

Topic:	Topic: Commercial Land Use
Topic Description:	Designate 200 additional acres of commercial land uses along main corridors; Require one Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) unit per acre of development area; Make necessary changes to TDR program
Respondent Category:	
Community Organization Representative	No additional commercial development. Current plan works. No additional commercial or residential development west of SR 441
Community Organization Representative	There should be no new development in the Ag Reserve. All agricultural land should remain agricultural forever. Any permits that have been granted to developers should be revoked. If any developers claim the right to develop agricultural land, they should be challenged in court. There has been too much development already in the agricultural reserve and any more development will have a devastating effect upon our economy, our quality of life, our environment, our health and well being, and will exacerbate global warming.
Developer/Agent	We oppose the designation of more land for commercial as your presentation demonstrated there is existing commercial that has done been either developed or fully developed. You also showed that there was significant commercial within an easy driving radius.
Developer/Agent	The existing commercial development in the Ag Reserve already produces too much traffic and noise which is not compatible with either large tract farming or wildlife corridors essential to the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. More commercial development threatens the existence of the Ag Reserve and the well being of birds from the nearby Refuge.
Developer/Agent	We presently have too much traffic and noise. The traffic makes it difficult for riders to enjoy their horses, and the farmers to move thier equipment. The noise threatens the wildlife that live on the Ag Reserve and the birds from the Refuge that use it as a primary food source. What commercial land that is available should be used for businesses that support the farmers.

Topic:	Topic: Commercial Land Use
Developer/Agent	<p>The Ag Reserve was originally created to take advantage of the many benefits offered by the land within the designated area. Of the many benefits provided, some directly impact the Refuge such as buffering the Refuge from urban development and providing valuable foraging habitat for birds that roost or nest in the Refuge. Bird species that utilize lands within the Ag Reserve and Refuge include the critically endangered Everglade snail kite and the endangered wood stork. Both species frequently use the agriculture fields to forage, particularly during rain events and field flooding. In addition to the species protected by the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) also has trust responsibility for birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and particularly for those designated as official Birds of Conservation Concern (BCCs). The BCCs represent our highest conservation priorities because, due to current declines in population or habitat, they could become candidates for federal listing under the ESA in the future unless current protections are adhered to, and/or additional conservation actions are instituted. Therefore, these species are particularly important when considering removal of current habitat. Most of the species on this list can be found within the Refuge as well as in the Ag Reserve, and many of these BCCs are also state-listed species. Common bird species, some listed as Species of Special Concern (SSC) by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) and known to utilize the agricultural fields including limpkins, roseate spoonbills, white ibis, glossy ibis, tri-colored heron, little blue heron, snowy egret, limpkins, red-shouldered hawks and even shore birds. For these reasons, the Refuge continues to strongly support the continued protection and preservation of lands in the Ag Reserve. In addition to the factors discussed above, the Refuge provides economic stimulus to the community. The Banking on Nature Report (FWS, 2013) estimates for every one dollar Congress provides in funding to run the National Wildlife Refuge System, almost five dollars on average is returned to local communities. The Refuge, in particular, was estimated to return \$6.81 on the dollar. Therefore, the Refuge is a significant contributor to the economy of Palm Beach County. Hydrologically, lands within the Ag Reserve, particularly west of 441, provide a seepage barrier as the farmers keep canals higher after rain events by working with Lake Worth Drainage District (LWDD) to store and retain water for water conservation purposes. As a buffer to the Refuge, the Ag Reserve provides protection from urban runoff, invasive/exotic species (both plants and animals), and light pollution from surrounding development. With the increased number of development proposals, the demand to provide additional flood control will fall on the Refuge and surrounding basins which already provide these services to many areas east of the Refuge. Refuge "Comprehensive Conservation Plan" Goals and Objectives. Three of the Refuge goals outlined in the Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) are: 1) Restore and conserve the natural diversity, abundance, and ecological function of Refuge flora and fauna; 2) Conserve natural and cultural resources through partnerships, protection, and land acquisition from willing sellers; and 3) Develop and implement appropriate and compatible wildlife-dependent recreation and environmental education and interpretation programs that lead to enjoyable experiences and greater understanding of the Everglades and South Florida ecosystems. Objective 3 under the Goal of Resource Protection outlined in the CCP'S Management Plan includes intentions to realign the Refuge acquisition boundary "Area of Concern" and recognize "Buffer Lands" along the eastern side of the Refuge (north and south of Lee Road). Specific strategies related to this objective include: 1) The Refuge recognizes the lands along the west side of U.S. Highway 441 and in front of the Refuge Headquarters entrance as a new acquisition boundary; 2) The Refuge considers the land west of U.S. Highway 441 and to the south of the Refuge to be a potential buffer zone; 3) Develop collaborative relationships with federal, state, and county land offices, agencies, organizations, and landowners to ensure the "Areas of Concern" remain as agricultural or natural lands; and 4) Work with federal, state, and county land offices to protect approximately 680 acres directly in front of the Headquarters Area and restore them to cypress swamp or wetlands. The Refuge is concerned that the loss of Ag Reserve lands could impede the goals and objectives outlined in the CCP through the loss of our protective buffer, potential conservation lands, and collaborative opportunities. The Refuge appreciates the opportunity to comment the Palm Beach County Commissioners evaluation of land use restrictions in the Ag Reserve. The Refuge was established to protect many wildlife species that may be at risk from the direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts from the proposed changes to the Plan. The Refuge is willing to provide any additional information to fully evaluate these changes and the potential impacts increased development in the area may have on our natural system. The Refuge also requests to be notified when any potential changes may take place to the Plan or as any new plan proposals become available.</p>
Developer/Agent	Staff fails to demonstrate need nor does one exist for ANY additional commercial allowances given the already existing uses and the ones nearby. Changes to the TDR program must be a net benefit to continued agricultural use of the land. The TDR program must remain as is.
Developer/Agent	Designating 200 additional acres for commercial use would further inflict more cars and trucks in this area which would increase noise and air pollution
Developer/Agent	Farmers have said that their operations are becoming less viable as they are surrounded by more and more development. I would oppose the designation of 200 additional acres of commercial land use along main corridors, unless 1) the main corridors in question are those already predominated by commercial use such as Atlantic Avenue and Boynton Beach Blvd, or 2) any change to the zoning was limited to legitimizing existing uses or to allowing a modest expansion of an existing use or to lifting some of the more onerous restrictions on existing uses, for example, Faith Farms should be allowed more beds and Bedner's should be allowed to sell gift cards with their fruit baskets and T-shirts with their name on them. I would oppose the proposed change to the TDR program.

Topic:	Topic: Commercial Land Use
Developer/Agent	It is amazing to me that this land got used for commercial use after the bond issue. I feel there is too much noise and traffic so close to the ARM Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. We are blessed with areas like Green Cay Wetlands and Wakodahatchee Wetlands because of the birds and wildlife that thrive and live in the refuge. In the mornings they fly out and spend time at these wetlands and return in the evening. This brings Palm Beach County tourists from all over the world to see the northern part of the Everglades and competes with Dade counties Everglades National Park as a prime place to stop and see the nesting birds up close and personal. All this traffic, noise and loss of land is not productive to the wildlife and the dollars the tourist trade brings in. Watching birds is a multi-million dollar industry. There are over 60 million American bird watchers. Please do not designate 200 additional acres of commercial land uses along main corridors.
Developer/Agent	These comments are submitted by the Everglades Law Center, on behalf of the Sierra Club, 1000 Friends of Florida and the Florida Wildlife Federation. State law (Chapter 163 Fla. Stat.) requires the amount commercial land use to be based on a demonstrated need. Staff analysis shows that there is already sufficient commercial and industrial land use within and adjacent to the Ag Reserve to meet the needs of existing and future residents as well as farm workers. There is no demonstrated need for additional commercial land use within the Ag. Reserve Tier. Creating additional commercial land use designations would undermine agriculture by segmenting farming operations, by increasing traffic within and adjacent to farming areas, by increasing land use conflicts between farming and urban use. Additionally "big box" or other commercial uses that draw customers from outside the region would further undermine the primary purpose of the Ag Reserve which is to promote and maintain large scale agricultural operations. Modifying the TDR program to allow TDR units to be transferred into the Ag Reserve is directly contrary to the purpose of the TDR program, which is to reduce density and development within sending areas like the Ag. Reserve. Converting the Ag Reserve from a sending area to a receiving area for TDR units (whether in support of commercial or residential development) would directly contradict the purposes for which the TDR program was established and would undermine the integrity and efficacy of the entire program countywide.
Equestrian	The existing commercial development in the Ag Reserve is already producing too much traffic and noise which is not compatible with either large tract farming or wildlife corridors essential to the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. More commercial development threatens the existence of the Ag Reserve and the well being of foraging birds from the nearby Refuge. Our Equestrian areas have been cut to almost nothing and you continue to take this sport from us. Lyons Road is a prime example. It is dangerous and unmarked for equestrians use. Horses and riders are in danger.
Equestrian	The existing commercial development in the Ag Reserve is already producing too much traffic and noise which is not compatible with either large tract farming or wildlife corridors essential to the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. More commercial development threatens the existence of the Ag Reserve and the well being of foraging birds from the nearby Refuge.
Equestrian	There is already too much commercial development in the Ag Reserve. The light pollution caused from impinging commercial buildings inhibits the activity of animals that reside in areas of the Ag Reserve, that being horses stabled in paddocks, cattle, non domesticated animals that hunt at night. The increased volume of any commercial land use combined with further increase in human population in reserved and preserved areas is detrimental to wildlife and the ecosystem.
Equestrian	there is already too much traffic and noise any additional traffic threatens the fragile ag reserve
Interested Citizen	The TDR program is a joke. I said it at a County commission meeting get rid of the commissioners and just put the developers up on the dais. In fact get rid of the staff too. Since for all the people watching from the cheap seats they seem work for the builders also.
Interested Citizen	Please do not restrict the discussion to these preconceived issues. The issue of whether or not to develop the Ag Reserve at all has not been settled. In other words, many concerned residents, individuals, and stakeholders favor the continued enforcement of the moratorium blocking any development of the area. While it is controversial as to whether Boca Raton and surrounding areas can absorb an additional condominium building or housing development, it is clear that a new community or city to be developed on the Ag Reserve will serve to strain Boca and its residents in many more ways than imagined here.
Interested Citizen	Stop any further commercial land use in the ag reserve
Interested Citizen	i am against any building on the ag reserve,& remind you about the the amendment that the residents passed to preserve these areas & not to build on them. Any building would be illegal & persued in a class action suit

Topic:	Topic: Commercial Land Use
Interested Citizen	More commercial and residential applications are not needed in the Ag Reserve. The citizens of Palm Beach County made their wishes pretty clear with the bond issue and the Palm Beach County commissioners have chosen to ignore those wishes. The area should continue to be agricultural in nature. NO MORE DEVELOPMENT.
Interested Citizen	The existing commercial development in the Ag Reserve is already producing too much traffic and noise which is not compatible with either large tract farming or wildlife corridors essential to the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, which is designated as critical habitat for the Endangered Snail Kite, protected under both Federal and State law. More commercial development threatens the existence of the Ag Reserve and the well being of birds from the nearby Refuge.
Interested Citizen	Steve Thomas of Thomas Produce, a large scale farmer in the Ag Reserve, has already testified on March 25, 2014 that he is being driven out of the Ag Reserve because he is crammed between a shopping center and a gated community. The Sun Sentinel reports that he is planning to move his operation to Ft. Pierce. What greater proof do you need that there is already too much commercial development in the Ag Reserve.
Interested Citizen	The existing commercial development in the Ag Reserve is already producing too much traffic and noise which is not compatible with either large tract farming or wildlife corridors essential to the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. More commercial development threatens the existence of the Ag Reserve. The regional mall that you are calling Delray Marketplace, is bringing unwanted traffic INTO the Ag Reserve and is not a marketplace in keeping with the Ag Reserve. Stop NOW.
Interested Citizen	This is farmland. We don't need more commercial growth here. Don't change any zoning to allow more commercial. More traffic is bad for farming and wildlife. We already have too many empty retail stores in this area.
Interested Citizen	This is the Ag Reserve. NO further commercial development is needed. Eastward ho! We do not need more traffic in the ag reserve. This is not good for farming or wildlife.
Interested Citizen	The existing commercial development in the Ag Reserve is ALREADY PRODUCING TOO MUCH TRAFFIC AND NOISE which is not compatible with either large tract farming or wildlife corridors essential to the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. More commercial development threatens the existence of the Ag Reserve and the well being of foraging birds from the nearby Refuge.
Interested Citizen	Who put you all in office GL Homes or the citizens of Palm Beach County do what is right for the State of Florida, protect the wild life and Ag Reserve. This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.
Interested Citizen	There is enough commercial already. Within a few miles, anyone can get anything they desire.
Interested Citizen	No need for any of these for farming success
Interested Citizen	The existing commercial development in the Ag Reserve is already producing too much traffic and noise which is not compatible with either large tract farming or wildlife corridors essential to the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. More commercial development threatens the existence of the Ag Reserve and the well being of foraging birds from the nearby Refuge.
Interested Citizen	The existing commercial development in the Ag Reserve is already producing too much traffic and noise which is not compatible with either large tract farming or wildlife corridors essential to the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. More commercial development threatens the existence of the Ag Reserve and the well being of foraging birds from the nearby Refuge.
Interested Citizen	Please stop the development of the AgReserve. Let us ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge!
Interested Citizen	I believe that there is too much development taking place, and so much at the same time. I think the process needs to be more carefully conducted, and more thoughtful consideration needs to be placed on the disappearance of these lands forever, not to mention the increased drain on resources to sustain these new developments and the intense impact on local traffic and services. I avoid more of these spaces just because the traffic is unwieldy.

