | 14/86 | 0.65 |
| $\cdots$ | Manufacturing | 140 | 1000 S.F. | 4.75 | 10\% | 76/24 | 0.68 | 31/69 | 0.74 |
| ¢ | Warehouse | 150 | 1000 S.F. | 1.71 | 10\% | 77/23 | 0.17 | 28/72 | 0.18 |
| 읃 | Mini-Warehouse/SS | 151 | 1000 S.F. | 1.45 | 10\% | 59/41 | 0.09 | 47/53 | 0.15 |
|  | HCF Center Warehouse - Non Sort | 155 | 1000 S.F. | 1.81 | 10\% | 81/19 | 0.15 | 39/61 | 0.16 |
|  | Single Family Detached | 210 | Dwelling Unit | 10 | 0\% | 26/74 | 0.7 | 63/37 | 0.94 |
|  | Multifamily Low-Rise Housing upto 3 story (Apartment/Condo/TH) | 220 | Dwelling Unit | 6.74 | 0\% | 24/76 | 0.4 | 63/37 | 0.51 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\widetilde{T}}{\stackrel{0}{0}} \\ & \text { O} \end{aligned}$ | Multifamily Mid-Rise Housing 4-10 story (Apartment/Condo/TH) | 221 | Dwelling Unit | 4.54 | 0\% | 23/77 | 0.37 | 61/39 | 0.39 |
| $\stackrel{N}{\mathscr{0}}$ | 55+ SF Detached | 251 | Dwelling Unit | 4.31 | 0\% | 33/67 | 0.24 | 61/39 | 0.30 |
|  | 55+ SF Attached | 252 | Dwelling Unit | 3.24 | 0\% | 34/66 | 0.2 | 56/44 | 0.25 |
|  | Congregate Care Facility | 253 | Dwelling Unit | 2.21 | 0\% | 58/42 | 0.08 | 49/51 | 0.18 |
|  | Assisted Living Facility | 254 | Beds | 2.6 | 0\% | 60/40 | 0.18 | 39/61 | 0.24 |
| Ldg | Hotel | 310 | Rooms | 7.99 | 10\% | 56/44 | 0.46 | 51/49 | 0.59 |
| O | Golf Course | 430 | Holes | 30.38 | 5\% | 79/21 | 1.76 | 53/47 | 2.91 |
| $\underline{\square}$ | Health/Fitness Club | 492 | 1000 S.F. | 32.93 | 5\% | 51/49 | 1.31 | 57/43 | 3.45 |
|  | Elementary School | 520 | Students | 2.27 | 0\% | 54/46 | 0.74 | 46/54 | 0.16 |
|  | Middle/Junior School | 522 | Students | 2.1 | 0\% | 54/46 | 0.67 | 48/52 | 0.15 |
| ত | High School | 525 | Students | 1.94 | 0\% | 68/32 | 0.52 | 48/52 | 0.14 |
| 윽 | Private School (K-8) | 530 | Students | $3.17{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0\% | 56/44 | 1.01 | 46/54 | 0.26 |
| 뀿 | Private School (K-12) | 532 | Students | 2.48 | 0\% | 63/37 | 0.79 | 43/57 | 0.17 |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text { c }}$ | Church/Synagogue ${ }^{\circ}$ | 560 | 1000 S.F. | 7.6 | 5\% | 62/38 | 0.32 | 44/56 | 0.49 |
|  | Day Care | 565 | Students | 4.09 | 50\% | 53/47 | 0.78 | 47/53 | 0.79 |
|  | Library | 590 | 1000 S.F. | 72.05 | 10\% | 71/29 | 1 | 48/52 | 8.16 |
| \% | Hospital | 610 | 1000 S.F. | 10.77 | 10\% | 67/33 | 0.82 | 35/65 | 0.86 |
| 之 | Nursing Home | 620 | Beds | 3.06 | 10\% | 72/28 | 0.14 | 33/67 | 0.14 |
|  | General Office (10k-250k SF GFA) ${ }^{\text {n }}$ | 710 | 1000 S.F. | 10.84 | 10\% | 88/12 | 1.52 | 17/83 | 1.44 |
|  | General Office (>250k SF GFA) ${ }^{\text {h }}$ | 710 | 1000 S.F. | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.87 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+3.05$ | 10\% | 88/12 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.86 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+1.16$ | 17/83 | 1.44 |
| ¢ | Small Office Building (<=10k SF GFA) | 712 | 1000 S.F. | 14.39 | 10\% | 82/18 | 1.67 | 34/66 | 2.16 |
| O | Medical Office (Stand-Alone) | 720 | 1000 S.F. | $\mathrm{T}=42.97(\mathrm{X})-108.01$ | 10\% | 79/21 | 3.10 | 30/70 | 3.93 |
|  | Medical Office (Near Hospital) | 720 | 1000 S.F. | 31.86 | 10\% | 81/19 | 2.68 | 25/75 | 2.84 |
|  | Government Office | 730 | 1000 S.F. | 22.59 | 10\% | 75/25 | 3.34 | 25/75 | 1.71 |

