

Comments Received at Meeting of Nursery Operators: August 26, 2014

Topic 1:	Future Vision of the Agricultural Reserve
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<p>OBJECTIVE 1.5 The Agricultural Reserve Tier</p> <p>Objective: Palm Beach County shall preserve the unique farmland and wetlands in order to preserve and enhance agricultural activity, environmental and water resources, and open space within the Agricultural Reserve Tier. This shall be accomplished by limiting uses to agriculture and conservation with residential development restricted to low densities and non-residential development limited to uses serving the needs of farmworkers and residents of the Tier. The Agricultural Reserve Tier shall be preserved primarily for agricultural use, reflecting the unique farmlands and wetlands within it.</p>
	<p>This land is <u>not</u> unique to any other farmland in the County. We <u>do</u> freeze, we have had <u>many</u> freezes over the years. The push to portray this land as different from any other farmland in the County is true in only one aspect - landowners have fewer rights! Of the 2700 +/- acres in Ag Reserve that does not fall in all the other categories more options are needed for these landowners, because the current policies are <u>punishing</u> them, not helping them.</p> <p>Historically - The Ag Res. Comp Plan was put together in 1980 - over 30 years ago. Obviously it is out dated. That is why we are having problems now. There have already been so many changes that it is no longer feasible for farmers to farm in the Ag Reserve. The reserve properties should be County owned. Individual land owners should have the rights of a normal land owner.</p> <p>Land that lies within the Ag Reserve which is truly unique & environmentally sensitive should be responsibly preserved. The owners of these properties should be economically compensated for their asset and recognized for positive land stewardship. Property which is not environmentally sensitive should be put to the highest and best use. It would be great if property uses from the east could be swapped out to the west.</p> <p>My vision of the "Ag Reserve" is that it is <u>county-owned land preserves</u> that the public can visit. For example, to Kayak west of 441 or to convert the county-owned land that is being leased to actual preserves for bird-watching, hiking, etc. The private property owners should have the <u>option</u> if they want to be part of the Ag Reserve or not. To that end, the county would buy these parcels and convert to preserves. For example, there may be a large tree or unique animals that live on a particular parcel. Nursery owners got their property rights back in 2014.</p> <p>Large areas for Row Crops kept and any land bought by county to continue to be preserve. Rest of land - best use: commercial, industrial or residential. Calling this <u>Ag Reserve</u> was true but NO Longer true.</p> <p>13% of the land from the Ag Reserve that is owned by private people and they should be able to maximize their land value. The county has 56% of the Ag Reserve between the bond and land that had the TDR remove and 56% left is pretty good. If the county wants the other 13% they should buy it like in the bond or supplement land owners</p> <p>The rule of touching a preserve to be able to sell development rights should be eliminated every agricultural land owner (nurseryman, equestrian, farmers) should have the right to sell their development right if they farm in the Ag Reserve. Many</p>

	<p>nursery owners are the care takers of their land. They are raising families on their farms. They should be able to sell development rights if their homes are larger than 1000 sq ft. It seems to me that every acre of property that can be preserved would be in the county's best interest. Helping the small land owners who have the above issues should be a major consideration.</p>
	<p>My vision for the Ag Reserve in the future is more development. Building beautiful housing development and town centers. Would like to see a little more commercial on Atlantic Avenue, Boynton Beach Blvd., and 441. Change 60/40 to allow more buildings. Keep the county owned property Ag</p>
	<p>It is time to reevaluate the Ag Reserve. Some of the nurseries development has jumped over them and they are surrounded. These parcels really need to be reexamined. The land that the county bought should always remain preserved.</p>
	<p>To put back in the reserve with parks lakes campsites, horse trails and preserve parcel west of 441. With more commercial for Ag uses east of 441 maintenance companies, etc</p>
	<p>Most "farm workers" live outside of the Ag Reserve. When all the approved homes are built, more than 1/3 of the Ag Reserve will be houses. It's odd that a farm area would have developments in it. Houses directly adjacent to Agricultural operations don't always mix. i.e., tractors on highways, crossing highways, pesticide use and applications, etc.</p>
	<p>The Agricultural line should be 441 except corners (Boynton, Atlantic, Clint Moore); it is a natural line and it will protect the wetlands. Residential + Nursery <u>don't mix on Lyons Road</u>; tractors and traffic and cars and trucks, sprays and smells are not what home owners want. <u>It looks ugly now</u>. Allow 3 houses per acre with landscaping buffers would enhance Delray Market Place and look good like Hagen Ranch Road. Keep the land that is preserved (sold TDR) in large parcels. Let the old nursery's south of Atlantic on Lyons develop into residential 3 houses per acre.</p>
	<p>The current plan has not conserved agriculture and has not restricted development to low densities. The current plan has put high density developments directly next to farm operations which has caused problems for the farms such as spraying and carrying on day to day operations in the farms. I do not see the future of the Ag Reserve including agriculture next to multimillion dollar homes and high end shopping centers. I see the only agriculture taking place west of U.S. 441 due to the non-development of this area.</p>
	<p>Everyone has a different vision. The future of the Ag Reserve should be based on the needs of the surrounding community. What is necessary to the people that live there so they have a good quality of life. The Ag Reserve, nurseries in particular, do not actually serve the community. Most plants sold in the area come from Miami. Most of our farms and nurseries are small family businesses and the younger family members do not want to keep the business running. You will have a lot of bank owned unutilized property. That should not be anyone's vision.</p>
	<p>(With) local government and Federal government will put the farmers and nursery men out of business. Have property rights restored to the 5 acre parcels.</p>
	<p>I think more care needs to be given to the definition of "unique". When Mr. Tuma attempted to address the definition of the word at the March 26 meeting, he had to cut it short because his time had been shortened. The above objective states that: "development be restricted to low densities and</p>

