

Comments Received at Meeting of Developers/Agents: September 11, 2014

Topic 1: Future Vision of the Agricultural Reserve

Adopted Comprehensive Plan:

OBJECTIVE 1.5 The Agricultural Reserve Tier

Objective: Palm Beach County shall preserve the unique farmland and wetlands in order to preserve and enhance agricultural activity, environmental and water resources, and open space within the Agricultural Reserve Tier. This shall be accomplished by limiting uses to agriculture and conservation with residential development restricted to low densities and non-residential development limited to uses serving the needs of farmworkers and residents of the Tier. The Agricultural Reserve Tier shall be preserved primarily for agricultural use, reflecting the unique farmlands and wetlands within it.

Comments:

- It is important to preserve the ag industry within the reserve area but needs to be more centralized and grouped for the future.
- The residential and commercial growth needs to be limited and well located residential development. Commercial needs but initially at commercial nodes already developed and limited additional commercial should be allowed in time as the needs grow.
- It is clear that there is a need presently for more commercial-residential development.

Being realistic farming in the ag reserve is over within the next generation. Therefore we need to plan for growth in a formal way east of 441 - I would suggest a mix of residential and commercial.

While the overall ag reserve concept has served the County well over the years there is no denying that Palm Beach County is part of a 21st century mass interurbia from Key West to Vero Beach. As such it is important to "dress" the preserved areas with appropriate border development in order to complement the changing environment.

The vision of the Ag reserve should be one of managed growth that respects the interests of all land owners in the area. It should avoid being inclusive of only one type of ag, res, or comm use. It needs to be diverse in its uses to accommodate the needs of the existing residents but also respect the ag uses already present.

Seems like the emphasis needs to be focused on the remaining developable properties-ability to be a smaller parcel and have reasonable development potential. Residential and non-residential.

Basic concept is problematic in that residential housing and farmland/farming are not compatible uses. The existing checkerboard layout and development pattern is not good planning. Development pressure will eventually erode farming interest in the AR.

If the goal is to preserve ag uses as well as open space, why limit parcel sizes +/- contiguity to other conservation areas. For example, if you have a parcel that is not contiguous to another conservation area and are not large enough to transfer density to become a preserve area why limit that parcel. It promotes "open space." Why not expand ag uses to include chipping mulching and soil production uses necessary for both nurseries, farms, and landscaping industries.

Topic 2:	Commercial Land Uses
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to those which serve the needs of the farmworker community, existing residents, and future residents of an AgR-PDD • In the form of an AgR-TMD • Within 1/4 mile of the intersections of Lyons Road with either Boynton Beach Boulevard or Atlantic Avenue. • Maximum of 80 acres and 750,000 square feet for the entire tier • County TDR program is limited to residential development rights • Ag Reserve is a Sending area for TDRs (one unit per acre) • Receiving areas within the Urban/Suburban Tier
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional 200 acres along main corridors • Require one TDR per acre of development area • Make necessary changes to TDR program
Comments:	<p>Suggested expansion is a good suggestion. If you go to existing TMD you can readily see that demand for commercial exceeds current supply. The area needs more commercial to serve existing population. Commercial should include office/med office and other ag & residential supportive uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New commercial, if allowed, should be required to meet the same LDRs as the two existing TMDs (preserve, primary/secondary frontage, size, etc.) This is a basic fairness issue for those that have developed under the existing rules. • If TDR concept is allowed for commercial then all above should apply less preserve requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to allow for more day-to-day retail/commercial and offices to support the existing residents. • No more TMDs; more typical commercial development. • Should not require purchase of TDRs if limited to major nodes. <p>Servicing the growing residential communities is a given. We must consider servicing future growth demand and create viable-looking commercial development to compliment same. I do think that senior housing should be a part of residential <u>not</u> commercial.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to evaluate logical non-residential development to include retail, office, medical office, etc. • Need to take specific focus on growth around hospital. • If TDRs are required, then preserve acreage should not be required - "double dip" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add nodes for limited commercial development • allow for mixed use in other areas • allow for additional density from some offsite source that includes an element of workforce housing <p>Commercial should be limited to nodes. Nodes, however, may need to be expanded. Lyons & Atlantic/Boynton are good node locations. Should consider other nodes such as Turnpike locations. 200 acres is too much. Should be determined on market need. Need to eliminate TMD requirement.</p> <p>The additional 200 acres is more than needed but (illegible) commercial needs to be at node not along all corridors. Commercial should include retail, office, senior assisted living, industrial (limited)</p>

