

EXHIBIT A

PALM BEACH COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD (LDRAB) ARCHITECTURAL SUBCOMMITTEE

DECEMBER 17, 2014 MEETING SUMMARY

Prepared by Monica Cantor, Senior Site Planner

On Wednesday, December 17, 2014, the Architectural Subcommittee met in the Ken Rogers Hearing Room (VC-1E-47), at the PBC Vista Center, 2300 North Jog Road, West Palm Beach, Florida.

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting commenced at 9:05 a.m.

1. Introductions

LDRAB Subcommittee Members: None

Zoning Commission Members: Robert Currie and Mark Beatty

Interested Parties: Bradley Miller and Pat Lentini

County Staff: Rebecca Caldwell, Jon MacGillis, William Cross, Monica Cantor, Wendy Hernandez, Bryan Davis, Eric McClellan, and Lucine Martens

2. Additions, Substitutions, and Deletions

Ms. Cantor stated that there were no additions, substitutions or deletions.

3. Motion to Adopt Agenda – Not Applicable/No Quorum

Ms. Cantor stated that the purpose of the meeting was to comments made by Mayor Shelley Vana at the December 4, 2014 Board of County Commissioners (BCC) Zoning Hearing, as relates to proposed amendments to the Architectural Guidelines. Ms. Cantor clarified that the Subcommittee agenda included 2 topics: clarification of what projects are subject to Architectural Review, and, identification of the mechanisms established to amend approved elevations. Participants agreed to continue with the agenda presented by staff.

B. OVERVIEW

1. Amendment Recap

Mr. MacGillis provided a brief history of the amendments and expressed concern with the limited public participation, considering that the reason to reconvene was originated in response to December 14, 2014 BCC comments that there may be interested parties who apparently are not in agreement with the amendments. He clarified that at the present time it was not clear who had concerns with the proposed changes.

Mr. MacGillis also reminded participants that the Zoning Commission (ZC) requested the BCC to direct staff to amend the Unified Land Development Code (ULDC) regarding architectural elevations. He clarified that the ZC requested that architectural elevations be mandatory at time of application, for developments reviewed by the ZC.

2. Amendment Draft Round 2014-02 (Exhibit)

Ms. Cantor highlighted the proposed changes associated with Art. 2, Development Review Procedures, that clarify the levels of administrative amendments to approved architectural elevations that would trigger additional review by the ZC or BCC.

C. PRESENTATION / DISCUSSION

DECEMBER 4, 2014 BCC ZONING HEARING - BOARD DIRECTION

Items 1 and 2 in the agenda to address projects subject to the architectural guidelines and mechanisms for amendments to approved elevations were developed concurrently in the discussion below.

Ms. Hernandez highlighted the number of applications submitted to the ZC in 2014 and clarified that most applicants elected to provide elevations for ZC review.

Ms. Cantor clarified that in cases where flexibility is desired, the Code has specific regulations such as Unique Structure or Green Buildings that allows for design flexibility. It was also clarified that the request of architectural elevations does not mean all construction plans to be provided. Staff indicated that plans to be submitted are contained in the Technical Manual.

Mr. McClellan, representing the PBC Facilities Development and Operations (FDO) Department, expressed concern that the architectural amendments are going to make it mandatory for the FDO to provide elevations at time of ZC or BCC. This differs from the options currently available in the Code, which allows applicants to provide architectural elevations at time of the Development Review Officer (DRO) or Building Permit. He is of the opinion that this request will increase the cost of government projects, as elevations may be revised at time of building permit from those originally presented to the ZC or BCC.

EXHIBIT A

PALM BEACH COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD (LDRAB) ARCHITECTURAL SUBCOMMITTEE

DECEMBER 17, 2014 MEETING SUMMARY

Mr. MacGillis clarified that the proposed amendments are not changing the projects required to provide elevations but when they need to be presented. This change is mainly to allow the ZC to ensure architectural elevations are compatible with surroundings. The ZC architects present at the meeting clarified that the main concerns about elevations are scale and character of proposed buildings.

Mr. MacGillis made it clear that Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) and Planned Industrial Park Developments (PIPDs) are required to provide a Master Plan. In such cases elevations are not required unless the site includes Requested Uses, otherwise the site plan will be reviewed at DRO and elevations could be provided at that time or Building Permit. Mr. MacGillis clarified that some applications presented to the BCC or ZC, such as rezoning or variances, are not required to provide elevations. He also mentioned that the ZC can impose conditions on any application which may include submittal of architectural elevations at BCC.

Participants also discussed how the proposed changes would apply to projects with multiple phases. It was generally agreed that architectural elevations should only be required buildings proposed in the 1st phase. All other phases would not be required to submit elevations to the ZC as long as they were consistent with the architectural elevations submitted in the 1st phase, and comply with the Design Standards in Article 5.C.

Mr. Miller requested that architectural elevations for old applications be included in ePZB to facilitate knowing if elevations for any given development were originally approved or not. Ms. Hernandez clarified that ePZB currently has elevations starting from October 2013 to present.

Ms. Cantor requested the ZC participants to attend the BCC Zoning Hearing on January 8, 2015 to support the requested amendments and respond to any comments or questions.

D. NEXT STEP

County staff would be reviewing options to revise the original amendment to accommodate discussion on phasing, and clarify that architectural elevations shall comply with the requirements contained in the Technical Manual. The draft and summary of the meeting will be e-mailed to all interested parties originally invited to the subcommittee meeting, which included government agencies, development agents, LDRAB members and Zoning Commissioners.

E. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 10:18 a.m.