Palm Beach County Trip Generation Rates
(Must be used with traffic studies submitted to the County on or after $9 / 1 / 2022$. However, immediate use is highly recommended)

| Gr | Landuse | ITE Code | Unit | Daily Rate/Equation | Pass-By \% | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | In/Out | Rate/Equation | In/Out | Rate/Equation |
| $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\bar{W}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ | Nursery (Garden Center) | 817 | Acre | 108.1 | 0\% | 50/50 | 2.82 | 50/50 | 8.06 |
|  | Nursery (Wholesale) | 818 | Acre | 19.50 | 0\% | 50/50 | 0.23 | 50/50 | 0.36 |
|  | Landscape Services | PBC | Acre ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 121.70 | 0\% | 40/60 | 34.4 | 58/42 | 15.1 |
|  | Shop Center (>150ksf) | 820 | $1000 \text { S.F. }$ | 37.01 | 24\% | 62/38 | 0.84 | 48/52 | 3.4 |
|  | Shop Plaza (40-150ksf) w/Sup Market | 821 | $1000 \text { S.F. }$ | 94.49 | 39\% | 62/38 | 3.53 | 48/52 | 9.03 |
|  | Shop Plaza (40-150ksf) w/out Sup Market | 821 | 1000 S.F. | 67.52 | 39\% | 62/38 | 1.73 | 49/51 | 5.19 |
|  | Strip Retail Plaza (<40ksf) | 822 | 1000 S.F. | 54.45 | 63\% | 60/40 | 2.36 | 50/50 | 6.59 |
|  | Automobile Sales (New) | 840 | 1000 S.F. | 27.84 | 15\% | 73/27 | 1.86 | 40/60 | 2.42 |
|  | Automobile Parts Sales | 843 | 1000 S.F. | 54.57 | 28\% | 55/45 | 2.51 | 48/52 | 4.9 |
|  | Tire Store | 848 | 1000 S.F. | 27.69 | 28\% | 64/36 | 2.61 | 43/57 | 3.75 |
|  | Supermarket | 850 | 1000 S.F. | 93.84 | 36\% | 59/41 | 2.86 | 50/50 | 8.95 |
|  | Pharmacy + DT | 881 | 1000 S.F. | 108.40 | 50\% | 52/48 | 3.74 | 50/50 | 10.25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 』 } \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \underset{\vdots}{\infty} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Drive-In Bank | 912 | 1000 S.F. | 100.35 | 47\% | 58/42 | 9.95 | 50/50 | 21.01 |
|  | Fine Dining Restaurant | 931 | 1000 S.F. | 83.84 | 44\% | 50/50 | 0.73 | 67/33 | 7.8 |
|  | High Turnover Sit-Down Rest. | 932 | 1000 S.F. | 107.2 | 43\% | 55/45 | 9.57 | 61/39 | 9.05 |
|  | Fast Food Restaurant w/o DT | 933 | 1000 S.F. | 450.49 | 45\% | 58/42 | 43.18 | 50/50 | 33.21 |
|  | Fast Food Restaurant + DT | 934 | 1000 S.F. | 467.48 | 49\% | 51/49 | 44.61 | 52/48 | 33.03 |
|  | Coffee/Donut Shop w/o DT | 936 | 1000 S.F. | $441.88{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 45\% | 51/49 | 93.08 | 50/50 | 32.29 |
|  | Coffee/Donut Shop + DT | 937 | 1000 S.F. | 533.57 | 49\% | 51/49 | 85.88 | 50/50 | 38.99 |
|  | Coffee/Donut Shop + DT w/No Seat | 938 | DT Lanes | 179 | 49\% | 50/50 | 39.81 | 50/50 | 15.08 |
|  | Gas Station w/Convenience Store ${ }^{\mathrm{e}}$ | FDOT | FP, 1000 S.F. | 14.3*PM Trips | 61\% | 50/50 | Note f | 50/50 | 12.3*FP+15.5*(X) |
|  | Carwash (Automated) ${ }^{\text {g }}$ | PBC | Lane | 166.00 | 0\% | 50/50 | 11.97 | 50/50 | 13.65 |