Topic:	Topic: Commercial Land Use
Interested Citizen	NO to all proposals promoting urban development and destruction of the Ag Reserve. As a lifelong S FL resident, I've seen the endless growth and it's so sad. Do you really want PBC to be another Broward, an endless sea of housing developments with zero green space? I have family in Broward that drives an hour just to find hiking areas in PBC (Grassy Waters, JDSP, etc.). In S. FL, only PBC still has a few remaining green spaces. Destroy those, and why would you want to live here? I voted for the Ag Reserve funding in the 90s, and based on the recent statewide Amd 1 conservation vote, it's clear the FL residents value our land and water. Why won't our politicians honor a clear mandate from the residents they serve?
Interested Citizen	Perpetuity, Perpetuity, Perpetuity! The preservation was not intended to be temporary. No development, period. Puppets concerned only for their own political future \$\$\$ will approve it for their favorite developer...good luck. The three witches of Hecate... Democrats, my ss.
Interested Citizen	Owners should be legally allowed to sell their land if farming is no longer sustainable.
Interested Citizen	The existing commercial distribution centers located at major intersections currently have heavy commercial traffic serving their facilities and should not have the burden of having to purchase TDR's. The development of commercial at existing signalized intersections will have a lesser impact on the Ag Reserve and neighborhoods than mid-block commercial development. This will result in better development for all involved.
Interested Citizen	Too much intrusion already so I am against any further development. I am a frequent visitor to Loxahatchee, and remember when the 441 was only two lanes. Bad impact on resident and migratory wildlife.
Interested Citizen	NO DEVELOPMENT WEST OF 441 DO NOT PERMIT BOYNTON BEACH BLVD, ATLANTIC AVE, LYONS ROAD, 441 TO BECOME COMMERCIAL CORRIDORS ENOUGH OTHER SPACES JUST OUTSIDE AG RESERVE FOR COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT- NO NEED FOR COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH IN AG RESERVE
Interested Citizen	No more commercial is needed in the Ag Reserve. There is already too much traffic into the Ag Reserve which is bad for horses, farmers and wildlife. There is plenty of commercial nearby.
Interested Citizen	no changes to TDR program. We do not need more commercial in the Ag Reserve. There is plenty of commercial very close by. More traffic does not belong here. Only developers and land owners want farmers to sell out to commercial interests. This is an agricultural area. Only farmstands and farmers markets belong here.
Interested Citizen	No. More commercial projects do not belong in our Ag Reserve. There's already too much traffic into this area, and nearby stores are vacant.
Interested Citizen	Eastward ho! We do not need more shopping in the Ag Reserve- send them to the empty stores nearby. This is an agricultural area, not a shopping>eating destination. It is already dangerous for horses and farm vehicles.
Interested Citizen	Absolutely we need commercial uses - simply put we need tax revenue. This is a way to build and maintain a tax base to protect the future of our community.
Interested Citizen	We are overloaded with commercial going out of business stores and Palm beach county is starting to not look so pretty anymore
Interested Citizen	I am total against any further development for retail or residential in the Ag Reserve area. What is there now should never have happened. We the taxpayers invested money to preserve the area. I am totally upset as to what has already be allowed. Why should we vote for something then because of special exceptions our desires are over ridden. I will certainly withhold my vote for anyone that votes to make changes to develop the area.
Interested Citizen	No to all three
Interested Citizen	The Ag Reserve is a "Goldilock's zone" for farming. This is a term often used by scientists that describe "just right" conditions (not too wet, not too dry, not too cold etc.) To use this special area and to ruin a sustainable PB Co. resource for anything else is a crime.
Interested Citizen	I came across a PB Post article of Sunday, Feb. 28, 1999. Here are some quotes: Com. Karen Marcus "We have to be different from Dade and Broward and this is our first step toward doing it." Joanne Davis "Let's not let the Agricultural Reserve's final crop be asphalt and houses". George Weaver, farmer "Why waste \$100 million of public money? There's no way for agriculture as you see it there to survive." Billy Bowman, farmer "You can't protect something that's not going to make it." The bond issue was approved by the citizens of PBC and we should expect our County Commissioners to honor the agreements they made to us.

Topic:	Topic: Commercial Land Use
Nursery Operator	I have a nursery and also live on the nursery. We are losing our Kubota tractor dealership and lost Helena Chemical last year. it would be real nice if these 2 business could have stayed for agriculture.
Nursery Operator	Staff had a nice presentation at the technical meetings, however, it would be helpful if the presentation on commercial land uses showed all the existing uses around the major intersections instead of just the few that are "legal". The intersection at 441 and Boynton, for example, has many very intensive industrial type uses that have existed for over 30 years. These should be part of the presentation in order to paint a clear and accurate picture of what exists on the ground.
Nursery Operator	Dear Board of County Commissioners: My Father invested in the Gold Leaf Nursery, near the intersection of Boynton Beach Boulevard and the Turnpike prior to the property being voted in to the Agricultural Reserve. It was zoned agricultural at the time of purchase, as was so much of South Florida that would later be zoned appropriately to accommodate the changing demands on the best and highest use of the land. In my opinion, the voters encumbered the property without giving the Gold Leaf Partnership just remuneration. The property has been granted minimum residential development rights, but at a density so low as to be unprofitable. The property is now surrounded by development. This is not farmland. I believe it is only right that full development rights should be granted to this property. The investors in the property have hard earned equity in the property. The public does not. Purchasing the property at a fair price would give the public the right to do whatever it wanted to do with it. That's the way the Nature Conservancy works, a real environmental organization which puts its money where its mouth is. Respectfully, James DeReuil Trustee for Estate of Louis J. DeReuil Gold Leaf Nursery
Nursery Operator	once the rest of the homes are built {6000}, that have all ready been permitted, there will be a need for more commercial, lite industrial ect. maybe not 200 more acres, but close. Some land owners were never given any TDRs, they should be treated the same as others. The quadrant of the turnpike would be ideal for any commercial, and would not affect the ag reserve, this was recommended in the first study done for the ag reserve, but the commissioners rejected it, why?

Topic:	Topic: Commercial Land Use
Nursery Operator	<p>• Given the success of the TMD in Delray Beach and the fact that it has had to be given more than 28 variances to expand the site as well as add additional parking to meet the public demand, it clearly shows the need for additional commercial development along West Atlantic Avenue and other major roadways in the Ag Reserve. More than 200 acres of commercial development may be needed in small clusters. • The Ag Reserve is 23,000+ acres – 200 additional acres of commercial land uses is not unrealistic. With the thousands of new homes being built in the area, there will be an increased demand for services. • A hospital was built in the Agriculture Reserve to support a growing community; hence, further development in the Ag Reserve. • Yes, make please necessary changes to the TDR Program and please analyze each of the farmers who are "locked in" by the current policy so that each is treated fairly. As we know, there is an unfair bias for large land owners in the Ag Reserve policy and that is why only small farmers are the ones who are now "stuck" with some even "suffering because of being locked in the Ag Reserve. • A lot of farms are now next to/near residential areas further restricting the agriculture use and possibly endangering residents with pesticides and chemicals because of the close proximity. • Small farmers should be given the same rights as the large farmers in terms of selling and developing their land. The way the policy is set up, it clearly benefits the farmers who owned 600 acres or more. • The initial Phase I of the 2000 Ag Reserve Master Plan showed mixed use centers along West Atlantic Avenue in Table 1-7. This Phase I correlates to the approval of Resolution No. R 2005-0588 – 0590 for the Special Assessment process for the Atlantic Avenue and State Road 7 Area Wastewater Force Main Extension Project, whereas it states, "This project will serve 41 commercial and 2 residential properties." Given the purpose of the water main, agriculture does not benefit from this assessment and additional cost incurred by farmers. • No one has ever been able to explain why the 41 land owners on W. Atlantic Avenue and State Road 441 are paying for a special assessment when those with an agriculture land use can not benefit from it. Please be sure to address and respond to this issue. • The nursery industry in Palm Beach County has declined dramatically over the last 20 years and needs to be analyzed. There is no longer a critical mass for the industry in Palm Beach County. This data needs to be available for the roundtable and presented to the Board of County Commission so that, as stated in the Ag Reserve Master Plan, • There was an assumption in the 2000 Ag Reserve Master Plan that the nursery industry would be sustainable (Chapter 2, Paragraph 1, Page 17). That is not the case and data will support this fact. There is no longer a critical mass of the nursery industry. In the 2000 Ag Master Plan, it is listed that more than 100 nurseries were in operation. Today there are 40 (According to the Palm Beach Chapter Florida Nursery, Growers and Landscape Association (FNGLA) – 19 of which are in the Ag Reserve) – so if we estimate that 110 nurseries existed in 2000, that means that approximately 64% have gone out of business. • As quoted in the Ag Reserve Master Plan, pg. 21, "It makes little sense to protect farmland if farmers cannot make a living." The pleading and begging that we have heard from farmers to be able to sell their land and sell their TDR's needs to be investigated; not overlooked. • The nursery industry in Florida for ornamental plants is now hallmarked by the Apopka area to the north and Homestead to the south. (I lost a \$7,000 order this week because my customer did not want to make another truck stop here in Delray when she could get the product in Homestead and Mount Dora). • Palm Beach Wholesale Growers Association no longer exists because there are not enough nurseries here in Palm Beach County to support it. • In 1995-96, there were 595 nurseries covering 7,219 acres countywide. By 2000, the number dropped to 558 on 6,374 acres. (Sun Sentinel, August 6, 2001, Farms, Nurseries get the Squeeze – (http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2001-08-06/news/0108060089_1_agricultural-preservation-program-nurseries-palm-beach-county)) • I would like to suggest that the Agriculture Reserve Master Plan be updated and that an Agriculture Reserve Residential/Commercial Plan be developed. • I would like to request that Table 1-1 and Table 2-1 be updated for the roundtable on February 17th. • I would like to suggest that an analysis of the nursery industry be conducted for Palm Beach County – as well as the nursery industry as a whole. It was never done.</p> <p>The only industry that was analyzed in the Ag Reserve Master Plan was the crop farmers – and the result of that analysis formed the foundation of the policy in the Ag Reserve as it pertained to selling land for development. Had a study been conducted on the future of the nursery industry, the policy may have been written differently,</p>

Topic:	Topic: Commercial Land Use
	<p>giving smaller farmers the rights to develop as well and we would not be in the predicament we are currently in with the small farmers stuck farming when there is no longer a critical mass for their industry. Only tracks of land 600 acres or larger could be used and they were given rights to sell off their land to develop. • Who are the farmers who are selling their development rights? What were they producing? Why are they selling? And why are the farmers who are pleading to be allowed to sell their development rights pleading? Why are they suffering so that they are pleading? These “pleads” are on public record and are in the newspaper. Here is one from a recent article:smaller farm owners who pleaded hardship and want the ability to sell off their development rights to developers like G.L. Homes; and brokers and real estate agents with special interests in transactions involving TDRs (Transfer of Development Rights). Why are they pleading hardship? This question needs to be asked. https://unitedpbc.org/2015/news/6-to-1-county-oks-gl-homes-requests-for-3-ag-reserve-zoning-changes/ I think the county needs to gather this data related to the farmers pleading and begging to sell their development rights and understand it. It was never meant for the farmers to suffer and that is what appears to be happening. • The concept of the Ag Reserve Master Plan was fatally flawed from the beginning as to “preserving agriculture” because the largest tracks of land could be developed. Furthermore, the way the policies were established hurt small farmers in that they were locked into farming while the critical mass of farming was being diminished. This is why the farmers are now “begging to sell their TDR’s because under the current policies. • The large land owners, who had 600 acres or more had so much more freedom in the use of their land than the small farm owners. • A big problem in the ag reserve area is the flawed assumption that the nursery business would continue to thrive despite the development that has reduced the industry. That assumption is wrong in the following ways: o In order for farming to be healthy, there has to be a large enough area so that you create a critical mass. A critical mass study should be conducted for the farming industries in the ag reserve similar to the study that was conducted in North Carolina. https://ideas.repec.org/p/ags/umdrwp/28552.html (Note that a tractor repair company that existed at Delray Growers from 1960-2004 – relocated because of the lack of demand for the services – this correlates to more than a 50% decrease in row crop farming in the Ag Reserve – yet Delray Growers is expected to continue to serve the farming/ag industry. This does not make sense.) • Conduct a Nursery Industry Cluster Analysis for Palm Beach County – • http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CB4QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.pdx.edu%2Fsites%2Fwww.pdx.edu.ims%2Ffiles%2Fims_neonursery.pdf&ei=MaPaVNWvKsqZNqLkgegC&usg=AFQjCNEIivINQyJ3EVzv8raJMD4hMp2ug&sig2=rX38v-1MQOnANzqw2JaoOg</p>
Nursery Operator	<p>My 10 acres is east of Lyons Road & South of Atlantic Ave. bordered by Misner Country Club, the Bridges & The Delray market place. This area is very high traffic and now dangerous for farm vehicles. After 30 years of growing we can no longer make a living and the pressures of traffic and the not welcome attitude of the community has made our life impossible. Please allow a zoning change for those of us in this area where you have allowed development all around us. We have paid taxes for 30 years and now must leave, without relief with a zoning change many land owners will be forced from our land.</p>
Nursery Operator	<p>• Yes, designate 200 or more additional acres of commercial land uses along main corridors. The initial Phase I of the 2000 Ag Reserve Master Plan showed mixed use centers along West Atlantic Avenue in Table 1-7. This Phase I correlates to the approval of Resolution No. R 2005-0588 – 0590 for the Special Assessment process for the Atlantic Avenue and State Road 7 Area Wastewater Force Main Extension Project, whereas it states, “This project will serve 41 commercial and 2 residential properties.” Given the purpose of the water main, my property does not benefit from this assessment and additional cost. No one has yet explained to me why we are paying for this waterline. It is of no use to us for property that is designated as agriculture. Our property should be changed to commercial along with the other properties who are paying for this water line as it was intended to be. Please be sure to address and respond to this issue. • The concept of the Ag Reserve Master Plan was fatally flawed from the beginning as to “preserving agriculture” because the largest tracks of land could be developed. Furthermore, the way the policies were established hurt small farmers in that they were locked into farming while the critical mass of farming was being diminished. It has also hurt their land value. • I would like to suggest that the Agriculture Reserve Master Plan be updated and that an Agriculture Reserve Residential/Commercial Plan be developed. • I would like to request that Table 1-1 and Table 2-1 be updated for the roundtable on February 17th.</p>
Nursery Operator	<p>As a nurseryman in the ag. reserve for over 30 years, it is time to move on. The nursery industry is no longer a viable business. The county commissioners voted without our knowledge and consent to change our land designation. We're not interested in staffs opinion they should just present the facts. We're also not interested in the pundits like COBRA environmentalists or Audubon society. We are going broke, while these people are making decisions about our lives.</p>
Nursery Operator	<p>Yes, designate additional commercial land uses along main corridors - and especially where land owners paying for the water assessment along W. Altantic Avenue and 441. This land was intended for use as commercial as noted in the Ag Reserve Master Plan.</p>
Nursery Operator	<p>MAKE NECESSARY CHANGES TO TDR PROGRAM.</p>