Topic 3:	60/40 PUD Development Area Size, Location and Density
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<p>Development area must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have a minimum of 100 acres • be located east of State Road 7 • have frontage on either State Road 7, State Road 806 (Atlantic Avenue), State Road 804 (Boynton Beach Boulevard), Clint Moore Road, Lyons Road extending north of Boynton Beach Boulevard or Lyons Road extending south of Atlantic Avenue and Acme Dairy Road extending south of Boynton Beach Boulevard to the L-28 canal. (Other roadways may be added by Plan amendment)
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce development area from 100 acres to 35 acres • Allow 60/40 PUDs anywhere in the Ag Reserve • Eliminate frontage requirement
Comments:	Look at the existing preserved areas and cluster to a degree these areas for agricultural use. Look to cluster residential areas and commercial area.
	Not sure you want to eliminate the frontage requirement. Some reduction may make sense. It may be something more than 35.
	At a minimum, County should eliminate frontage requirement. PBC is no longer purchasing land in ag reserve, so the frontage restriction now serve only to restrict private property.
	I agree, the preserve area should be able to include small parcels and expand definition of ag uses in preserve parcels.
	I agree with the proposal set forth.
	Agree with March presentation.
	Reduce min ac. size to allow small parcels to be included as development/preserve area.
	Should not be west of SR7.
Topic 4:	Preserve Area Size/Location Criteria
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<p>Preserve area parcels for 60/40 PUDs must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contain a minimum contiguous area of 150 acres; or, • have a common boundary with other lands that aggregate to a total of 150 acres and 1) have a future land use designation of Conservation; and/or 2) that are designated as an Agricultural Reserve Preserve; and/or 3) that have had the development rights removed and remain in some type of open space
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eliminate minimum size/contiguity requirement
Comments:	Agree with the proposal. Again if one of the goals is to expand open space why have a minimum size or a contiguity requirement? It is understood that wetlands, uplands and other preserve areas are more successful w/ large sizes, open spaces are equally important regardless of size.
	Fairness dictates that the minimum size/contiguity requirement should be removed. Facts: (1) The potential units were already counted as potential units under original master plan, (2) It is in the County's best interest to have as many properties

	<p>controlled under a conservation easement; and (3) the use of the property, not its size, is (or should be) the controlling factor as to whether or not the property should qualify.</p> <p>Should still have minimum size, but much lower. 5 acres, but no 1 acre scattered lots, that defeats the purpose.</p> <p>I agree with the March 2014 proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with March comments - restricts remaining development parcel sizes • Control open space within developments through LDRs. <p>Reduce size of min acres.</p> <p>Allow for everyone to participate in the program</p>
Topic 5:	Preserve Area Uses
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be utilized for crop production, pasture, equestrian purposes, retained as fallow land or, if designated by the South Florida Water Management District as a Water Preserve Area, or to serve regional water management purposes as certified by either Lake Worth Drainage District or South Florida Water Management District, or for water management purposes not directly related to the 60/40 AgR-PDD if approved by the Department of Environmental Resources Management, managed for environmental resource values. • Accessory agricultural structures such as barns and pump structures shall be permitted. • Agricultural support uses such as processing facilities, grooms' quarters, and farm worker housing may be accommodated provided that certain criteria are met.
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow more uses such as landscape maintenance, mulching, and the production of products that serve as accessory to the agricultural industry. • Eliminate current (code) size restrictions for packing houses
Comments:	<p>Not to be redundant, I believe ag uses should be expanded to include ag supportive uses such as packing plants, chipping and mulching and soil production. These uses should be allowed as preserve uses.</p> <p>ULDC should expand to allow these uses in preserve. Packing houses should be allowed on preserve parcels w/o further restrictions as a Requested Use approval.</p> <p>Agree with what was presented at March 2014 Workshop.</p> <p>Anticipate newer cutting-edge farming techniques such as aquaponics and research type of facilities - should <u>not</u> be restricted by "commercial" limitations and/or current F.A.R (.15 -- too restrictive)</p> <p>I concur with the proposal. Why not consider alternative energy production?</p> <p>Suggest keeping current uses.</p> <p>This should be allowed - chipping/mulching/industry</p>
Topic 6:	Single Farm Residence/Caretaker's Quarters
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard density of one unit per 5 acres applies; not permitted in preserve areas • Caretakers' quarters limited to 1,000 sq. ft. (code)
As presented at	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow a home to serve as a farm residence in preserve areas on less than five