a) Based on Daily to AM peak ratio for LUC 532 (Private School (K-12)
b) Weekend peak hour rate $=10.36$ per 1,000 s.f. with a $48 / 52$ directional split
c) Landscape Services acreage consists of overnight vehicle and equipment storage as well as areas (covered or uncovered) for chemicals, fertilizers,
landscape materials (excluding plants) and other items needed for day-to-day operations. Not included are drive aisles, customer/employee parking,
structures shared by nursery and landscape services, facilities that solely serve the onsite landscape activities or any nursery growing areas.
d) Based on Daily to PM ratio for ITE Code 937 (Coffee Donut Shop + DT)

Modification History 3/2/2020: Added Landscape Services, modification history, edited formatting 7/25/2022: Updated with ITE TG Manual 11th ed information
e) FP=Fueling Position. Use both FP and Convenience Store size in estimating trips using the provided equation. Note that no internalization
between the gas pumps and convenience store, as per ULDC Artice 12, should be applied to estimate the net trips.
f) Use PM rates
g) Daily rate taken from PBC trip gen. study. Peak hour rates derived by applying peak to daily ratios for gas station to daily carwash rate from older ITE TGM. New PBC rate study underway. h) Based on PBC analysis of ITE TGM data plots

Land Use: 942 Automobile Care Center

## Description

An automobile care center houses numerous businesses that provide automobile-related services, such as repair and servicing, stereo installation, and seat cover upholstering. Quick lubrication vehicle shop (Land Use 941) and automobile parts and service center (Land Use 943) are related uses.

## Additional Data

The sites were surveyed in the 1980s and the 1990s in California and Florida.

## Source Numbers

267, 273, 439, 715

## Automobile Care Center

 (942)Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic
One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 6
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 17
Directional Distribution: 66\% entering, $34 \%$ exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.25 | $1.20-5.30$ | 1.49 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Automobile Care Center

 (942)Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 6
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 17
Directional Distribution: 48\% entering, 52\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.11 | $1.87-5.65$ | 1.09 |

Data Plot and Equation
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| $3.0 \%$ | 4 |
| :--- | :--- |

Demand
0
Balanced

| $3.0 \%$ | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |

Demand

| Net External Trips for Multi- Use Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LAND USE A | LAND USE B | LAND USE C | LAND USE D | LAND USE E | LAND USE F | TOTAL |  |
| Enter | 135 | 31 | 310 | 107 | 76 | 0 | 659 |  |
| Exit | 134 | 32 | 309 | 107 | 76 | 0 | 658 |  |
| Total | 269 | 63 | 619 | 214 | 152 | 0 | 1,317 |  |
| Single-Use TG. Est. | 290 | 70 | 640 | 233 | 166 | 0 | 1,399 |  |
|  | $7.24 \%$ | $10.00 \%$ | $3.28 \%$ | $8.15 \%$ | $8.43 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $5.86 \%$ |  |



| $5.0 \%$ | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |

Demand
0
Balanced

| $5.0 \%$ | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |

Demand

| Net External Trips for Multi- Use Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LAND USE A | LAND USE B | LAND USE C | LAND USE D | LAND USE E | LAND USE F | TOTAL |
| Enter | 10 | 4 | 53 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 83 |
| Exit | 7 | 1 | 49 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 68 |
| Total | 17 | 5 | 102 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 151 |
| Single-Use TG. Est. | 18 | 5 | 103 | 17 | 12 | 0 | 155 |
|  | $5.56 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.97 \%$ | $5.88 \%$ | $8.33 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $2.58 \%$ |



| $5.0 \%$ | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| De |  |

Demand
0
Balanced

| $5.0 \%$ | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |

Demand

| Net External Trips for Multi- Use Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LAND USE A | LAND USE B | LAND USE C | LAND USE D | LAND USE E | LAND USE F | TOTAL |  |
| Enter | 12 | 2 | 23 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 54 |  |
| Exit | 15 | 4 | 22 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 58 |  |
| Total | 27 | 6 | 45 | 21 | 13 | 0 | 112 |  |
| Single-Use TG. Est. | 30 | 6 | 47 | 23 | 14 | 0 | 120 |  |
|  | $10.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $4.26 \%$ | $8.70 \%$ | $7.14 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $6.67 \%$ |  |
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## Exhibit 5: 2045 Volumes
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SERPM 82045 Cost Feasible Adjusted Two-Way Traffic Volumes - Palm Beach County