Topic:	Topic: Commercial Land Use
Nursery Operator	There should be some commercial acreage added to what is called the ag reserve to accommodate all of the development that has been and will be built.
Representative/owner of a non-residential use	<p>The 11.23 ac. parcel west of 1/2 Mile Rd. with approx. 715 ft. of frontage on the south side of Atlantic Ave. (St.Rd. 806) has been in the ownership of a single family since 1961. It is zoned IND/AGR which is a unique situation within the Ag. Reserve. The only other properties with similar zoning are located along both sides of Atlantic Ave. - on the north side from Smith-Sundy Rd. to St.Rd. 7 and on the south side from 1/2 Mile Rd. also to St.Rd.7. Except for the most westerly parcel - all properties on the north side are developed with industrial uses: ie. a well drilling & irrigation supply business a golf cart manufacturing business an auto repair shop an ice cream distribution facility a gas station with convenience store and, a self storage facility. On the south side of Atlantic Ave. the only developed property is a religious facility and an abandoned lumber yard. The land to the south behind all of the undeveloped properties on the south side of Atlantic Ave. is AGR and will probably be developed as residential. A change of the use designation of this "south of Atlantic Ave" IND/AGR property to Commercial would encourage "softer" uses such as "professional/medical office" or "mixed-use business" in lieu of the more intense uses allowed under the current " industrial" designation. The size of the undeveloped "south side" lands totals approx. 28 acres (including the abandoned lumber yard) of which approx. 23 acres are contiguous and currently owned by only 2 entities. The unique situation of these "south side of Atlantic Ave." properties presents a fair and reasonable opportunity for the encouragement of business uses instead of the more intense industrial development of this land. Such a change to Commercial would be for the betterment of the Atlantic Ave. corridor from 1/2 Mile Rd. to St.Rd. 7 and the Ag. Reserve overall.</p>
Resident of the Ag Reserve	<p>Recently I received a notification from PBCWUD (the water company) saying our bills could go from \$20 a month to \$400 a month. Although we were experiencing extreme drought at the time, it was only last year that the drought was broken. Shouldn't the "water company" weigh in here? I don't want to see any aggrandizement in the Ag Reserve if we are headed for water prices like that. I suggest that PBCUD commission an environmental impact study before any further development begins.</p>
Resident of the Ag Reserve	<p>I think it is inevitable and good for the area to add retail or other commercial uses if done by professionals and controlled. We also desperately need a gas station out here as there is only peanuts and prices are high, not clean, needs competition. The area will only benefit as we are in the middle of nowhere now and if people want that, they would move to larger parcels out west or north in my view. People here want convenience and value add to the area.</p>

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Topic Description:	Eliminate minimum size/contiguity requirement	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	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, and/or eliminate restriction on size of caretakers' quarters allowed in preserve areas
Respondent Category:			
Community Organization Representative	NO! Piecemeal preserve parcels were never the intended end result of our comprehensive plan. Large farms and tracts for wildlife are the endgame.	May consider increased size for packing houses, on an individual basis for local, row crop farms.	No. farmers can hold back the tdr's necessary to build their homes. Preserve is preserve.
Community Organization Representative	Agreed, but do not allow LWDD and SfWMD to participate.	Do not allow uses such as landscape maintenance, mulching and the production of products on preserve land	Maintain five acres for each sSWD.
Community Organization Representative	Agree	No changes	Agree
Community Organization Representative	There should be no new development in the Ag Reserve. All agricultural land should remain agricultural forever. Any permits that have been granted to developers should be revoked. If any developers claim the right to develop agricultural land, they should be challenged in court. There has been too much development already in the agricultural reserve and any more development will have a devastating effect upon our economy, our quality of life, our environment, our health and well being, and will exacerbate global warming.	Such uses that support agriculture should be supported. All agricultural land should remain agricultural forever. There has been too much development already in the agricultural reserve and any more development will have a devastating effect upon our economy, our quality of life, our environment, our health and wellbeing, and will exacerbate global warming. Only those uses which aid and support agriculture should be allowed in the agricultural reserve.	There should be no new development in the Ag Reserve. All agricultural land should remain agricultural forever. Any permits that have been granted to developers should be revoked. If any developers claim the right to develop agricultural land, they should be challenged in court. There has been too much development already in the agricultural reserve and any more development will have a devastating effect upon our economy, our quality of life, our environment, our health and well being, and will exacerbate global warming.

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Developer/Agent	Again, we are concerned that this will further fragment an already fragmented area. We need to maintain areas large enough to support row crops when possible. We also need buffers so that nursery owners and farmers can spray without bothering nearby owners. We need signage and county education to alert homeowners that they live in an agricultural area where agricultural uses are permitted.	These proposals need more study. These may need to be permitted, but on a case by case basis to assure that they fit in the areas being suggested. The restrictions on packing houses needs to be studied and should not be part of this proposal. Packing houses are necessary for agricultural production. How will these changes affect their viability. We need more study to make the right decision on this issue.	Are these true caretaker homes or is this an attempt to further development on residences? If these are true caretaker homes than these could be approved case by case. In some cases this makes sense, but opening it up to all cases may not be a good idea.
Developer/Agent	It appears GL Homes is running out of land to create the "Preservation Area" required under the 60/40 development option where a parcel of land that is 1.5 times the size of the development area must be preserved for farming, fallow land, wetlands or other conservation purposes. Eliminating this requirement would gut the law, allowing developers to build thousands of more homes in an area that is set aside under the law to be "preserved primarily for agriculture." This plan is dangerous to the wetlands and wildlife corridors around the Wildlife Refuge and threatens the very survival of the Ag Reserve.	The farming that is under threat in the Ag Reserve is large tract, row-crop farming, an economic engine in Palm Beach County. Large tract, row-crop farmers who wish to grow their business in the Ag Reserve should receive accommodation on packing houses, providing they do not infringe on the ability of other farmers to operate successfully in the Ag Reserve.	This appears to be a ruse by development interests. Under current law, the Ag Reserve is a "sending" area for development rights. This means that landowners can sell their development rights but they must be "sent" outside of the Ag Reserve to areas that are zoned Urban or Suburban. This must remain the law in order to allow the Ag Reserve to survive and stop the dangerous development in the Ag Reserve.
Developer/Agent	NO! This change would allow all developers the right to create slightly smaller, but still massive planned developments, that would then require more services. Give an inch and it quickly becomes a planned development.	I would be in favor or expanding the uses of the land east of state road 7 as long as it was beneficial to farmers and the green industry.	I would favor allowing a farm residence of any size, on any size piece of property as long as that property and all of the remaining property can no longer be a sending area for development rights.
Developer/Agent	See comments above.	See comments above.	See comments above.

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Developer/Agent	<p>Contiguity and Minimum size are fundamental requirements that are necessary to protect agriculture. Elimination of these requisites would encourage development of the reserve and discourage and quite possibly endanger the continued existence of farming by chipping away at the critical mass necessary for continued viable farming operations.</p>	<p>Neither landscape maintenance nor mulching production is compatible with farming operations. While at first blush these operations are rural uses but not appropriate where the lands preserved are protected for vegetable and/or row crops, not commercial uses. This is also the reason that packing house limits must remain.</p>	<p>Housing should not be considered as "caretaker" especially in preserve areas. This ultimately leads to unsustainable encroachment into the very same lands you portend to save as agriculture preserve. Size limits should not be altered. ALL preserve areas must be subject to a recorded conservation easement that is enforceable by third parties. Any revisions to conservation easements should require a supermajority vote in the affirmative by the County Commission.</p>
Developer/Agent	<p>I would oppose eliminating the minimum size/contiguity requirement for 60/40 PUDs. Farmers have said that their operations are becoming less viable as they are surrounded by more and more development. As more of the areas for farming are broken up, more of the remaining farmers will give up and the concept of an Agricultural Reserve will become a lost cause, not to mention a waste of taxpayers' money. Preserve areas also lose their value for wildlife habitat and water storage, not to mention their aesthetic and recreational value, when they are relegated to small islands in the midst of a sea of development. And more development diminishes the value of the Ag Reserve as a buffer to Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, in particular any development west of S.R. 7.</p>	<p>I would want to look at allowing more types of operations in 60/40 PUD Preserve areas on a case-by-case basis. I believe that lifting some of the current restrictions on operations in the Ag Reserve could encourage some owner/operators to keep their lands in agriculture/horticulture/equestrian uses, etc. that overall are a lower intensity use of the land and better for wildlife and the people who live there.</p>	<p>In general I would support removing restrictions on the size of a farm residence or caretakers' quarters, but I would want to be very careful about the wording of any such change, because it might be easy to take advantage and allow more development that in no way meets the spirit of the definition of farm residence or caretakers' quarters.</p>

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Developer/Agent	<p>This is a very bad idea. Builders have been able to convince the board of commissioners thruout the years that their plans are best for the public. This plan is dangerous to the wetlands and wildlife corridors. It is important to keep the land for future farming for our children as the climate continues to change. Please do not change the 60/40 pds.</p>	<p>Farming in the Ag Reserve is row-crop farming and is a large part of the economic success of Palm Beach County. We need to protect and help the farmers as their needs arise so they remain in farming but not infringe on the ability of other farmers to operate in the Ag Reseve. Do not eliminate code size but allow a case by case review of the needs for larger packing houses.</p>	<p>The farmers should be able to build a single-family home to accomodate their needs and not have a size restriction but they need to keep their development rights on their own lands. A caretakers' quarters size should be adjusted to current needs and be a reasonable size but not have all size restrictions removed.</p>
Developer/Agent	<p>The purpose of the size / contiguity requirement was to ensure a critical mass of agricultural land such that large-scale farming would continue to be viable into the future. Eliminating this requirement would undermine this effort by allowing extremely small preserve parcels to be scattered throughout the Ag Reserve. By opening up additional parcels to serve as preserve areas, it would foster and facilitate increased development potential in the Ag Reserve, which is the driving purpose behind virtually all of the proposed amendments. The desire to increase development potential and return on investment for landowners is not a legitimate planning purpose upon which plan amendments can legally be based. This proposed change, as well as the others that have been proposed undermine agriculture by fragmenting agricultural areas, resulting in piecemeal, unconnected preserve areas, which serve no purpose to the greater whole. Additionally these changes increase residential development potential, which, due to the inherent conflicts between urban and agricultural use, further undermines the primary purpose of the Ag Reserve - to promote the long-term viability and sustainability of agriculture.</p>	<p>Allowable uses within the preserve areas were purposely limited to those that support agriculture, water resources or the environment. Landscape maintenance and mulching operations do not constitute agriculture, nor does either provide any benefit to agriculture, water resources or the environment. Allowing these uses within preserve areas would undermine agriculture by preventing the establishment of uses that are actually beneficial to the purpose of the Ag Reserve tier.</p>	<p>These changes appear to be attempts to allow undetermined amounts of residential development to be located within preserve areas, beyond that which is needed for traditional farm residences and / or caretakers quarters. It has been suggested that provision could allow existing and future preserves to be developed and built out as 5 acre ranchettes. To the extent that increased residential development within preserve areas is a potential outcome of this proposed change, it would be fundamentally inconsistent with very purpose for which the Ag Reserve was established. Allowing any increased residential development within preserve areas would significantly undermine the public investment within the Ag Reserve by reducing the critical mass of preserved agricultural land, while increasing land use conflicts between agriculture and residential development. No additional residential uses should be allowed on preserve lands.</p>

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Equestrian	<p>GL Homes is running out of land to create the "Preservation Area" required under the 60/40 development option where a parcel of land that is 1.5 times the size of the development area must be preserved for farming, fallow land, wetlands or other conservation purposes. Thus, GL Homes now wants to gut the law so that it can build thousands of more homes in an area that is set aside under the law to be "preserved primarily for agriculture." This plan is dangerous to the wetlands and wildlife corridors around the Wildlife Refuge and threatens the very survival of the Ag Reserve. You have to take responsibility and STOP GL Homes from destroying our land for their GREED.</p>	<p>The farming that is under threat in the Ag Reserve is large tract, row-crop farming, an economic engine in Palm Beach County. Large tract, row-crop farmers who wish to grow their business in the Ag Reserve should receive accommodation on packing houses, providing they do not infringe on the ability of other farmers to operate successfully in the Ag Reserve.</p>	<p>This is another ruse by development interests. Under current law, the Ag Reserve is a "sending" area for development rights. This means that landowners can sell their development rights but they must be "sent" outside of the Ag Reserve to areas that are zoned Urban or Suburban. This must remain the law in order to allow the Ag Reserve to survive and stop the dangerous development in the Ag Reserve. Don't ignore the LAW. Do what is right for the people and stop this now before it goes any further.</p>
Equestrian	<p>GL Homes is running out of land to create the "Preservation Area" required under the 60/40 development option where a parcel of land that is 1.5 times the size of the development area must be preserved for farming, fallow land, wetlands or other conservation purposes. Thus, GL Homes now wants to gut the law so that it can build thousands of more homes in an area that is set aside under the law to be "preserved primarily for agriculture." This plan is dangerous to the wetlands and wildlife corridors around the Wildlife Refuge and threatens the very survival of the Ag Reserve.</p>	<p>The farming that is under threat in the Ag Reserve is large tract, row-crop farming, an economic engine in Palm Beach County. Large tract, row-crop farmers who wish to grow their business in the Ag Reserve should receive accommodation on packing houses, providing they do not infringe on the ability of other farmers to operate successfully in the Ag Reserve.</p>	