March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<p>acres, provided that majority of property is in uses permitted by conservation easements, to allow for sale of development rights on the additional lands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminate restriction on size of caretakers' quarters allowed in preserve areas
Comments:	Support the proposal
	(1) Allow preserve areas to retain 1 unit for farm residence w/o 1 per 5 density restriction. This promotes continuity and retention of Ag uses. (2) Eliminate or increase size restriction for caretakers quarters. Current 1,000 SF restriction makes no sense, many caretakers live with their family in the caretakers quarters.
	Agree with the proposal from March 2014 workshop
	I have no issue with this proposal. Owners should have that right.
	Agree with March comments - "caretaker" should include family - difficult to raise a family in 1,000 sq ft
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow larger caretaker residence. Allow residence on farm, min acreage size for farm
	Yes allow one per preserve area
Topic 7:	Create TDR Residential Overlay Option
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ag Reserve is a Sending area for TDRs (one unit per acre) Receiving areas within the Urban/Suburban Tier
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create overlay option for undeveloped lands allowing for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a base potential density of 1 du/ac a minimum requirement to purchase a TDR per acre from County TDR bank an option to purchase an additional TDR elimination of 60% preserve requirement max of 3 du/ac on development area Cap units transferred to Ag Reserve at 7,000 Make necessary changes to TDR program
Comments:	This may be a stretch in line with your objective 1.5
	I agree with the proposal from the March 2014 Workshop
	This needs to be negotiated!
	Consider an alternative overlay or ability for more TDRs for CLF uses (Senior housing)
	Too much density - max density 1 -2 du/ac Eventually - farming will be gone except for government owned land
	This would allow for a clear development pattern to finish the ag reserve. Type 3 -
Topic 8:	Other Ag Reserve Concepts, Ideas, Issues
Consider evaluating zoning /buffers compatibility requirements when located in the Ag Reserve. For example, a chipping business is require to install incompatibility buffers notwithstanding location next to a landscaping business because the neighbors might be residential in the future.	
County needs to relook at Mandatory Reclaimed Water Service Area requirement in the Ag Reserve. Treated water enters PUD retention areas and discharges into adjacent LWDD canals. During storm events treated water is then utilized by farming operations for irrigation, a violation of Federal Food Safety Standards. This catch 21 needs to be resolved.	

The Ag Reserve needs to be branded. More signage, noting how important the area is. Better relationships need to be fostered between the County and the growers / nurseries / etc.

Making and keeping communities viable. Start offering choices to its residents. Changing environments require open mindedness to accommodate the changes through progressive concepts

Allow for C/L & other users

Reevaluate procedures for less restriction for ag related uses (opposed to bona fide ag) for continuation or promotion of ag uses.

Take a realistic look at AgR & ability to have resid & Ag Reserve near each other.

For Commercial Land Use

- Eliminate TDR requirement - makes little sense
- 200 acres is way too much additional acreage - if all for retail. If that includes office, medical, ACLF, light industrial, etc. then could make sense - but there shall be clear delineation/definition.
- Retail should be limited to an additional 40 acres or less which equates to 350-400,000 SF of space. That should be more than enough additional retail space (perhaps way more)
- Retail should remain restricted to the current two TMD intersections and within a 1/4 mile of each intersection. That would allow 4 currently undeveloped parcels to be developed for retail - very adequate for the future of the Ag Reserve. So, "main corridors" criteria is too broad, and 200 acres is far too much for only "retail" use.
- TMD requirement should be eliminated as additional TMDs make no sense. What is more warranted is more traditional retail development for the Ag. Reserve.