| PBC Station | FDOT Station | Roadway | From | To | Existing <br> Lanes |  | $2005$ <br> Counts | $\begin{aligned} & 2010 \\ & \text { Count } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2015 \\ & \text { Count } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2018 \\ & \text { Count } \end{aligned}$ | 2015 <br> Model | $\begin{gathered} 2045 \\ \text { Model } \end{gathered}$ | $2045$ <br> Adjusted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6886 | 937492 | BOCA RATON BLVD | 28th St NW | Yamato Rd | 4 | 4 | 23,928 | 17,861 | 24,622 | 26,251 | 18,477 | 13,815 | 20,000 |
| 6884 | 937417 | BOCA RATON BLVD | Yamato Rd | Clint Moore Rd | 2 | 2 | 17,870 | 16,732 | 19,176 | 21,066 | 5,432 | 6,871 | 20,600 |
| 6882 | 937417 | BOCA RATON BLVD | Clint Moore Rd | Hidden Valley Blvd | 2 | 2 | 13,608 | 11,454 | 14,849 | 14,966 | 5,432 | 6,871 | 16,300 |
| 6302 | 937453 | BOCA RATON BLVD | Hidden Valley Blvd | C-15 Canal | 2 | 2 | 5,464 | 3,804 | 4,005 | 4,738 | 5,817 | 7,039 | 5,200 |
| 6418 | 937140 | BOCA RIO RD | SW 18th St | Palmetto Park Rd | 2 | 2 | 13,715 | 12,511 | 12,717 | 14,800 | 12,818 | 12,931 | 12,800 |
| 6408 | 937139 | BOCA RIO RD | Palmetto Park Rd | Glades Rd | 2 | 2 | 18,152 | 16,883 | 16,394 | 18,280 | 14,441 | 14,592 | 16,600 |
| 4676 | 937118 | BOUTWELL RD | 2nd Ave N | 10th Av N | 2 | 2 | 10,779 | 8,559 | 10,337 | 11,365 | 3,957 | 5,917 | 12,300 |
| 5401 | 930408 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | SR-7 | Lyons Rd | 4 | 4 | 15,092 | 13,721 | 15,242 | 16,207 | 14,080 | 20,158 | 21,800 |
| 5103 | 937237 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | Lyons Rd | Turnpike | 6 | 6 | 26,352 | 28,144 | 37,476 | 42,725 | 28,521 | 41,784 | 50,700 |
| 5201 | 935201 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | Turnpike | Hagen Ranch Rd | 6 | 6 | 41,174 | 40,167 | 46,955 | 55,602 | 41,735 | 46,276 | 52,100 |
| 5641 | 937240 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | Hagen Ranch Rd | Jog Rd | 6 | 6 | 44,733 | 37,786 | 41,813 | 48,018 | 32,849 | 44,656 | 53,600 |
| 5633 | 937239 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | Jog Rd | El Clair Ranch Rd | 6 | 6 | 44,668 | 37,450 | 39,735 | 43,748 | 31,189 | 41,233 | 49,800 |
| 5611 | 930153 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | El Clair Ranch Rd | Military Tr | 6 | 6 | 51,515 | 42,597 | 45,350 | 49,428 | 35,067 | 44,471 | 54,800 |
| 5613 | 930058 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | Military Tr | Lawrence Rd | 6 | 6 | 38,992 | 42,179 | 37,509 | 41,234 | 13,992 | 17,046 | 40,600 |
| 5601 | 937238 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | Lawrence Rd | Congress Ave | 6 | 6 | 45,860 | 41,780 | 40,732 | 41,620 | 21,972 | 27,384 | 46,100 |
| 5615 | 930285 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | Congress Ave | Old Boynton Rd | 6 | 6 | 39,769 | 43,209 | 34,792 | 37,388 | 26,947 | 37,373 | 45,200 |
| 5203 | 935042 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | Old Boynton Rd | High Ridge Rd | 6 | 6 | 48,405 | 47,361 | 47,876 | - | 51,421 | 56,528 | 52,600 |