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Equestrian	<p>This topic as purposed lacks common sense, foresight and wisdom for the Ag Reserve. The southern part of Palm Beach County needs to maintain it's geographical identity, farm lands need to remain in their present state. Do not allow further over development so that the Ag Reserve becomes the part of the county of nothing notable, like allowing the area to become one all-consuming vast concrete urban expanse. STOP FURTHER DEVELOPMENT IN THE AG RESERVE.</p>	<p>There has to be a greater discription and further detailed information of products given to comment on "uses" in this proposal. Offering code elimination proposals to owners of packing houses is inconceivable due to the fact that it is an obligation and duty of the county commissioners and staffers to maintain long range driven standards, and set ethical rules that provide the greatest good for the greatest group of citizens of the county, not the greatest good to a greed-driven few. Why is there such a rush to let go of the tax payers property that this proposal offers over-the-top perks for the packing houses, and to those who own the land they utilize located on the precious fertile farm land in the Ag Reserve? That said, if a particular farmer needs to increase his packing plant to accommodate his particular bountiful crop production, there needs to be a provision for that.</p>	<p>PROTECT and PRESERVE the AG RESERVE FROM BEING FURTHER TRUNCATED BY SUCH MEANS PROPOSED. Why are homes in the AgReserve considered Preserved ? In reality they are not preserve. More attention needs to be devoted to definitions.</p>
Equestrian	<p>this plan is dangerous to the wetlands and wildlife refuge and impacts the ag reserve to survival</p>	<p>gl homes wants to change existing law to build additional homes that will lead to the demise of the ag reserve the ag reserve should receive accomadation on packing houses so long as it does not infringe on other farmers to operate successfully in the ag reserve</p>	<p>the landowners can sell their development rights but must be sent outside the the ag reserve to bother areas zoned urban or suburbanthe law must remain as is</p>

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Interested Citizen	<p>Lets just make a patchwork quilt and call it Agricultural. We can lay it down on 441 and call it vegetables. Farms need to be contiguous because the people who move into subdivisions do not want a farm next door. Seven Bridges is a perfect example its in the middle of nowhere and the people dumb enough to pay \$700.000 to 2 MILLION DOLLARS will want every store nearby not a farm. They will cry that their poodle Fefe is allergic to tomatoes. The 1989 PBC Comprehensive Plan was to avoid the Bastardization of Palm Beach County. The 100 Million Dollar Bond was to avoid building in the AG Reserve. It was the buy 10,000 acres not 2300 acres period. Since the builders want to destroy the concept they need to give the taxpayers 100 MILLION DOLLARS PLUS the interest. I think a fare amount would be 200 Million. Since they are the ones benefiting from all the profits they receive as they keep moving up the road like locusts.</p>	NO	<p>NO And Hell No. This once again is a scam to put 100 more units on any one acre. Developers will not be happy until they can pave EVERY SQUARE INCH OF FLORIDA from Key West to Pensacola. They do not care if there is water or if we can breath or if we live at all. Florida is not New York City.</p>

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Interested Citizen	Please do not restrict the discussion to these preconceived issues. The issue of whether or not to develop the Ag Reserve at all has not been settled. In other words, many concerned residents, individuals, and stakeholders favor the continued enforcement of the moratorium blocking any development of the area. While it is controversial as to whether Boca Raton and surrounding areas can absorb an additional condominium building or housing development, it is clear that a new community or city to be developed on the Ag Reserve will serve to strain Boca and its residents in many more ways than imagined here.	Please do not restrict the discussion to these preconceived issues. The issue of whether or not to develop the Ag Reserve at all has not been settled. In other words, many concerned residents, individuals, and stakeholders favor the continued enforcement of the moratorium blocking any development of the area. While it is controversial as to whether Boca Raton and surrounding areas can absorb an additional condominium building or housing development, it is clear that a new community or city to be developed on the Ag Reserve will serve to strain Boca and its residents in many more ways than imagined here.	Please do not restrict the discussion to these preconceived issues. The issue of whether or not to develop the Ag Reserve at all has not been settled. In other words, many concerned residents, individuals, and stakeholders favor the continued enforcement of the moratorium blocking any development of the area. While it is controversial as to whether Boca Raton and surrounding areas can absorb an additional condominium building or housing development, it is clear that a new community or city to be developed on the Ag Reserve will serve to strain Boca and its residents in many more ways than imagined here.
Interested Citizen	Stop any further PD's in the ag reserve	Stop any further PD's in the ag reserve	Stop any further PD's in the ag reserve
Interested Citizen	I am not in favor of eliminating the size/contiguity requirement. Contiguity is needed for wildlife. Wildlife is a reason many people move out west and we should be saving a place for wildlife.	These are acceptable purposes so long as Ag Reserve land currently used for growing is not removed for growing for the creation of these new uses.	Again, there should be no commercial or residential development in the Ag Reserve. And, certainly nothing in preserve areas.

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Interested Citizen	GL Homes is running out of land to create the "Preservation Area" required under the 60/40 development option where a parcel of land that is 1.5 times the size of the development area must be preserved for farming, fallow land, wetlands or other conservation purposes. Thus, GL Homes now wants to gut the law so that it can build thousands of more homes in an area that is set aside under the law to be "preserved primarily for agriculture." This plan is dangerous to the wetlands and wildlife corridors around the Wildlife Refuge and threatens the very survival of the Ag Reserve.	The farming that is under threat in the Ag Reserve is large tract, row-crop farming, an economic engine in Palm Beach County. Large tract, row-crop farmers who wish to grow their business in the Ag Reserve should receive accommodation on packing houses, providing they do not infringe on the ability of other farmers to operate successfully in the Ag Reserve.	This is another ruse by development interests. Under current law, the Ag Reserve is a "sending" area for development rights. This means that landowners can sell their development rights but they must be "sent" outside of the Ag Reserve to areas that are zoned Urban or Suburban. This must remain the law in order to allow the Ag Reserve to survive and stop the dangerous development in the Ag Reserve.
Interested Citizen	This proposal is on the table because GL Homes has run out of tiny slivers of land to call Preservation Areas. What it simply means is that if the code change is approved, quarter-acre parcels could be called "Preservation Areas." What kind of high yield farming could be done on a quarter-acre parcel? How would this further the goal of large-tract farming in the Ag Reserve?	Packing plants serve a legitimate purpose if the farmer is engaged in large-scale row-crop production in the Ag Reserve. Packing plants should not be approved for row-crop production conducted in a different county unless that farmer also has significant row-crop production in the Ag Reserve.	Since GL Homes just got the County Commission to rubber stamp its "Preservation Areas" attached to its vastly expanded Valencia Cove development in the Ag Reserve, despite the fact that some of these "Preservation Areas" had single family homes on them (which is not allowed under current law), one must assume this is one more proposal seeking to benefit GL Homes.
Interested Citizen	This plan is dangerous to the wetlands and wildlife corridors around the Wildlife Refuge and threatens the very survival of the Ag Reserve.	Consider allowing large tract, row-crop farmers who wish to grow their business in the Ag Reserve to receive accommodation on packing houses, providing they do not infringe on the ability of other farmers to operate successfully in the Ag Reserve.	The county is not in the business of making farmers rich. Every last 5 acre parcel does not need to be given TDR's. SEND the tdr's OUT of the Ag Reserve- don't add more IN the Ag Reserve.
Interested Citizen	No changes. Small acreage is not good for farming. Keep our green space, green. You are selling out on our valuable farmland. There is none other like it in the country.	Perhaps consider larger packing houses for large row crop farms.	No. A preserve is a preserve. Use your own tdr for a house.
Interested Citizen	NO! Preserve agriculture.	maybe, on a case by case basis.	No.

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Interested Citizen	<p>GL Homes is running out of land to create the "Preservation Area" required under the 60/40 development option where a parcel of land that is 1.5 times the size of the development area must be preserved for farming, fallow land, wetlands or other conservation purposes. Thus, GL Homes now wants to gut the law so that it can build thousands of more homes in an area that is set aside under the law to be "preserved primarily for agriculture." This plan is dangerous to the wetlands and wildlife corridors around the Wildlife Refuge and THREATENS THE VERY SURVIVAL OF THE AG RESERVE.</p>	<p>The farming that is under threat in the Ag Reserve is large tract, row-crop farming, an economic engine in Palm Beach County. Large tract, row-crop farmers who wish to grow their business in the Ag Reserve should receive accommodation on packing houses, providing they do not infringe on the ability of other farmers to operate successfully in the Ag Reserve.</p>	<p>This is another ruse by development interests. Under current law, the Ag Reserve is a "sending" area for development rights. This means that landowners can sell their development rights but they must be "sent" outside of the Ag Reserve to areas that are zoned Urban or Suburban. This must remain the law in order to allow the Ag Reserve to survive and stop the dangerous development in the Ag Reserve.</p>
Interested Citizen	<p>Who put you all in office GL Homes or the citizens of Palm Beach County do what is right for the State of Florida, protect the wild life and Ag Reserve. This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.</p>	<p>Who put you all in office GL Homes or the citizens of Palm Beach County do what is right for the State of Florida, protect the wild life and Ag Reserve. This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.</p>	<p>Who put you all in office GL Homes or the citizens of Palm Beach County do what is right for the State of Florida, protect the wild life and Ag Reserve. This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.</p>

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Interested Citizen	No. The Ag Reserve is a special tier that was created to preserve agriculture, not development.	maybe	no. keep the rules as is
Interested Citizen	No need for change	Might be helpful	
Interested Citizen	GL Homes is running out of land to create the "Preservation Area" required under the 60/40 development option where a parcel of land that is 1.5 times the size of the development area must be preserved for farming, fallow land, wetlands or other conservation purposes. Thus, GL Homes now wants to gut the law so that it can build thousands of more homes in an area that is set aside under the law to be "preserved primarily for agriculture." This plan is dangerous to the wetlands and wildlife corridors around the Wildlife Refuge and threatens the very survival of the Ag Reserve.	The farming that is under threat in the Ag Reserve is large tract, row-crop farming, an economic engine in Palm Beach County. Large tract, row-crop farmers who wish to grow their business in the Ag Reserve should receive accommodation on packing houses, providing they do not infringe on the ability of other farmers to operate successfully in the Ag Reserve.	This is another ruse by development interests. Under current law, the Ag Reserve is a "sending" area for development rights. This means that landowners can sell their development rights but they must be "sent" outside of the Ag Reserve to areas that are zoned Urban or Suburban. This must remain the law in order to allow the Ag Reserve to survive and stop the dangerous development in the Ag Reserve.
Interested Citizen	GL Homes is running out of land to create the "Preservation Area" required under the 60/40 development option where a parcel of land that is 1.5 times the size of the development area must be preserved for farming, fallow land, wetlands or other conservation purposes. Thus, GL Homes now wants to gut the law so that it can build thousands of more homes in an area that is set aside under the law to be "preserved primarily for agriculture." This plan is dangerous to the wetlands and wildlife corridors around the Wildlife Refuge and threatens the very survival of the Ag Reserve.	The farming that is under threat in the Ag Reserve is large tract, row-crop farming, an economic engine in Palm Beach County. Large tract, row-crop farmers who wish to grow their business in the Ag Reserve should receive accommodation on packing houses, providing they do not infringe on the ability of other farmers to operate successfully in the Ag Reserve.	This is another ruse by development interests. Under current law, the Ag Reserve is a "sending" area for development rights. This means that landowners can sell their development rights but they must be "sent" outside of the Ag Reserve to areas that are zoned Urban or Suburban. This must remain the law in order to allow the Ag Reserve to survive and stop the dangerous development in the Ag Reserve.
Interested Citizen	No way this much control should be given to developments.	These more "natural" endeavors can help to sustain the forever wild nature of these areas, and should be encouraged, especially as opposed to the developments which will pave over lands, and make other support developments necessary.	Yes, this is more compatible to the forever wild nature of the Ag Reserve.

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Interested Citizen	NO. When the Ag Reserve was set up, the 60/40 WAS THE COMPROMISE. Developers were supposed to agree to this IN PERPETUITY. This plan is dangerous to the wetlands and wildlife corridors around the Wildlife Refuge and threatens the very survival of the Ag Reserve.	NO. The farming that is under threat in the Ag Reserve is large tract, row-crop farming, an economic engine in Palm Beach County. Large tract, row-crop farmers who wish to grow their business in the Ag Reserve should receive accommodation on packing houses, providing they do not infringe on the ability of other farmers to operate successfully in the Ag Reserve.	NO. This is another ruse by development interests. Under current law, the Ag Reserve is a "sending" area for development rights. This means that landowners can sell their development rights but they must be "sent" outside of the Ag Reserve to areas that are zoned Urban or Suburban. This must remain the law in order to allow the Ag Reserve to survive and stop the dangerous development in the Ag Reserve.
Interested Citizen	Light up an El Corrupto, and feel good again!	Could the manufacture of tractors, manure spreaders, and pesticides be considered as accessory to agriculture...since all you are doing is spreading more manure.	See the Wellington Equestrian development. How much less than five acres? 1/2 acre? More manure.
Interested Citizen	Please allow owners who bought their land prior to the AgReserve designation to sell their land. It is too difficult to farm it and impossible to sell it.	Please allow owners who bought their land prior to the AgReserve designation to sell their land. It is too difficult to farm it and impossible to sell it.	Please allow owners who bought their land prior to the AgReserve designation to sell their land. It is too difficult to farm it and impossible to sell it.
Interested Citizen	This has already taken place by developers being permitted to swap out smaller parcels for larger tracts.	There already are existing packing facilities that are under utilized as many are gone and others running well below capacity. The reality is that commercial farming has been minimized by existing development in the AG Reserve.	I do not believe that this will assist in leveling the playing field with the large tract developers that has already taken place.

