

Comments Received at Meeting of Environmental Organization Representatives: August 14, 2014	
Topic 1:	Future Vision of the Agricultural Reserve
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<p>OBJECTIVE 1.5 The Agricultural Reserve Tier</p> <p>Objective: Palm Beach County shall preserve the unique farmland and wetlands in order to preserve and enhance agricultural activity, environmental and water resources, and open space within the Agricultural Reserve Tier. This shall be accomplished by limiting uses to agriculture and conservation with residential development restricted to low densities and non-residential development limited to uses serving the needs of farmworkers and residents of the Tier. The Agricultural Reserve Tier shall be preserved primarily for agricultural use, reflecting the unique farmlands and wetlands within it.</p>
Comments:	<p>I would like Palm Beach County to be known nationwide and locally as one of the most productive farming areas, serving as a buffer to a restored Everglades, where birds no longer endangered fly freely to forage, where local grocers and restaurants proudly promote and sell our local produce, where residents who live in the Ag Reserve and elsewhere in the County understand and appreciate the unique role of the Ag Reserve in the reputation of the County and in their own quality of life.</p> <p>Preserve wetlands and keep buffer to northern Everglades habitat. Provide winter vegetable to palm Beach County for generations to come. Protect natural resources from urban growth, infrastructure, and runoff. Limit development. Promote northern Everglades habitat. Promote small farms and sustainable produce. No increased development; pressure on water supply and flood control.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Maintenance/expansion of agriculture-promotion as agricultural region-promote eat local movement 2) No more residential/commercial/industrial west of SR 7-this area should be a buffer to the refuge 3) Should closely resemble originally proposed master plan 4) Residential and other development uses should be strictly limited to protect/preserve agriculture 5) Agriculture should be preserved-once lost it is gone forever <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locavore promotion • Natural Area buffer • voter confidence in government promises • "ability to expand" is not a right • it is built out. stop building. • protecting the environment should not be compromised by short-term capitalism • step-down of densities to Refuge • Investigate conservation easements again (amendment 4 of 2011? changed things) • negative impacts on Refuge water levels just as west County energy center did to Corbett <p>I want to see agriculture-"no farms-no food" Without wetlands flooding risk increases Keep it the way it is! Maintain the agriculture. Local food production! Want to make development in the Ag Reserve more difficult - keep the existing</p>

	<p>Comprehensive plan. Protect agricultural jobs. Keep buffer for Loxahatchee Refuge. Every change leads to more change. Keep agriculture--no more building west of SR 7. Keep economic benefit of agriculture and wetlands! Protect 90 million dollar investment.</p>
	<p>We would like to see agricultural uses maintained with environmentally friendly practices. We want the Ag Reserve to continue to produce vegetables and fruits. We do not want to see increased development in the Ag Reserve. Increased development would put pressure on the environment and infrastructure (including water resources). We want to see the Ag Reserve continue to act as a buffer to the Loxahatchee Refuge and the Everglades ecosystem. We want to see the Ag Reserve maintained as agriculture.</p>
Topic 2:	Commercial Land Uses
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to those which serve the needs of the farmworker community, existing residents, and future residents of an AgR-PDD • In the form of an AgR-TMD • Within 1/4 mile of the intersections of Lyons Road with either Boynton Beach Boulevard or Atlantic Avenue. • Maximum of 80 acres and 750,000 square feet for the entire tier • County TDR program is limited to residential development rights • Ag Reserve is a Sending area for TDRs (one unit per acre) • Receiving areas within the Urban/Suburban Tier
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional 200 acres along main corridors • Require one TDR per acre of development area • Make necessary changes to TDR program
Comments	<p>The farmers who testified at the Ag Reserve meeting this spring all said that the more development that encircles them, the less viable that farming becomes. And the less viable businesses that supply farmers become. I would not support this change; in particular I would be concerned with the vague wording "main corridors" which seems open to broader interpretations as years go by.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't want to see any changes along main corridors • Make TDR harder to change • Don't want to increase TMDs in Ag Reserve • Follow zoning restrictions within master Plan • Ag Reserve needs to remain a sending area <p>1)Limit commercial to existing locations 2) maintain Ag Reserve as sending area, strengthen TDR program by limiting exceptions and require <u>ALL</u> density increases in receiving areas to be through TDRs Only allow receiving areas within Urban/Suburban Tier Do not allow Ag Reserve to be receiving area - this would be directly contrary to fundamental purpose of the Ag Reserve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hell no. • Development is forever. Conservation easements, TDR removals and set-asides and natural areas mitigation efforts should also be forever. • Why must all roads in south Florida be ugly strip malls and cheap commercial? • Every one of these proposals is a bad idea. Why must we go through each of them