|  | 930064 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | High Ridge Rd | 1-95 | 6 | 6 |  |  | - | - | 48,821 | 51,600 | 51,600 |
| 5301 | 935403 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | 1-95 | Seacrest Blvd | 5 | 5 | 34,557 | 31,740 | 35,624 | 32,000 | 28,822 | 48,363 | 59,800 |
| 5807 | 935408 | BOYNTON BEACH BLVD | Seacrest Blvd | US-1 | 5 | 5 | 17,887 | 15,339 | 18,570 | 19,500 | 12,765 | 25,942 | 31,700 |
| 3829 | 937544 | BUNKER RD | US 1 | Parker Ave | 2 | 2 | 7,041 | - | 2,900 | 4,600 | 722 | 732 | 2,900 |
| 2305 | 937349 | BURNS RD | SR 811 | Military Tr | 4 | 4 | 22,681 | 18,214 | 18,461 | 16,900 | 17,453 | 19,960 | 21,100 |
| 2835 | 937350 | BURNS RD | Sandalwood Ct | SR-811 | 4 | 4 | 20,527 | 18,244 | 18,096 | 17,300 | 11,353 | 12,918 | 19,700 |
| 2839 | 937351 | BURNS RD | Prosperity Farms Rd | Sandalwood Cir | 4 | 4 | 7,122 | 8,918 | 9,032 | 8,900 | 5,907 | 6,811 | 9,900 |
| 6638 | 938550 | BUTTS RD | Glades Rd | Town Center Rd | 2 | 2 | 11,749 | 10,859 | 12,216 | 11,294 | 15,789 | 24,347 | 20,800 |
| 6627 | 938550 | BUTTS RD | Military Tr | Glades Rd | 2 | 2 | 10,082 | 8,743 | 9,085 | 9,698 | 15,789 | 24,347 | 17,600 |
| 6422 | 937157 | CAIN BLVD | Glades Rd | W Kimberly Blvd | 3 | 3 | 16,875 | 15,633 | 14,742 | 15,518 | 9,221 | 11,778 | 17,300 |
| 6426 | 937158 | CAIN BLVD | W Kimberly Blvd | Yamato Rd | 3 | 3 | 9,846 | 9,253 | 8,960 | 9,770 | 7,297 | 9,536 | 11,700 |
|  | 6426a | CAIN BLVD | Yamato Rd | Boca Chase Dr | 3 | 3 |  |  | - | - | 9,167 | 11,293 | 11,300 |
|  | 937540 | CAMINO DEL MAR | SW 18th St | Camino Real | 2 | 2 |  |  | - | - | 4,942 | 5,871 | 5,900 |
| 6839 | 6839 | CAMINO GARDENS BLVD | SW 9th Ave | SW Boca Raton Blvd | 2 | 2 | 4,048 | 3,819 | 4,003 | 3,853 | 1,597 | 2,985 | 5,400 |
| 6619 | 937067 | CAMINO REAL | Powerline Rd | Camino del Mar | 4 | 4 | 11,873 | 10,288 | 10,748 | 13,036 | 9,119 | 17,266 | 20,400 |
| 6636 | 937218 | CAMINO REAL | Camino del Mar | Military Tr | 4 | 4 | 15,548 | 12,674 | 14,221 | 16,203 | 32,729 | 37,514 | 19,000 |
| 6311 | 937412 | CAMINO REAL | Military Tr | 12th Ave SW | 4 | 4 | 17,192 | 14,853 | 16,510 | 17,874 | 6,761 | 9,938 | 19,700 |
| 6849 | 937412 | CAMINO REAL | 12th Ave SW | 3rd Ave SW | 4 | 4 | 14,052 | 13,312 | 14,275 | 14,022 | 6,761 | 9,938 | 17,500 |
| 6853 | 937412 | CAMINO REAL | 3rd Ave SW | Old Dixie Hwy | 4 | 4 | 21,519 | 22,924 | 22,542 | 19,422 | 6,761 | 9,938 | 25,700 |
| 6855 | 860490 | CAMINO REAL | Old Dixie Hwy | US 1 | 4 | 4 | 17,110 | 15,158 | 20,413 | 17,452 | 35,583 | 43,804 | 28,600 |
| 6857 | 937597 | CAMINO REAL | US 1 | ICWW Bridge | 4 | 4 | 14,090 | 14,055 | 15,076 | 13,700 | 8,269 | 11,229 | 18,000 |
| 6859 | 937597 | CAMINO REAL | ICWW Bridge | A1A | 2 | 2 | 7,429 | 8,875 | 9,562 | 8,351 | 8,269 | 11,229 | 13,000 |
|  | 937519 | CAMPUS DR | Rca Blvd | Gardens Parkway | 2 | 2 |  |  | - | - | 2,797 | 4,225 | 4,200 |
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Exhibit 6: Active FLUA Amendments
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## 2022 FUTURE LAND USE ATLAS AMENDMENT APPLICATION