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Interested Citizen	NO CHANGE TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	NO CHANGE TO COMPREHENSIVE PALN	1) PERMIT A FARM RESIDENCE IN PRESERVE AREA 2) ALLOW RESIDENCE TO BE BUILT ON LESS THAN 5 ACRES 3) ELIMINATE SIZE RESTRICTION ON CARETAKERS QUARTERS 4) PERMIT ONE SINGLE FAMILY FARM RESIDENCE IN A PRESERVE AREA 5) CODE REQUIREMENT OF DENSITY AT 1 UNIT FOR 5 ACRES TO BE MAINTAINED 6) MAINTAIN SIZE RESTIRCTIONS OF 1000 SQ ST ON CARETAKER QUARTERSNO CHANGE T
Interested Citizen	no, no, no. Small preserve areas scattered all around is not was intended in the Ag Reserve.	Must be looked at case by case. Legitimate Ag related use might be ok within certain perimeters. Larger packing houses might be ok for legitimately large farms with excessive amounts of produce to be shipped. Trucks should not bring produce into the Ag Reserve from other farms for shipping. Codes and restrictions are needed- do not completely do away with these.	A residence is not a good use of preserve land. Do not eliminate restrictions on size of caretakers quarters on preserve land. If larger quarters are needed, use development land, not reserve land.
Interested Citizen	no. The citizens envisioned the Ag Reserve to be an area of large, productive farms. This is very valuable farmland- a very special area in our country.	I don't know.	Again, preserve should be preserve. We are not in the business of making farmers rich. We should be in the business of making farms productive.
Interested Citizen	No changes.	Maybe allow larger packing houses, but individual review necessary. I would not like to see large trucks coming into the Ag Reserve from other areas with fruit and vegetables to be packed here. The packing houses should only be used for our local farms.	Not on preserve areas. Let them use the TDR's for their houses. Same for caretakers' quarters.
Interested Citizen	No changes.	maybe allow more real agricultural related uses. Must be subject to review. BTW, how did we allow a garbage transfer site on preserve land? Is the county going to use the money to buy another beautiful farm to preserve in it's place?	No- keep the 5 acre minimum for homes.

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Interested Citizen	As above - we need to grow our economy.	As above - we need to grow our economy.	As above - we need to grow our economy.
Interested Citizen	No more homes	No more	Np
Interested Citizen	No change except to not allow any building.	Allow agriculture. Maintain size restriction for packing houses until need is proven.	So, proposed a home of any size in preserve areas on less than 5 acres. NO. NO HOMES UNDER THE GUISE OF CONSRVATION. No elimination of restriction on size of caretakers quarters allowed.
Interested Citizen	No	No no	No No
Interested Citizen	Back when you were in biology class you learned that Malthus suggested that in any interval, food production increases arithmetically (2+2+4+8...) while human population growth increases geometrically (2x2x4x16x32...). The two curves quickly diverge. What sense does it make to take away a single acre of land perfectly suited for growing food and convert it into housing developments and so called preservation areas that do not produce food. 60/40 should be changed within the Ag. Reserve.	The farming that is under threat in the Ag Reserve is large tract, row-crop farming, an economic engine in Palm Beach County. Large tract, row-crop farmers who wish to grow their business in the Ag Reserve should receive accommodation on packing houses, providing they do not infringe on the ability of other farmers to operate successfully in the Ag Reserve.	There was an article in the 1/11/2015 PB Post titled "National Gross Harvest Decreased In 2014. This was just 3 days after a 6-1 vote that turned restricted easements into the hands of development. 60/40 does not work. It needs to be removed from the Ag. Reserve. Houses can be built in other areas with lesser density zoning. Do not destroy any more of this precious agriculture "Goldilock's zone".
Nursery Operator	I have 2 5 acres pieces on acme dairy road. We live on one of the pieces and I have been in the business since 1980. Our area is surrounded by house developments, school just to the south of us and a hospital about 3 miles west. we are not big enough for preserve area even with all the neighbors and their are no preserves adjacent to us but we must remain in Agriculture. I don't understand how some landowners received the development rights to sell and others like myself have been left out but are forced to stay in agriculture.	Have no problem with landscape companies in ag Reserve but mulching needs to be zoned away from any existing home some that noise and fire risked are separated.	You want us to stay in ag. but have this notion that I can not live here. I would think that people like me and other small farmers would be allowed to participate like the large land owners did. I would like to stay and farm and love living on the property. it would make more sense to bull doze my house so that the 5 acres would get 5 development rights at \$80000 each and move to a different location. I don't want to do that.

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Nursery Operator			this is a no brainer I am for this change.
Nursery Operator	THIS IS FAIR FOR THE SMALLER LAND OWNERS	if it pertains to agriculture it should be able to exist in the ag reserve	this works for someone who only has one or two acres. the small land owner should have the rights as the large land owner
Nursery Operator	• Since preserves are currently allowed to be "moved" and "swapped" – with other land, eliminate minimum size/contiguity requirement.	It is too late. The critical mass for the agriculture industry is already gone in the Ag Reserve.	Yes, allow a home to serve as a farm residence and eliminate restriction on size of caretakers' quarters.
Nursery Operator	Yes on all of these	yes on all of these	Yes
Nursery Operator	• Since preserves are currently allowed to be "moved" and "swapped" – with other land, and I understand now it can even be swapped outside of the ag reserve - eliminate minimum size/contiguity requirement.	These changes that were suggested would not work. The county has already lost its critical mass for the agriculture industry. A welder was on our property for 50 years fixing farm equipment - and went to work directly for one farmer - because all the large tracts of land were sold - so there is no longer a need for his services. How could it be expected to product products that serve as an accessory to the agricultural industry when the industry has been decreased by more than 50% - just in the land area. With schools, hospitals and thousands of houses being built, this is no longer an agricultural area.	Yes, allow a home to serve as a farm residence and eliminate restriction on size of caretakers' quarters.
Nursery Operator	Yes, eliminate minimum size/contiguity requirement - many small farmers have been pleading to be allowed to sell their development rights. Unfortunately, under the current plan that is their only hope. Especially since their land value has diminished in the ag reserve - an unintended consequence.	Yes, allow more uses and eliminate current size restrictions for packing houses.	Note that the ag reserve master needs to be updated so it correlates to what is realistic. Agree with both recommendations above.
Nursery Operator	ELIMINATE MIN. SIZE CONTIUIITY REQUIREMENT.	ALLOW MORE USESACCESSORIES TO AG INDUSTRY.	ALLOW HOME TO SERVE AS FARM RSIDENCE.....ON LESS THAN FIVE.....TO ALLOW SALE OF DEVELOPMENTRIGHTS ON ADDITIONAL LANDS

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Nursery Operator	not sure how I feel about this. I have the ability to sell mine but have not because I do not want to be doing this the rest of my life. Been in the nursery business since 1980 and VERY tired. I think you need to take a survey of those who have sold. Im sure most of them did just because they needed money. NOT because they wanted to stay in the ag business.	This just adds more of the non ag uses that are already out there. packing houses should have no size limit.	
Resident of the Ag Reserve		In Appendix "B", page B-6 of the Ag. Reserve Master Plan it says: "The uses below are to be accommodated as a part of the continuation of the Reserve." FAITH FARMS Churches Faith Farm is a church, and runs its 9-month Residential Drug & Alcohol Recovery Program on its 90-acres on U.S. 441 /State Rd. 7. Faith Farm was established when its frontage was on a 2-lane road. There were NO facilities available. That is why Faith Farm has its own Water AND Sewer Plants. Our Students in Recovery are allowed no vehicles, so Faith Farm is not even a burden on the Road System, no matter how many residents are in the Program. Faith Farm should NOT be required to adhere to ANY CONFORMING USES, because we were there BEFORE there were ANY uses, so there should be no comparison for Faith Farm. We should be (and we believe we are) exempt from the Ag Reserve Issues totally. Yet, Zoning is afraid to acknowledge that, and we are constantly limited in developing additional beds to save more people in the community from addictions. Judges sentence people to Faith Farm, taking \$92,500/year (we're told) off the costs of incarceration, yet we spend \$3,000 per month per student to transform people from being thieves, committing burglaries, etc. to get money to buy drugs into providing jobs, college grants, etc. and transforming them into renting, working tax-paying citizens, yet we cannot expand to increase this work? something's really wrong with this picture.	

Topic:	Topic: Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Topic: Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Topic: Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters
Resident of the Ag Reserve	Stop your aggrandizement. Save our quality of life and preserve these sensitive wetlands. Conserve water, don't think you can commoditize it. We'll reach a tipping point from which we will not be able to return to the norm. We're headed to a calamitous ending of our quality of life and will look more like Martin county, teetering on the margins in all respects.	Some agricultural services might be permitted, but only by special, individual approval, according to environmental impact, traffic allowances, and of course necessity to support existing industries.	I would oppose breaking up 5 acre estates for the purpose of further development. A room in the barn, or a loft could serve as a housekeepers quarters. Should the house be bigger than the barn? I suppose it would be possible to have a servant's quarters that is actually bigger than the house. I can't imagine something like this in one of our gated communities but if the residence is in an accepted equestrian or farming community than I suppose the barn/servant's quarters could be as big as the owner of the property wants.
Resident of the Ag Reserve		Not a good idea. These operations detract from neighboring residential parcels	
Resident of the Ag Reserve	agreed	not sure that is what we want, depends on areas in the reserve.	no comment
Resident of the Ag Reserve	PLEASE GIVE ME THE LITTLE MAN THE RIGHTS TO MY OWN PROPERTY AGAIN	AS ABOVE	AS ABOVE

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Topic Description:	Create overlay option for undeveloped lands allowing for a base potential density of 1 du/ac, a min. req. 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 into Ag Reserve at 7,000; Make corresponding changes to TDR program	Post signs indicating designated Agricultural Reserve area and cautioning motorists about slow moving farm equipment; Encourage and support agritourism where practical; Seek public/private support for commodity festivals; Consider traffic modifications more conducive to farming/nursery operations
Respondent Category:		
Community Organization Representative	NO! This is the Ag Reserve- one of the most productive agricultural areas in our country. We MUST NOT dismantle the large tracts for farming. This cannot just be about the end game for farmers who are no longer interested in farming. Make it valuable to sell to farmers, NOT to developers and commercial interests. Take them out of the equation. Farmland is valuable! No new TDR's IN- only OUT. Change the rules so that preserved parcels remain preserve parcels. Stop the parking and moving of tdr's.	YES! Make our farmland valuable for what it is- one of the richest agricultural areas in our country. Promote the Ag Reserve and help our farmers!
Community Organization Representative	Make no changes in the TDR program.	Agreed
Community Organization Representative	No TDRs in the Ag Reserve	Agree

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Community Organization Representative	There should be no new development in the Ag Reserve. All agricultural land should remain agricultural forever. Any permits that have been granted to developers should be revoked. If any developers claim the right to develop agricultural land, they should be challenged in court. There has been too much development already in the agricultural reserve and any more development will have a devastating effect upon our economy, our quality of life, our environment, our health and well being, and will exacerbate global warming.	We support these measures.
Developer/Agent	This appears to open the area up for too much development. There is already a number of developments in the works. Do not support a TDR bank at this time. There needs to be a long term plan that limits the amount of development and guarantees a minimum threshold for farming to keep the area viable as an area of agricultural production.	We support these ideas. Roads should designed so that agricultural equipment can be safely operated. There may need to be reduced speed limits and greater enforcement. Support community festivals. Strongly support agritourism. This is a great idea to bring in more business to our area.
Developer/Agent	No major farming area in the United States allows for development of 3 homes per acre as proposed above. The proposal to end the 60 percent preserve requirement would effectively turn the Ag Reserve and the buffer lands around the Wildlife Refuge into a densely populated residential area.	Sounds good.
Developer/Agent	We cannot end the 60/40 requirement! That would be the end of the Ag Reserve. it was my understanding at the technical meetings that the commisssioners wanted to preserve the AG Reserve. This change would end it!	yes. we might want to consider water farming as well. We need an economic impact study on the whole area.
Developer/Agent	See comments above.	See comments above.

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Developer/Agent	<p>There is absolutely no rational justification for the TDR overlay option. Ultimately, the County would be pressured and allowed to sell TDRs with no requirement that these sales be used to acquire more agricultural lands. The end result would not encourage the preservation of agricultural but instead would allow for the proliferation of sprawling development. Eliminating the 60% requirement is a fundamental violation of the Ag Reserve program. From a planning perspective, 3/dus/acre is not compatible with agricultural protection. Accordingly, NO additional units should be allowed in the Ag Reserve.</p>	<p>YES to all of these. Add a requirement that all residential unit purchasers sign an acknowledgment disclosure statement regarding the Right to Farm Act. See Fla. Stat. 823.14.</p>
Developer/Agent	<p>To allow 60% of preserve to be established as residential homes will increase density and decrease the natural areas of the preserve.</p>	
Developer/Agent	<p>I would oppose any changes to the TDR program. Farmers have said that their operations are becoming less viable as they are surrounded by more and more development. As more of the areas for farming are broken up, more of the remaining farmers will give up and the concept of an Agricultural Reserve will become a lost cause, not to mention a waste of taxpayers' money. More development also diminishes the value of the Ag Reserve as a buffer to Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, in particular any development west of S.R. 7.</p>	<p>I absolutely would support ideas such as these that would let more county residents know that we have an Agricultural Reserve, it is something to be proud of, with many local benefits, that living in it is a privilege that comes with benefits but some restrictions. Those benefits include harboring wildlife from the neighboring Everglades, which by the way more residents should also be made aware of. I also heard some good ideas on helping farmers stay in farming at one of the recent technical sessions. One was to make sure that the county is not leasing county-bought land back to farmers at rates that undercut other owners in the Ag Reserve who could otherwise charge higher rates for leasing their own land. Another was to offer tax breaks to owners in the Ag Reserve who keep their land in farming, and to allow those breaks to continue if/when the land is sold, to partly compensate for the restrictions that prevent their selling out to developers for top dollar.</p>

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Developer/Agent	The proposal to end the 60 percent preserve requirement would effectively turn the Ag reserve and the buffer lands around the Wildlife into a densely populated residential area. I am definately against this idea!!	This is the best idea!! It is important to advertise the ag reserve land and to make people aware of how lucky we have some of the best crops in the US. We definately need to support agritourism and have commodity festivals (like the Everglades Day Festival put on at ARM Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge) and definately consider traffic modifications more conducive to farming/nursery operations. WE NEED TO SUPPORT THE FARMERS! They are very very important to our future!