	<p>one at a time?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TDR sending areas should not be receiving DRs <p>Never permit a seller of TDR to go back and get development. Oppose changes to the TDR program. Do not want to see additional development along main corridors. Don't support additional commercial development. There is already enough commercial. No more commercial. Don't change TDR program. Keep commercial to existing locations. Don't make Ag Reserve a receiving area. Keep existing Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>We are concerned because the proposal does not have enough detail to explain where this would be or what would be the requirements (e.g. is it 40:60?). It also does not define what type of commercial they want to allow or what would be the impact. How would this affect remained of the Ag Reserve or nearby areas and infrastructure? This would make it a receiving area, which is bad precedent. Would increase development, which we oppose.</p>
Topic 3:	60/40 PUD Development Area Size, Location and Density
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<p>Development area must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have a minimum of 100 acres • be located east of State Road 7 • have frontage on either State Road 7, State Road 806 (Atlantic Avenue), State Road 804 (Boynton Beach Boulevard), Clint Moore Road, Lyons Road extending north of Boynton Beach Boulevard or Lyons Road extending south of Atlantic Avenue and Acme Dairy Road extending south of Boynton Beach Boulevard to the L-28 canal. (Other roadways may be added by Plan amendment)
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce development area from 100 acres to 35 acres • Allow 60/40 PUDs anywhere in the Ag Reserve • Eliminate frontage requirement
Comments:	<p>Ditto response to #2. Particular concern would be eliminating frontage requirement- this more than anything would destroy integrity and purpose of Ag Reserve. Anything west of 441 is within A.R.M. Loxahatchee NWR acquisition boundary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not allow development west of State Road 7. • Continue to provide buffer to Strazzulla Marsh and Lox Refuge. • Keep frontage requirement but development only east of 441. • Do not reduce development size. See more novel approaches to selling land other than just for development. • Refuge may want to purchase lands west of 441 in the future as part of minor expansion proposal <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) All development areas <u>MUST</u> be east of SR 7, for buffering. 2) Agriculture is already strained due to encroachment of non- agr uses - frontage & minimum size requirements must be maintained. 3) With row crops-need minimum size- need to maintain as many large tracts of agricultural land as possible for long term viability. 4) Smaller development parcels would further segment ag parcels which increases infrastructure and other farming costs, reducing long term viability

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • why can't we just say no ...and stay with it • 35 acre developments result in city parks • agriculture needs minimum size to exist. Don't want to risk going below that. • What genius thought this up? • Long-term economic benefits come from agriculture. The long term drain of providing services comes from development (police, fire rescue, schools, roads, et al) <p>Keep existing Comprehensive Plan Do not change from 80/20 to 60/40. Where 80/20 exists we should keep it. No! Don't permit on the west side of SR 7. Do not make development easier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development areas must be located east of SR 7. • Should maintain the current frontage requirement in order to prevent increased need to create new roadways (unless allowed by Comp Plan) • Keep the Comprehensive Plan as it is. Do not make changes as proposed.
Topic 4:	Preserve Area Size/Location Criteria
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<p>Preserve area parcels for 60/40 PUDs must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contain a minimum contiguous area of 150 acres; or, • have a common boundary with other lands that aggregate to a total of 150 acres and 1) have a future land use designation of Conservation; and/or 2) that are designated as an Agricultural Reserve Preserve; and/or 3) that have had the development rights removed and remain in some type of open space
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eliminate minimum size/contiguity requirement
Comments:	<p>We oppose this proposal because it would be detrimental to the environment. It would prevent ecosystem connectivity, which is key for maintaining water quality and flow and supporting habitat for species in the Loxahatchee Refuge and the Greater Everglades Ecosystem. Isolating preserve area to smaller areas would not be effective in achieving the goal of preservation of connected agricultural lands as well.</p> <p>This change will destroy existing agriculture. Keep Comprehensive Plan as is. Agriculture needs to be contiguous to protect farming.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is why Florida has its national reputation of being totally dysfunctional..it's run by rich people as their amusement park • Use the 80/20 option... It's there for you! • <u>Nothing</u> should be west of SR 7. • Common knowledge correctly understands that edge effects and small parcel size drastically reduce value to wildlife and increase maintenance costs to keep useful for nature • nature does not thrive on postage stamps of land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This proposal would eliminate row crops as agricultural use as this requires large acreages • This would result in segmentation of ag uses, serious economic inefficiency • Minimum preserve acreages must be maintained • Isolated small acreage of preserve land is not sustainable • This proposal would seriously threaten long term viability of large scale agriculture