## Part 1. Amendment Data

## A. Amendment Data

| Round | 23-B | Intake Date | November 9, 2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application Name | Boynton Place MUPD | Control No. | 1997-00004 |
| Acres | 8.86 (See Survey at Attachment P) | Concurrent Zoning application? | Yes |
|  |  | Text Amend? | No |
| PCNs | 00-42-45-22-00-000-5030 |  |  |
| Location | Generally located on the north side of Boynton Beach Boulevard, east of Jog Road |  |  |
|  | Current |  | Proposed |
| Tier | Urban/Suburban | Urban/ Suburban |  |
| Use | General Industrial | Commercial |  |
| Zoning | Single Family Residential (RS) | Multiple Use (MUPD) | Planned Development |
| Future Land Use Designation | 3.96 acres (West side of property)Commercial High (CH) <br> 4.90 acres (East side of property) Commercial Low Office (CLO) | 8.86 acres Commercial Low (CL) |  |
| Underlying Future Land Use Designation | Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) | Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) |  |
| Conditions | Condition of Approval \#B. 1 (per Ordinance No. 1997-011): That Unity of Control for the subject parcel and the parcels identified by Property Control Numbers 00-42-45-22-00-000-5040 and 00-4~-45-22-00-000-5020, which together with the subject parcel are the subject of Palm Beach County Zoning Petition \#PDD97-04, in a form approved ty the County Attorney and recorded in the public records; and two (2) recorded copies provided to the Palm Beach County Planning Division prior to final site plan certification. <br> Condition of Approval \#B. 2 (per Ordinance No. 1997-011): The site plan for the properties contained within the Unity of Control described in I.B.I. shall include a 35 landscape buffer on the north and east property lines which shall include a continuous 4' berm, hedges and trees, and solid 6' wall. | Condition of Approval \#B.1:That Unity of Control for the subject parcel and the parcels identified by Property Control Numbers 00-42-45-22-00-000-5040 and 00-4~-45-22-00-000-5020, which together with the subject parcel are the subject of Palm Beach County Zoning Petition \#PDD97-04, in a form approved ty the County Attorney and recorded in the public records; and two (2) recorded copies provided to the Palm Beach County Planning Division prior to final site plan certification. <br> Condition of Approval \#B.2: The site plan for the properties contained within the Unity of Control described in I.B.I. shall include a 20' landscape buffer on the north and east property lines which shall include a continuous 3' berm, hedges and trees, and solid 8' wall. |  |
| Density Bonus | None | None |  |
| Total Number of Units | None | None |  |

## B. Development Potential

|  | Current FLU | Proposed FLU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Density/Intensity: | 0.5 FAR or 5 DU/acre | 0.5 FAR (0.85 FAR for self-storage) or 5 DU/acre |
| Maximum Dwelling Units ${ }^{1}$ (residential designations) | $5 \mathrm{DU} \times 8.86 \mathrm{ac} .=44$ units | 5 DU x 8.86 ac. $=44$ units |
| Maximum Beds (for CLF proposals) | Not applicable | Not applicable |
| Population Estimate | 44 max DU x 2.39= 105 persons | 44 max DU $\times 2.39=105$ persons |
| Maximum Square Feet 2,4 (non-residential designations) | 0.5 FAR $\times 4.90$ ac. $=106,722$ SF Medical Office. <br> 0.5 FAR $\times 3.96$ ac. $=86,249$ SF Retail. | 0.5 FAR x $8.86 \mathrm{ac} .=192,971 \mathrm{SF}$ Medical Office. |
| Proposed or Conditioned Potential 3,4 | ---- | 200,000 SF Mini-Warehouse/SS, 2,500 SF Automobile Sales, 1,200 SF Coffee/Donut Shop DT, 7,500 SF Automobile Care Center and a 3,275 SF (One lane) Carwash. |
| Max Trip Generator | Medical Office [ITE Code 720]: $\mathrm{T}=42.97 \mathrm{X}-108.01$ <br> Shop Plaza (40-150ksf) W/Sup Market <br> [ITE Code 821]: <br> 94.49 Per 1000 sf | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Medical Office [ITE Code 720]: } \\ & \mathrm{T}=42.97 \mathrm{X}-108.01 \end{aligned}$ |
| Maximum Trip Generation | 8,325 daily trips | 7,366 daily trips |
| Net Daily Trips: | -959 (maximum - current) <br> $-7,347$ (maximum - proposed) |  |
| Net PH Trips: | 538 ( $425 \ln / 113$ Out) AM, 682 (173 In/510 98 ( $55 \mathrm{In} / 43$ Out) AM, 86 (42 In/44 Out) P | Out) PM (maximum) M (proposed) |