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Developer/Agent	<p>This proposed change is outrageously inconsistent with the premise of continued agriculture within the Ag Reserve. It is nothing more than a blatant attempt to drastically increase development to the detriment of agriculture and the environment. It directly contravenes the most fundamental and basic purposes and intents of the Transfer of Development Rights program which is to reduce development potential in sensitive areas like the Ag Reserve. These proposed changes and the others above, as a whole, would significantly undermine the long-term viability of agriculture and environmental protection within the Ag Reserve. Their basic purpose is nothing more than to increase development potential and land values to the benefit of landowners and to the detriment of long-term agriculture. They significantly undermine the massive public investment to protect and maintain agricultural land within the Ag Reserve in perpetuity. Because they are based upon increasing private profit as opposed to preserving agriculture, they fail to further any legitimate public purpose and instead irreversibly undermine the purposes for which the Ag Reserve was established. There is no legitimate planning purpose that supports these amendments and they fail to address the important state and local interest in long-term agricultural preservation. These changes should be rejected in total, as they are extremely detrimental to the purposes of the Ag Reserve and they provide no benefit to agriculture or the environment whatsoever.</p>	<p>These changes and other similar additions to the Ag Reserve plan seem appropriate and should be a key area of focus when looking for consensus. Additional agricultural enhancement ideas should be developed and considered, including, promoting farmer's markets to improve the visibility and importance of agriculture to the local community; re-instituting a PACE program for properties that are unable to qualify as preservation areas; utilization of "locally grown" or "PBC Ag Reserve" labels on all Ag Reserve produce; increased opportunities for "farm to table" agriculture; the promotion of "locally grown" CSA;s or consumer cooperatives, proper management of preserve areas to ensure they do not become infested with exotic species; and requiring disclosures for homebuyers of their location within an agricultural area. Additionally options should be explored to further the protection of agricultural land in perpetuity, such as providing 3rd party enforcement rights for conservation easements, requiring land use changes for preservation parcels, and / or requiring a super-majority vote for modification of conservation easements. As recommended in the Ag Reserve Master Plan, opportunities for agricultural education facilities should be explored. Such a program could be used to assist farms making the transition from one generation to the next. "Farm Link" programs have been initiated in several states, Through these programs, a farmer approaching retirement is linked with someone wanting to start farming through a coordinated effort and process.</p>

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Equestrian	It is an insult to the taxpayers of this county that this proposal is even being put out for consideration. No serious farming area in the United States allows for development of 3 homes per acre as envisioned above. The proposal to end the 60 percent preserve requirement would effectively turn the Ag Reserve and the buffer lands around the Wildlife Refuge into a densely populated residential area. As one commentator stated at a previous Concerned Citizens' roundtable, "the outrage is the lack of outrage." And that outrage is lacking because the people are misinformed	These proposals came from those sincerely interested in protecting the Ag Reserve and should be given serious consideration. But other important recommendations from the public have been excluded from consideration: (1) stop all further development in the Ag Reserve because it is already overbuilt and driving farmers out; (2) conduct independent, economic impact studies to see how much this overdevelopment is costing taxpayers in both the short-term and long-term by converting unique farmland that produces up to 3 plantings in winter into zero lot line homes that produce high taxpayer costs for roads, schools, parks, etc. Why is it that all of the developer's wish list is on the table but concerned public citizens' cannot get valid proposals considered?
Equestrian		These proposals came from those sincerely interested in protecting the Ag Reserve and should be given serious consideration. But other important recommendations from the public have been excluded from consideration: (1) stop all further development in the Ag Reserve because it is already overbuilt and driving farmers out; (2) conduct independent, economic impact studies to see how much this overdevelopment is costing taxpayers in both the short-term and long-term by converting unique farmland that produces up to 3 plantings in winter into zero lot line homes that produce high taxpayer costs for roads, schools, parks, etc. Why is it that all of the developer's wish list is on the table but concerned public citizens' cannot get valid proposals considered?
Equestrian	This increased density consideration is not acceptable or in compliance with the \$100 Million in tax payer money to have been used to protect the Ag Reserve from developers. NO TDRS INTO THE AG RESERVE, NOT EVER	All valid, all necessary. More pro conservation proposals necessary as well.
Equestrian	I do not want and end of the 60 percent preserve because the ag reserve will be to densely populated	stop further development. we must not overbuild the ag reserve can not sustain itself

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Interested Citizen	<p>Overlays are a joke just like the Glades Area Protection Overlay (GAPO) written for Enrique Tomeu and Palm Beach Aggregates which gave us the biggest source of pollution in the world a 3800 megawatt power plant blowing 12 MILLION TONS OF POLLUTION , which needs 21 Million Gallons of water a day from 5 different permits , has 900 PSI, 36 inch natural gas pipeline with no Shut off valve for 34.7 miles and rock mining blasting daily within 200 feet till 2032. And they think they can steal more water and sell it to Broward from the 4000 acre pits right next to the power plant. Good luck with that dumb idea. HELL NO to any overlays ever again. This whole subject was brought up by a commission who thumbs their noses at bonds, commitments, and perpetuity. Our Commissioners sit on the dais speaking the exact words of the builders its uncanny that they repeat verbatim every nuance like puppets on the builders laps.</p>	<p>The Arthur Marshall is having it free day on February 14 2015 Valentines Day. That in itself is where I never see County Commissioners or Staff you need to go. That was what the entire area looked like before the rape and pillage started. 441 was a two lane road with canals on either side just a few years back.</p>

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Interested Citizen	Please do not restrict the discussion to these preconceived issues. The issue of whether or not to develop the Ag Reserve at all has not been settled. In other words, many concerned residents, individuals, and stakeholders favor the continued enforcement of the moratorium blocking any development of the area. While it is controversial as to whether Boca Raton and surrounding areas can absorb an additional condominium building or housing development, it is clear that a new community or city to be developed on the Ag Reserve will serve to strain Boca and its residents in many more ways than imagined here.	Please do not restrict the discussion to these preconceived issues. The issue of whether or not to develop the Ag Reserve at all has not been settled. In other words, many concerned residents, individuals, and stakeholders favor the continued enforcement of the moratorium blocking any development of the area. While it is controversial as to whether Boca Raton and surrounding areas can absorb an additional condominium building or housing development, it is clear that a new community or city to be developed on the Ag Reserve will serve to strain Boca and its residents in many more ways than imagined here.
Interested Citizen	Stop any further PD's in the ag reserve	Do anything and everything to keep the ag reserve as what it's supposed to be, an ag reserve, as defined originally, and stop picking away at it and allowing development.
Interested Citizen	No commercial or residential development should be allowed and the county should not be selling any land for any purpose. The land should be preserved for agricultural use only.	Good idea if there will actually be any land left where some growing is going on. Perhaps a green market out there for the residents of the area. I do not live in the Ag Reserve area but that doesn't mean that I am not concerned about the future of it. More and more residents of Palm Beach county are waking up to what is happening here in this county. In the haste to develop all of Palm Beach county, the very reasons that many move here are being lost.

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Interested Citizen	It is an insult to the taxpayers of this county that this proposal is even being put out for consideration. No serious farming area in the United States allows for development of 3 homes per acre as envisioned above. The proposal to end the 60 percent preserve requirement would effectively turn the Ag Reserve and the buffer lands around the Wildlife Refuge into a densely populated residential area. As one commentator stated at a previous Concerned Citizens' roundtable, "the outrage is the lack of outrage."	These proposals came from those sincerely interested in protecting the Ag Reserve and should be given serious consideration. But other important recommendations from the public have been excluded from consideration: (1) stop all further development in the Ag Reserve because it is already overbuilt and driving farmers out; (2) conduct independent, economic impact studies to see how much this overdevelopment is costing taxpayers in both the short-term and long-term by converting unique farmland that produces up to 3 plantings in winter into zero lot line homes that produce high taxpayer costs for roads, schools, parks, etc. Why is it that all of the developer's wish list is on the table but concerned public citizens' cannot get valid proposals considered?
Interested Citizen	Serious farming areas throughout the United States restrict residential development to one home per every 25 acres, or one home per 10 acres or one home per 5 acres. To suggest that it would be appropriate to allow 3 homes per acre in the Ag Reserve is all the proof one needs that these proposals are coming from a developer out to help himself and not to help farmers.	These are great suggestions but will only be helpful if NONE of the egregious proposals above to dramatically expand development are approved.
Interested Citizen	The proposal to end the 60 percent preserve requirement would effectively turn the Ag Reserve and the buffer lands around the Wildlife Refuge into a densely populated residential area. The purpose of the Ag Reserve is to preserve Agriculture!!!	Excellent idea. Make farming profitable! Sell agricultural land for agriculture. Do NOT change zoning and rules. Make farmland valuable as farmland. Make it safe for tractors and horses to exist in the Ag Reserve. This is MOST important.
Interested Citizen	no, no, no. We want farmland. That is the purpose of the Ag Reserve.	Yes! Make our farmland valuable as farmland!
Interested Citizen	No. Preserve agriculture in this area. It is the Ag Reserve- a very special place for farming in America. Didn't we taxpayers already vote in 1999 and tell you that we value agriculture and open green space and want it to remain that way?	Yes- encourage agritourism and promote farm related , farm to table type projects, farmers markets, etc.

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Interested Citizen	It is an insult to the taxpayers of this county that this proposal is even being put out for consideration. NO SERIOUS FARMING AREA IN THE UNITED STATES ALLOWS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF 3 HOMES PER ACRE as envisioned above. The proposal to end the 60 percent preserve requirement would effectively turn the Ag Reserve and the buffer lands around the Wildlife Refuge into a densely populated residential area. As one commentator stated at a previous Concerned Citizens' roundtable, "the outrage is the lack of outrage."	These proposals came from those sincerely interested in protecting the Ag Reserve and SHOULD BE GIVEN SERIOUS CONSIDERATION. But other important recommendations from the public have been excluded from consideration: (1) stop all further development in the Ag Reserve because it is already overbuilt and driving farmers out; (2) conduct independent, economic impact studies to see how much this overdevelopment is costing taxpayers in both the short-term and long-term by converting unique farmland that produces up to 3 plantings in winter into zero lot line homes that produce high taxpayer costs for roads, schools, parks, etc. Why is it that all of the developer's wish list is on the table but concerned public citizens' cannot get valid proposals considered?
Interested Citizen	Who put you all in office GL Homes or the citizens of Palm Beach County do what is right for the State of Florida, protect the wild life and Ag Reserve. This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.	Who put you all in office GL Homes or the citizens of Palm Beach County do what is right for the State of Florida, protect the wild life and Ag Reserve. This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.
Interested Citizen	No!	Yes, yes, yes! Promote agriculture and buy local. This is the trend nationwide.
Interested Citizen		Seek additional dollars for purchase of lands for farming enhance family farming and promotion of local food in restaurants and hotels

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Interested Citizen		It is shameful that the overbuilding in the Ag reserve, continues to be manipulated by our politicians, & major developers, ie. GL homes. The overwhelming majority of Florida residents object to building in the Ag reserve as it will destroy farming, the water table, & ruin the habitat for many of nature's creatures. We desperately need to maintain the integrity of these lands, & listen to the majority of residents who our politicians are supposed to serve
Interested Citizen	It is an insult to the taxpayers of this county that this proposal is even being put out for consideration. No serious farming area in the United States allows for development of 3 homes per acre as envisioned above. The proposal to end the 60 percent preserve requirement would effectively turn the Ag Reserve and the buffer lands around the Wildlife Refuge into a densely populated residential area. As one commentator stated at a previous Concerned Citizens' roundtable, "the outrage is the lack of outrage."	These proposals came from those sincerely interested in protecting the Ag Reserve and should be given serious consideration. But other important recommendations from the public have been excluded from consideration: (1) stop all further development in the Ag Reserve because it is already overbuilt and driving farmers out; (2) conduct independent, economic impact studies to see how much this overdevelopment is costing taxpayers in both the short-term and long-term by converting unique farmland that produces up to 3 plantings in winter into zero lot line homes that produce high taxpayer costs for roads, schools, parks, etc. Why is it that all of the developer's wish list is on the table but concerned public citizens' cannot get valid proposals considered?
Interested Citizen	It is an insult to the taxpayers of this county that this proposal is even being put out for consideration. No serious farming area in the United States allows for development of 3 homes per acre as envisioned above. The proposal to end the 60 percent preserve requirement would effectively turn the Ag Reserve and the buffer lands around the Wildlife Refuge into a densely populated residential area. As one commentator stated at a previous Concerned Citizens' roundtable, "the outrage is the lack of outrage"	These proposals came from those sincerely interested in protecting the Ag Reserve and should be given serious consideration. But other important recommendations from the public have been excluded from consideration: (1) stop all further development in the Ag Reserve because it is already overbuilt and driving farmers out; (2) conduct independent, economic impact studies to see how much this overdevelopment is costing taxpayers in both the short-term and long-term by converting unique farmland that produces up to 3 plantings in winter into zero lot line homes that produce high taxpayer costs for roads, schools, parks, etc. Why is it that all of the developer's wish list is on the table but concerned public citizens' cannot get valid proposals considered?