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not promote additional habitat fragmentation • Limiting or eliminating the minimum size will promote roof top impervious surface • Keep large contiguous areas to limit farmer/resident interactions <p>Ditto Topic 2 & 3 - contiguity is crucial to preserve integrity of Ag Reserve and viability of farming in it.</p>
Topic 5:	Preserve Area Uses
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be utilized for crop production, pasture, equestrian purposes, retained as fallow land or, if designated by the South Florida Water Management District as a Water Preserve Area, or to serve regional water management purposes as certified by either Lake Worth Drainage District or South Florida Water Management District, or for water management purposes not directly related to the 60/40 AgR-PDD if approved by the Department of Environmental Resources Management, managed for environmental resource values. • Accessory agricultural structures such as barns and pump structures shall be permitted. • Agricultural support uses such as processing facilities, grooms' quarters, and farm worker housing may be accommodated provided that certain criteria are met.
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow more uses such as landscape maintenance, mulching, and the production of products that serve as accessory to the agricultural industry. • Eliminate current (code) size restrictions for packing houses
Comments:	I would support changes within reason that would encourage farmers to stay in farming in the Ag reserve, and to sell their development rights. I would like to ease one restriction in particular that I'm aware of - Bedner's told me they could not sell shirts with their name on them. I would like the County to do more to promote our farmers and raise their visibility, and allow them to promote themselves. (they can't even sell gift cards to go with their fruit baskets)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seems to be geared to industrial and away from ag. • Encourage farmers to stay in ag and not want to sell out. • Figure out ways to keep farmers in production. • Want packing houses in non preserve areas.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mulching is not appropriate use or related to ag, and provides no benefit to agriculture or ag reserve residents • Packing plants serving areas beyond the ag reserve should be limited to areas outside the preserve land
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That's what we all need is more big buildings...are you crazy?? • commercial support for ag activities should be outside of ag reserve • just another step to destroying the good idea of an ag reserve that has been working for a quarter century • bigger packing houses means more trucks from outside - moving to industrial site
	<p>Keep existing Comprehensive Plan. Do not want industrial development. Want to assist farmers who want to stay if changes are being made.</p>

	We do not support use of Ag reserve for mulching in the preserve areas. We also do not support the addition of landscape maintenance (e.g. parking lots for equipment). We also do not support the elimination of current (code) site restrictions for packing houses in preserve areas.
Topic 6:	Single Farm Residence/Caretaker's Quarters
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard density of one unit per 5 acres applies; not permitted in preserve areas • Caretakers' quarters limited to 1,000 sq. ft. (code)
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow a home to serve as a farm residence in preserve areas on less than five acres, provided that majority of property is in uses permitted by conservation easements, to allow for sale of development rights on the additional lands • Eliminate restriction on size of caretakers' quarters allowed in preserve areas
Comments:	We oppose the proposal because it would increase the density of units in the Ag Reserve and we oppose increased development. This would reduce the benefits of the Ag Reserve as a buffer to the Refuge and would put pressure on infrastructure, increasing traffic and the use of natural resources (e.g. water) It could increase water pollution problems.
	Don't increase density. Will erode large tracts. We need to preserve large tracts.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counterproposal that those extra development rights must be transferred out of the Ag Reserve • Makes for making housing permanent and changes the character to residential from agriculture • As densities increase then septic don't do as well push goes to providing water and septic
	5 acres size on caretakers' quarters should be maintained. This would increase overall density of ag reserve and result in large lot residential throughout preserve areas under the guise of farm residences.
	This would potentially erode large scale tracts. More housing units in Ag Reserve would result which isn't desired.
	I would support this change to encourage farmers to stay in farming in the Ag Reserve and allow them to sell their development rights. I would not want to allow this as part of a 60/40 PUD.

Topic 7:	Create TDR Residential Overlay Option
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ag Reserve is a Sending area for TDRs (one unit per acre) • Receiving areas within the Urban/Suburban Tier
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create overlay option for undeveloped lands allowing for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a base potential density of 1 du/ac • a minimum requirement to purchase a TDR per acre from County TDR bank • an option to purchase an additional TDR • elimination of 60% preserve requirement • max of 3 du/ac on development area • Cap units transferred to Ag Reserve at 7,000 • Make necessary changes to TDR program
Comments:	I would strongly oppose making the Ag Reserve a receiving area for TDRs. This would destroy the integrity & purpose of the Ag Reserve.
	Do not change TDR to make Ag Reserve a receiving density Increases homes which is major negative for natural areas Not protecting ag or Northern Everglades Seems like opening Pandora's Box.
	Strongly oppose this proposal goes contrary to fundamental principles of promoting/preserving agriculture. Existing developments will seek to eliminate preserve areas based on this precedent.
	Ag Reserve is sending area, not receiving area. What can't they understand about that? It's pretty simple. That's why it's not an industrial reserve, commercial reserve, or city center. We would need to convert Wellington to an STA to deal with the results of this gem!
	Keep existing Ag Reserve. Do not change TDR function. Do not increase density in Ag Reserve.
	We oppose this proposal because it increases density and decreases preserve areas.
Topic 8:	Other Ag Reserve Concepts, Ideas, Issues
Ag Reserve should be marketed and advertised as a great agricultural benefit to Floridians and Palm Beach County residents.	
Development is forever, nature is lost forever. Nature is limited, development keeps on rolling.	
Consider where water resources are going to come from. Flood supply/water control is Lox mandate... more pressure would impact Everglades restoration. Put pressure on STA's Strazzulla & USFWS land swap Water quality issues from run-off and seepage.	
I would like the County to consider ways to help keep farming viable and promote our farmers \$ the Ag Reserve & the role it plays in agriculture, water storage, flood control, & as a buffer to the Everglades. For that matter, find ways to promote Palm Beach County as part of the Everglades!	