1. Maximum units per acre see Future Land Use Element;
2. Maximum FAR see FLUE. If the site's acreage is large enough to be a planned development, utilize the PDD maximum whether or not a PDD is proposed. If the site's acreage does not meet the minimum PDD thresholds, the non-PDD maximum may be utilized.
3. For applications with a voluntary condition for a maximum development potential and use which will become binding in the adopting ordinance;
4. FLUA Amendments with a concurrent zoning application must calculate maximum development potential at the typical use \& trip generation (eg. General Retail for Commercial future land uses) and in addition, calculate the trip generation for the actual proposed zoning application.

## 2022 FUTURE LAND USE ATLAS AMENDMENT APPLICATION

## Part 2. Applicant Data

## A. Agent Information

Identify the information for the agent processing the application. The agent will be the primary contact for Planning Division staff throughout the amendment process.

| Name | Josh Nichols, LEED AP |
| :--- | :--- |
| Company Name | Schmidt Nichols |
| Address | 1551 N Flagler Drive, Suite 102 |
| City, State, Zip | West Palm Beach FL 33401 |
| Phone / Fax Number | 561-684-6141 |
| Email Address | jnichols@snlandplan.com |

## B. Applicant Information

Identify the information for each Property Owner and Contract Purchaser. Duplicate table as needed.

|  | Applicant A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Name | Carl Jobson, MGR |
| Company Name | Job-Man Development, LLC |
| Address | 10000 Madarin Street |
| City, State, Zip | Parkland, FL33076 |
| Phone / Fax Number | Please Contact Agent |
| Email Address | Please Contact Agent |
| Interest | Property Owner, 50\% |


|  | Applicant B |
| :--- | :--- |
| Name | Daniel Mancini, MGR |
| Company Name | Job-Man Development, LLC |
| Address | 3100 S.W. 15 |
| th Street |  |
| City, State, Zip | Deerfield Beach, FL 33442 |
| Phone / Fax Number | Please Contact Agent |
| Email Address | Please Contact Agent |
| Interest | Property Owner, 50\% |
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EXhibit 8: Policy 3.5-D Approval

Boynton Beach Place - Palm Beach County Policy 3.5 D T: (561) GO2-JFOG•www.jfogroupinc.com•info@jfo.us
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## Department of Engineering and Public Works

P.O. Box 21229

West Palm Beach, FL 33416-1229

> (561) 684-4000

FAX: (561) 684-4050
www.pbcgov.com

Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners

Gregg K. Weiss, Mayor
Maria Sachs, Vice Mayor
Maria G. Marino
Michael A. Barnett
Marci Woodward
Sara Baxter
Mack Bernard

County Administrator
Verdenia C. Baker

August 31, 2023

Anna Lai, P.E., PTOE
Simmons \& White
2581 Metrocentre Boulevard West, Suite 3
West Palm Beach, FL 33407

## RE: Boynton Beach Place <br> FLUA Amendment Policy 3.5-d Review <br> Round 2022-23-B

Dear Anna:
Palm Beach County Traffic Division has reviewed the Land Use Plan Amendment Application Traffic Statement for the proposed Future Land Use Amendment for the above-referenced project, revised June 12, 2023, pursuant to Policy $3.5-\mathrm{d}$ of the Land Use Element of the Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan. The project is summarized as follows:

| Location: | North side of Boynton Beach Boulevard, east of Jog Road |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCN: | 00-42-45-22-00-000-5030 |  |
| Acres: | 8.89 Acres |  |
|  | Current FLU | Proposed FLU |
| FLU: | (Commercial High (CH) on 3.99 acres <br> And <br> Commercial Low Office (CL-O) on 4.9 acres)/Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR-5) | Commercial High (CH)/Medium Residential, 5 units per acre (MR5) |
| Zoning: | Single Family Residential (RS) | Mixed Use Plan Development (MUPD) |
| Density/ Intensity: | 0.5 FAR for 4.9 acres | 0.85 FAR for 4.9 acres |
| Maximum <br> Potential: | $\begin{gathered} \text { Medical Office }(\text { Stand-Alone })= \\ 106,722 \mathrm{SF} \end{gathered}$ | Shopping Center ( $>150 \mathrm{ksf}$ ) $=$ 181,427 SF |
| Proposed Potential: | None | ```Mini-Warehouse/SS \(=250,001\) SF Automobile Sales (New) \(=2,500\) SF Fast Food Rest. + DT \(=800 \mathrm{SF}\) Automobile Care Center \(=7,500\) SF Carwash (Automated) \(=1\) Lane``` |
| Net Daily | 1,073 (maximum - current) |  |