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Interested Citizen	Too much residential development is what should be eliminated as dangerous and incompatible to the Ag Reserve.	These are necessary and welcome aspects of keeping the Ag Reserve present and safe.
Interested Citizen	NO. This is a serious insult to the taxpayers of this county that this proposal is even being put out for consideration. Allow development of 3 homes per acre? Even in New Jersey, that's called a 'city'. The proposal to end the 60 percent preserve requirement would effectively turn the Ag Reserve and the buffer lands around the Wildlife Refuge into a densely populated residential area. For crying out loud - go back and re-read the 1999 vote and original plan. Barely 15 years in and the proposal is to totally destroy the Ag Reserve? Really? Then give me back my \$100M.	PROTECT THE AG RESERVE! THAT'S WHAT PBC CITIZENS VOTED FOR. These proposals came from those sincerely interested in protecting the Ag Reserve and should be given serious consideration. GO MUCH FURTHER: (1) stop all further development in the Ag Reserve because it is already overbuilt and driving farmers out; (2) conduct independent, economic impact studies to see how much this overdevelopment is costing taxpayers in both the short-term and long-term by converting unique farmland that produces up to 3 plantings in winter into zero lot line homes that produce high taxpayer costs for roads, schools, parks, etc. WHY ARE THE ONLY ITEMS UNDER CONSIDERATION THOSE THAT DEVELOPERS WANT? DID I MISS THE PART WHERE THE RESIDENTS DON'T MATTER ANYMORE?
Interested Citizen	Correction: Transfer of Rights of Development (TRD). the more you go again, you are spreading more TRDs.	Post signs warning potential developers and home buyers that agriculture and residential development should not be contiguous, due to harmful herbicides, and pesticides being sprayed, and farm equipment noise starting at or near sunrise, and continuing throughout the day. ULDC- The Unified Land Developers' Caprice.
Interested Citizen	Please allow owners who bought their land prior to the Ag Reserve designation to sell their land. It is too difficult to farm it and impossible to sell it.	None of these ideas make farming in this area easier. We need to offer money to purchase the land of the homeowners who can no longer afford to farm the land. It is only fair. The owners bought the land prior to the Ag Reserve with the expectation that they would be able to sell the land. Currently it is too expensive and difficult to farm and there are no good options to sell the land.
Interested Citizen	The development of a parcel should be determined by what it is surrounded by now and what capacity it has for traffic to get in and out of the parcel. The elimination of 60% preserve is logical. The majority if not all of the preserve areas are controlled by the large tract builders.	As a native Floridian it is very difficult if not impossible to expect more commercial farming and slower traffic when existing major arterial's have already sliced the AG Reserve up. Traffic already travels at 65 mph on 441, Clint Moore Rd., Atlantic Ave, Boynton Beach Blvd., & Lyons Road.

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Interested Citizen	NO CHANGE TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	FOR THESE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMS
Interested Citizen	No TDR's should be transferred into the Ag Reserve. No change in housing density. The Ag Reserve is about farming, not about development.	Yes- this is the national trend and more PR is needed to help our farmers continue to farm.
Interested Citizen	No changes. Stop helping developers and start helping farmers.	Yes- this is just what we need.
Interested Citizen	No.	Great ideas! This is what is becoming very popular nationwide. Let's promote our farmers and make it enticing to be a farmer. Let's promote farm to table meals and markets.
Interested Citizen	No.	Yes! Promote agritourism and promote farmers!
Interested Citizen	As above - we need to grow our economy.	safety first! but be practical about the regulations we impose.
Interested Citizen	No	
Interested Citizen	NO RESIDENTIAL OR COMMERCIAL PERIOD. We did not vote for residential building in the Ag Reserve. At least that's what most of us thought we were voting for. Personally, I feel those who voted for the hospital and the homes and the recent change for GL Homes should be run out of town.	Agricultural Enhancement Programs....who is kidding who? Developers and friendly Commissioners want to build out the area, then what will be left to "promote enhancement"? Just remember, 80 or 90% of what is in most of our homes is from China and the far east. How do you like your vegetable's coming from Central or South America? I don't think my vote is the only one that will be for those that protect what we the voters decided by more than 70% that we wanted and were willing to pay for.
Interested Citizen	No no NO	More NO's
Interested Citizen	It is an insult to the taxpayers of this county that this proposal is even being put out for consideration. No serious farming area in the United States allows for development of 3 homes per acre as envisioned above. The proposal to end the 60 percent preserve requirement would effectively turn the Ag Reserve and the buffer lands around the Wildlife Refuge into a densely populated residential area. As one commentator stated at a previous Concerned Citizens' roundtable, "the outrage is the lack of outrage."	I grew up in PB Co. learning that this was a major agriculture county for winter vegetables located east of the Mississippi. As we chip away at prime farm land, it is like "death by a thousand cuts" to this industry. This provides a sustainable income year after year for Palm Beach County. Changing this to housing produces a one-time profit. Most of this profit leaves us to go to investment banks and others somewhere else. I will be happy to put back on my retired biology teacher's hat, if anyone wishes to learn more in detail.

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Nursery Operator		Traffic modifications are definitely needed since our tractors are driving 10 or 15 mph and cars are zipping past us beeping like we should not be here. as far as agritourism, this is a pipe dream for people that think commercial operations would want this. this would have to be set up like Bedners as a separate location from your working farm location. Don't really know any one that would be interested. liability is always a question and why I don't allow homeowners on my properties.
Nursery Operator	I am all for this change. Why should Ag.Reserve TDR's go out of the area. This is revenue for the County,and is an easy change. Allow 3 du/ac on land south of Atlantic to blend in with the area residential and Agricultural do not mix well. I have a church,kinder, St.Marys to north,Mizner CC.and Delray Estates to my Southeast.It is very hard for me to spray chemicals when needed do to the over spray on the kids.	All the nurseries should be in one area west of 441 as a buffer to the everglades it would be a busines hub for the shippers north and a one stop for the local trade.
Nursery Operator	this gives the rights to the small land owner, right now the small land owners rights have been taken away, and the land owners who were there before the ag reserve was created should have this	this is kind of late putting 6 lane road ways thru the ag reserve makes it kind of hard to move tractors, plant trailers and employees safely.

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Nursery Operator	I do not understand what is being proposed and therefore do not wish to comment.	<p>The four proposed Agricultural Enhancement Programs will not compensate for the decline in agriculture in the ag reserve. There is a need for a new plan for development that incorporates a way to keep this area special - but not "force" farming. We have passed the point when a "sign" will help enhance agriculture or a new nursery will make up for the loss of the critical mass. What will help is dealing with the reality that the primary goals of the Ag Reserve Master Plan to develop the large tracks of row crop farm land was accomplished, now we have to deal with the nurseries and other farm related companies that have been negatively impacted by this major decline in agriculture a.k.a. the small farmers and give them the same equal treatment as the large tract land owners. The small farmers are being unfairly treated and unduly burdened for the good of the public. that the Agricultural Reserve Master Plan be updated. Using a plan that is 15 years old that does not even talk about GL Homes - yet GL Homes is now the largest land owner in the Ag Reserve along with Palm Beach County. Table 1-1 Developments in the Agriculture Reserve be updated Table 2-1 Land Uses in the Agriculture Reserve be updated. Please note; there was not a category for agriculture land owner in the ag reserve. This is the category I would be in. My brother is the nursery operator - I am a plant broker. Thank you for your efforts. We look forward to a positive and fair outcome for all farmers, not just a few.</p>
Nursery Operator	Yes on all	Not possible where we are
Nursery Operator		<p>There is a need for a new plan for development that incorporates a way to keep this area special - but not "force" farming. Please consider making the ag reserve where the property is that the county owns - and put signs there - this was public money. The public seems to be confused thinking that they bought the entire ag reserve - please clarify this for the public - so they know what their money bought - signs would help in those county owned areas.</p>

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Nursery Operator		I do not believe it is feasible to enhance agriculture now - we have passed that point. What we can do is preserve the land that the county bought with the public bond and put signs on those properties. As far as preserving agriculture, there has been too much development in eastern Palm Beach County to do that. There is plenty of land in Western Palm Beach County to preserve - why are we trying to preserve one of the most desired places to live in the world?
Nursery Operator	A BASE POTENTIAL DENSITY ON ONE HOUSE PER ACRE. ONE HOUSE PER FIVE ACRES IS TOO RESTRICTIVE. MY FAMILY CAN NOT BUILD ANOTHER HOUSE ON THE FIVE ACRES WHERE I LIVE. MY FAMILY WOULD LIKE TO BUILD ON MY LAND SO WE CAN HELP EACH OTHER.....RAISE THE NEXT GENERATION.SO I CAN CONTINUE TO KEEP MY LAND AGRICULTURE. I THINK THAT THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BE ABLE TO RESTRICT MY RIGHTS ON MY OWN LAND!!!!!!WHEN I BOUGHT MY FIVE ACRES OVER THIRTY EIGHT YEARS AGO , IT WAS ZONED ONE HOUSE PER TWO AND HALF ACRES . HOW WOULD THE PBCC LIKE IT IF I RESTRICTED THE OWNERSHIP, OF THEIR HOME AND PROPERTY.?? OUT OF THE AG RESERVE.....THERE IS MORE FREEDOM IN THE OWNERSHIP IN PROPERTY. PLEASE HEAR OUR PLEAS FOR FAIRNESS.....WE PUT IN OUR OWN WELLS,,,NO CITY WATER.....WE PUT IN OUR OWN SEPTIC TANKS.....NO CITY SEWER WE MAINTAIN OUR DIRT ROADS, ETC.....WHAT DO WE GET FOR OUR TAXES???? I CALLED 911	POST SIGNS.....MOST PEOPLE EVEN IF THEY HAVE LIVED HER TWENTY YEARS DO NOT KNOW WHERE THE AG RESERVE BEGINS AND ENDS. WHEN I TELL LOCAL PEOPLE I LIVE IN THE AG RESERVE.....THEY THINK THAT IT IS LOXAHATCHEE.

Topic:	Topic: TDR Residential Overlay	Topic: Agricultural Enhancement Programs
Nursery Operator		Have been saying this for years.Way to many crazy drivers. BUT its to late. The ag reserve is really no more.Needs to end with an exception of the land that we the tax payers own.
Resident of the Ag Reserve	Again, I want to reiterate my position that without a water impact and scarcity of resource study by PBCWUD or commissioned by them (FAU could be contacted and assigned this study), I am opposed to further aggrandizement in the Ag Reserve.	
Resident of the Ag Reserve	This is a terrible idea for current land owners. We would be competing with the county for the sale of development rights.	These are all well and good but, we should be studying more specific enhancements to the AR to create value to the Ag Res. 1) Completing rural parkway along Lyons Rd.,that county committed to do when road was built. 2) Perimeters outside of the walls of residential developments should be open to public for walkers, biker and horses. Developers get credit for this being open space yet county allows them to fence it off. This would allow landowners to promote the AR having over 35 miles of open recreational trails. Talk about increasing land value. A special property tax program should be designed for AG where the purchaser receives a low tax rate as long as the land is used for agriculture. Currently the county tries to access land at the new purchase price. The developers proposal we have been asked to look at should be tabled and a committee created to put forth a plan to increase land values in the Ag Res. I have a 60 acre horse farm in the AR and would appreciate county help in increasing value.
Resident of the Ag Reserve	I agree with this, allows a middle ground.	some areas yes, some should become resi and commercial as it is a nuisance, dangerous with cars driving with kids or older drivers trying to pass huge and slow farm equipment...they do not mix well in a suburban area like this.

Topic:	Topic: Development Area Requirements for 60/40 Planned Developments (PD)
Topic Description:	Reduce minimum size of development area from 100 acres to 35 acres; Allow 60/40 PDs anywhere in the Ag Reserve; Eliminate frontage requirement
Respondent Category:	
Community Organization Representative	No! This is the Ag Reserve! This is not about how many homes and commercial properties CAN be developed. The focus should be on , how do we best preserve agriculture? Already, horses and farmworkers are endangered by increased traffic. Create safe horse and tractor paths, NOT roadways, homes and commercial projects. Stop!
Community Organization Representative	There should be no development west of State Road 441.
Community Organization Representative	Reduce minimum size of PUD to 35 Acres. Permit one residence by farmer or caretaker on up to 5 acres in Preserved parcels
Community Organization Representative	There should be no new development in the Ag Reserve. All agricultural land should remain agricultural forever. Any permits that have been granted to developers should be revoked. If any developers claim the right to develop agricultural land, they should be challenged in court. There has been too much development already in the agricultural reserve and any more development will have a devastating effect upon our economy, our quality of life, our environment, our health and well being, and will exacerbate global warming.
Developer/Agent	Frontage is important to the look and feel of developments. We do not support removal of frontage requirements. We are concerned that the Ag Reserve remain as conducive to agriculture as possible. The more fragmented the more difficult for agriculture. We need to find a way to assist land owners without encouraging fragmentation of the Ag Reserve. Further, those areas not deemed housing need to be considered in a more restrictive manner as many are not either open space, natural areas, farmland or ag use.
Developer/Agent	This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.
Developer/Agent	This is a threat to the survival of the birds and other wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.
Developer/Agent	There can be absolutely no further development West of State Road 7. Water availability is the biggest threat to our future, and RCAP includes this this area for our future water supply and climate resiliency. Farmers use best management practices because it is good business, homeowners don't. Presently we cannot manage the phosphorus levels, we certainly cannot add more. No more roads! Riders and farmers are already having trouble moving their horses and equipment. More roads give more frontage and allow for more development. I am against changing any of these items, they are presently against the law and need to stay that way!
Developer/Agent	The Refuge supports the protection and preservation provided to lands in the Agricultural Reserve and the goals and objectives put forth in the comprehensive plan voted on by the residents of Palm Beach County. Wildlife usage of the ag reserve has been observed by both Refuge biologists and area University researchers. Species such as the critically endangered Everglade snail kite and the endangered wood stork use the ag fields to forage during rain events and field flooding. When farm fields adjacent to the Refuge are flooded between crop rotations, birds such as wood storks, roseate spoonbills, white ibis, and shore birds can forage in these areas for food. The Refuge is concerned about the requests that have recently come up for re-zoning in the ag reserve and would result in the reduction and/or fragmentation of existing conservation easements. Wildlife use of fragmented land parcels is of much less quality than larger tracts. Therefore, the Refuge supports the conservation of the adjacent ag lands for protection of the Refuge from urban runoff and invasive species, as well as for the benefit of wildlife that utilizes the Refuge and the adjacent lands.
Developer/Agent	There is no rational basis that substantiates the reduction of development area to 35 acres. This benefits development interests at the detriment of agricultural production. Similarly, allowing these PDs anywhere will lead to a sprawl development pattern that has an adverse effect on existing farming operations and only promotes more development. Finally, there is no rational benefit to agriculture by eliminating the frontage requirement.
Developer/Agent	I would oppose relaxing the Development Area Requirements for 60/40 PUDs. Farmers have said that their operations are becoming less viable as they are surrounded by more and more development. As more of the areas for farming are broken up, more of the remaining farmers will give up and the concept of an Agricultural Reserve will become a lost cause, not to mention a waste of taxpayers' money. More development also diminishes the value of the Ag Reserve as a buffer to Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, in particular any development west of S.R. 7.

Topic:	Topic: Development Area Requirements for 60/40 Planned Developments (PD)
Developer/Agent	This is currently against the law and should remain that way. This would infringe on the birds and wildlife at the ARM Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. We are so lucky this refuge exists to show people up close and personal what the everglades looks like. It is so important to maintain the wildlife as they exist today.
Developer/Agent	The minimum size of development areas for AGR-PUD's was intentionally established to limit the amount of development that could be approved within the Ag Reserve. There is a perception that large landowners "got to participate" in the Ag Reserve development program while many smaller landowners did not. The 100 acre minimum size for development areas was intentionally selected because large parcels of land are much more valuable for maintaining large-scale agriculture production than smaller parcels. While some smaller landowners have suggested that their inability to "cash out" by selling their development rights constitutes a violation of their property rights, there is no legal property right to a density increase. The fact that one property owner meets the criteria for a development increase while a second property owner fails to meet those criteria does not constitute a taking or violation of the latter's property rights. Allowable development densities within the Ag Reserve have only increased since the 1980's. Claims of takings or other private property rights violations relative to the Ag Reserve are completely unsupported by the law. Reducing the minimum development size would undermine agriculture by increasing development within the Ag Reserve, by segmenting farming operations, by increasing traffic within and adjacent to farming areas, and by increasing land use conflicts between farming and residential use. It is also important to note that there is (and has been since the 1980's) an existing development option for these smaller landowners. The 80/20 PUD option requires a minimum of only 40 acres, while providing the same 1 unit per acre density overall. While the smaller development size does result in a denser development than the 60/40 option, developers can certainly choose to build less than the maximum number of units if lower densities are desired. This option has been and remains as a viable development option for smaller parcels. There is no justification to change the plan in order to provide additional development options for smaller land-owners, when legitimate development options already exist for these parcels. Allowing 60/40 PUD's anywhere within the Ag Reserve / eliminating the frontage requirement would undermine efforts to preserve land west of SR-7 which is a fundamental goal of the Ag Reserve program. Land west of SR-7 provides a critical buffer to the adjacent Everglades and allowing 60/40 PUD development there would significantly exacerbate land use conflicts between farming and residential use by forcing these uses to exist in much closer proximity. Already farmers complain that they have difficulty farming due to the existing encroachment of urban uses. Changes such as these, which are intended for the sole purpose of increasing development potential within the Ag Reserve stand to weaken the very significant public investment in Ag by undermining the long term viability of farming due to the known conflicts and incompatibilities of agriculture and urban development. It is important to remember that the fundamental purpose of the Ag Reserve, the master plan, and the County's \$100 million dollar public investment in land is to promote and advance the long-term sustainability of agriculture in the region. It is NOT to benefit private property owners or to ensure that each and every property owner can "cash-out" by building homes or selling development rights.
Equestrian	This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.
Equestrian	This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.
Equestrian	There has to be frontage requirement. There has to be setbacks and safety guidelines. There are less than adequate horse paths and designated horse crossings. There are increasingly precarious narrow roadway lanes currently used by tractors and other types of farm vehicles. Adding thousands more homes with too many cars, plus the fact that there is little or no regard for the safety setbacks is not well thought. Row farms need large plots of land. The piece meal chipping away of the Ag Reserve's land is contrary to this type of farming. With no respect of the investment made by the tax payers of Palm Beach County to keep the Ag Reserve whole, this proposal mirrors the avarice of GL Homes and/or the next enthusiastic developer who comes courting the staff and commissioners. Please, Make no further changes through the zoning department.
Equestrian	the additional homes in the ag reserve were never contemplated under the master plan the comprehensive plan or the unified land development code. it is against the law to do so.
Interested Citizen	NO and Hell no. No reduction period. Anyone who watched the origami BS with the GL land swaps in the last month knows whats coming. Deck chairs on the Titanic. The theme that Were Entitled is a lie. You bought what you bought. no rezoning. The zoning is one per 10 acres changed to one in 2.5 acres under the guise "We need to be able to borrow money." Development does not go hand in hand with farming. The 60% set aside is a crock the developers come in and say we need a variance. In fact one of the weasels who chanted the 60% set aside mantra is working for a developer right now and sat at the round-table. Again What a Crock.
Interested Citizen	Please do not restrict the discussion to these preconceived issues. The issue of whether or not to develop the Ag Reserve at all has not been settled. In other words, many concerned residents, individuals, and stakeholders favor the continued enforcement of the moratorium blocking any development of the area. While it is controversial as to whether Boca Raton and surrounding areas can absorb an additional condominium building or housing development, it is clear that a new community or city to be developed on the Ag Reserve will serve to strain Boca and its residents in many more ways than imagined here.
Interested Citizen	Stop any further PD's in the ag reserve

Topic:	Topic: Development Area Requirements for 60/40 Planned Developments (PD)
Interested Citizen	There should be NO residential or commercial development in the Ag Reserve. I am very concerned about development west of 441. That is a buffer area for the water supply of the residents of south Florida, i.e. Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. Development is already to north and south of the entrance of the refuge and people are not able to enjoy the refuge as a refuge with so much commercial and residential development. Just because people want to move here doesn't mean that we have to develop every vacant area to support those people. We are recreating the big cities of the northeast but we don't have the public transportation that those large cities have. Here, we just have gridlock which is getting worse every year as you build out Palm Beach county.
Interested Citizen	This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.
Interested Citizen	This is a radical and dangerous plan that serves the interests of GL Homes while further encroaching on the ability of large-tract farmers to survive in the Ag Reserve. Allowing 60/40 developments "anywhere" in the Ag Reserve means allowing them to move west of Route 441 (where they are not currently allowed) into the prime farming areas and buffer lands surrounding the Arthur R. Marshall Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge.
Interested Citizen	This would allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. There was a reason that this was against the rules and must remain against the rules. Piecemeal farming and piecemeal development are wrong for our Ag Reserve.
Interested Citizen	No changes. Keep large parcels for farming.
Interested Citizen	No change. This is about agriculture and keeping it in PBC. Development will never pay for itself- the taxpayers will be left with the financial burden. New development, where it doesn't belong, will de-value our existing homes.
Interested Citizen	This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently AGAINST THE LAW and it MUST REMAIN AGAINST THE LAW.
Interested Citizen	Who put you all in office GL Homes or the citizens of Palm Beach County do what is right for the State of Florida, protect the wild life and Ag Reserve. This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.
Interested Citizen	No! This is prime agricultural land. The only change that should be made is that institutions should not be allowed on reserve land. They should only be allowed on developed land. Also, did the county buy other reserve land after they sold county owned reserve land for the garbage transfer site?
Interested Citizen	No need for these changes. The current system works.
Interested Citizen	This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.
Interested Citizen	This is the dream of GL Homes and a nightmare for those who want to ensure the survival of the Ag Reserve and protect the birds and wildlife at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge. The above proposal would do the following: allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge; add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code. It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.
Interested Citizen	The lands need to be maintained as permanent land and not allowed to be developed.

Topic:	Topic: Development Area Requirements for 60/40 Planned Developments (PD)
Interested Citizen	NO. Large contiguous areas of undeveloped land are essential to protecting the nature of the Ag Reserve. Why is it so important to cater to a single commercial interest, GL Homes? Once this land is built on, it's destroyed. Why allow development west of Route 441 in the buffer lands surrounding the Wildlife Refuge? Why add thousands of additional homes and roads in the Ag Reserve that were never contemplated under the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or the Unified Land Development Code? It's all currently against the law and it must remain against the law.
Interested Citizen	The preservation ballot said nothing about any residential development in the Ag Reserve. Once the voters approved the Ag Reserve, planners came trotting that out in their shertes (Sp). There should not have been any developments in the AG Reserve. Corruption County.
Interested Citizen	please make it easier to sell the land.
Interested Citizen	Eliminating the frontage requirement will create inequities for the owners that purchased their parcels on the main arteries and create mid-block development.
Interested Citizen	NO CHANGE TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
Interested Citizen	No. Keep the rules as they are. Large plots are needed for farming, not for development. We don't need more development scattered about in small parcels. Main road frontage is necessary to keep more traffic away from horses and farm vehicles. Safe crossings and paths are needed for farm vehicles and horses.
Interested Citizen	We should not be talking about development at all. We should be talking about how to keep agriculture in this area and how to keep out development. Also, why are schools, churches and other civic uses allowed on preserve land? The citizens believe that Preserve means Preserve. No more pavement. Let's change the rules to favor green land and farming, not development.
Interested Citizen	No changes.
Interested Citizen	No. Do not change any rules for developers. Help farmers to farm, not to become rich from selling land. BTW, change the rules so that civic building must be done on development portion of land, not preserve portion. What is environmentally sound or green about more pavement and traffic into the Ag Reserve?
Interested Citizen	As above - we need to grow our economy or things will erode quickly. Essential services are at stake.
Interested Citizen	We have enough homes and need our land statics are showing retirees cannot afford Florida and are moving to Carolina's we don't need more housing
Interested Citizen	No further development. Period. We need to plan for the future. We have already reduced the number and size of our dairies. Our orange groves and farms are also struggling. We may soon no longer be able to depend on California for vegetables and fruit. Our county's cattle ranches are also struggling. If we continue to build on our farm land, we will eventually need to import all our food. Work out a plan so that there will not be any more building on the Ag Reserve. OR....get our \$100 million back plus interest. Also, as I mentioned, I will vote against anyone not fighting to save the Ag Reserve.
Interested Citizen	No, no, no
Interested Citizen	I recently officiated a Somerset Canyon soccer game on a field adjacent to Valencia Cove at Lyons Rd. and Boynton Beach Blvd. As I looked at this parcel located on the southeast corner of the intersection, I saw a perfect example of why 60/40 does not work. This parcel had a beautifully landscaped buffer next to the road designed to hide the shopping center. There were a couple of large retention ponds and two soccer fields. 60% "preservation", 40% development, and 0% agriculture was occurring at this plot.
Nursery Operator	I am all for reducing development to 35 acres and allowing 60/40 anywhere, or 3 houses per acre, specially property surrounded by development
Nursery Operator	THIS ONLY MAKES IT FAIR FOR THE SMALLER LAND OWNERS, THEY WERE LEFT OUT. THE LARGER LAND OWNERS WERE THE ONLY ONES THAT COULD PARTICIPATE
Nursery Operator	• The County can preserve whatever tracks they own they own in the Ag Reserve. Let the land owners who want to develop, develop and if they want to farm, farm. Please stop forcing small farmers to farm.
Nursery Operator	Yes on all of these
Nursery Operator	The county has more than 30,000 acres of preserve land. If they would like to preserve more that is fine, but please do not require the small farmers to preserve theirs. All the development in the county has already diminished the nursery industry to the point that there is no longer a critical mass of nurseries in Palm Beach County. Besides, the prices of plants are actually priced less than they were in the 1980's - making it very difficult for the nursery industry - especially on small tracts of land - to succeed.
Nursery Operator	Yes, reduce minimum size of development area from 100 acres to 35 acres - not everyone wants to live in large gated communities. It's not healthy planning to just have one massive development after another.

Topic:	Topic: Development Area Requirements for 60/40 Planned Developments (PD)
Nursery Operator	ELIMINATE FRONTAGE REQUIREMENT. REDUCE MIN. SIZE OF DEVELOPMENT AREA FROM ONE HUNDRED TO THIRTY FIVE.
Nursery Operator	great idea. the small land owner has no options to sell their property.They are stuck farming whether they want to or not.not fair.
Resident of the Ag Reserve	Recently the governor set aside state land for sensitive wetlands. Why don't the county commissioners do the same. We are heading towards \$400 a month water bills according to PBCWUD. I don't want to get there tomorrow. If the county commissioners feel the need to pour more concrete, why not follow Miramar's example and build a Mondo track out there. While promoting track and field, they can still help their friends!
Resident of the Ag Reserve	This would for the most part eliminate the AR
Resident of the Ag Reserve	I think between Lyons and Clint Moore this is inevitable and should be done when the road opens. The ag vehicles are a nuisance, dangerous to traffic and an eyesore in this clearly residential belt.
Resident of the Ag Reserve	PLEASE GIVE ME THE LITTLE MAN YHE RIGHTS TO MY OWN PROPERTY AGAIN