Anna Lai, P.E., PTOE
August 31, 2023
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| Trips: | $-3,057$ (maximum - proposed) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Net PH | $116(71 / 45)$ AM, $469(225 / 244)$ PM (maximum) |
| Trips: | $72(42 / 30)$ AM, $89(43 / 46)$ PM (proposed) |
| *Maximum indicates typical FAR and maximum trip generator. Proposed indicates |  |
| the specific uses and intensities/densities anticipated in the zoning application. |  |

Based on the review, the Traffic Division has concluded that the proposed amendment will have a negligible impact on traffic. The Long Range analysis suggests reduced impact, while Test 2 analysis shows insignificance on the roadway network. These findings meet Policy 3.5-d of the Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Element at the proposed potential density shown above. As such, a condition of approval is required to restrict this amendment to the proposed development potential or use(s) generating equivalent trips.

Please contact me at 561-684-4030 or email me at DSimeus@pbcgov.org with any questions.

Sincerely,


Dominique Simeus, P.E.
Professional Engineer
Traffic Division

```
DS:jb
ec:
    Quazi Bari, P.E., PTOE - Manager - Growth Management, Traffic Division
    Lisa Amara - Director, Zoning Division
    Bryan Davis - Principal Planner, Planning Division
    Stephanie Gregory - Principal Planner, Planning Division
    Khurshid Mohyuddin - Principal Planner, Planning Division
    Kathleen Chang - Senior Planner, Planning Division
    David Wiloch - Senior Planner, Planning Division
    Alberto Lopez Tagle - Technical Assistant lll, Traffic Division
```

File: General - TPS - Unincorporated - Traffic Study Review
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We specialize in Traffic Enginemeing and Transportation Planning solutions in the context of Land Development for both public and private clients. In addition to representing our clients and projects in municipalities and counties where our expertise is required, and in front of any applicable agencies such as Departments of Transportation, we have also worked on behalf of several agencies and municipalities. JFO GROUP INC holds Certificates of Authorization (COA) to practice Professional Engineering in the States of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina and Alabama.


[^0]:    DS:jb
    ec:
    Quazi Bari, P.E., PTOE - Manager - Growth Management, Traftic Division
    Bryan Davis - Principal Planner, Planning Division
    Stephanie Gregory - Principal Planner, Planning Division
    Khurshid Mohyuddin - Principal Planner, Planning Division
    Kathleen Chang - Senior Planner, Planning Division
    David Wiloch - Senior Planner, Planning Division
    Alberto Lopez Tagle - Technical Assistant III, Traffic Division

    File: General - TPS - Unincorporated - Traffic Study Review
    N:TTRAFFIC\Development Review\Comp Plan\23-B\Boynton Beach Place - Revised.docx

[^1]:    1 4.90 Acres X 0.5 FAR X 43,560 SF/Acre
    2 3.96 Acres X 0.5 FAR X 43,560 SF/Acre

[^2]:    1 8.86 Acres X 0.5 FAR X 43,560 SF/Acre

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ According to the Palm Beach TPA, the 2045 adjusted traffic volumes were calculated based on the difference between the 2015 base year model outputs and the 2015 observed traffic counts and rounded to the nearest hundred vehicles using one of the following equations:

    $$
    \begin{gathered}
    \qquad \text { if } \frac{2015 \text { Observed }}{2015 \text { Model }}>0.8 \text { and } \frac{2015 \text { Observed }}{2015 \text { Model }}<1.2, \\
    \text { then } 2045 \text { Adjusted }=\frac{2045 \text { Model }}{2015 \text { Model }} \times 2015 \text { Observed } \\
    \text { if } \frac{2015 \text { Observed }}{2015 \text { Model }}<1.2 \text { or } \frac{2015 \text { Observed }}{2015 \text { Model }}>0.8 \text {, then } 2045 \text { Adjusted }=\frac{2045 \text { Model }}{2015 \text { Model }} \times 2015 \text { Observed }
    \end{gathered}
    $$