	<p>non-residential development <u>limited to uses serving the needs of farmworkers and residents of the tier.</u>" This really makes no sense to me when currently it is very inconvenient and costly for a farmer or resident to purchase a hammer, nails or ladder to perform needed tasks. How can you have literally tens of thousands of people living in an area and not allow them access to services and products that will enhance their work and living situations? I'm not talking about uncontrolled, ugly, and environmentally unsound growth. I'm talking about well planned and well thought out <u>basics</u> !</p>
	<p>Since my acres are already preserved and I would like to see the remaining acres that are not already developed become development. schools, office and medical centers that are designed to coexist with the natural preserves and the development that is already in place.</p> <p>If Ag is to remain- we need companies we can go to, to service us, we can drive to in a reasonable time. All Ag business, tractors, chemical, supplies, etc. have moved away!!</p>
	<p>This ruling, which sounded good enough that the citizens of Palm Beach County fell for it, has proven unworkable. Residential neighborhoods and farms are incompatible. The Plan is unpopular with farmers because it actually interferes with farming. It is unpopular with small landowners because it limits the use of value of their land. It is popular with large real estate corporations who have been able to profit from the real estate that is permitted on large holdings and denied small holdings. It is popular with some of the residents of that real estate who like the illusion that they are living in a bucolic setting or feel virtuous about preserving "nature" now that they have their piece of it. Land planners like it, too! Unfair to small property owners!</p>
	<p>I believe the land that fronts on Boynton Beach Road should be developed as commercial. It stands to reason. Most exits of TP with areas of residential development need certain types of facilities to support the residents. Our land was bought before the Ag. Reserve was created. It does not seem right that someone can dictate what you can do with your land. Obviously certain developers have had their way with the Ag Reserve. Unfortunately not everyone has same resources to circumvent the system.</p>
	<p>I find your objective interesting but hardly functional. The first issue that comes to mind is water resources. For a minimum of 15 years Agriculture in Palm (Beach County) has been considered responsible for the pollution of the Everglades, so we are a unique and necessary water source? The second item that draws attention is the enhance agriculture activity. Please show us how Palm Beach County, by <u>restricting</u> development within the agricultural reserve has in any way <u>enhanced</u> our activity. I would ask the County to consider Bedner's Market who because of your restrictions has been unable to build sufficient facilities to handle his direct to the consumer business. What has Palm Beach County done to oppose all the new BMP regulations that will decrease most usable acreage by a minimum of 10%? How did you enhance and preserve Agriculture when you allowed for the massive development of homes by a single contractor? How is swapping of the TDRs beneficial to Agriculture? You promoted and passed a bond that is not sustainable. Agriculture in the Ag Reserve in the remaining areas will not grow. There is no place to grow to - everywhere you turn there is development. Asking agriculture to remain in this area is the same as asking one to wear a shoe two sizes too small forever, because the county thinks it looks good and they can win a best dressed award!</p>

Now let's look at agriculture - should the State encourage agriculture? Yes. Should agriculture be encouraged? Yes. But where?? In order for agriculture to be sustainable it requires larger pieces of land mass than what has been reserved in Palm Beach County Ag Reserve. It would behoove this panel to research areas near and around Okeechobee area. What you will have in the Ag reserve (its future) is another Loxahatchee. Smaller patches of this, that, and nothing. This is hardly a preserve presentation.

You are oblivious to the many issues facing Agriculture today (see back of sheet). Additionally, you cannot lump the row crop farmers with the nursery woody ornamental producers, they are explicitly differently, requiring different needs. If you drive down 441 from Okeechobee Blvd. to Clint Moore road, I would ask you how you could possibly restrict growth in the reserve when it is surrounded by growth?

The Ag Reserve needs to be dissolved in its entirety. From an economic standpoint Palm Beach County needs the increase in tax base.

Do not hold your head in the clouds. You broke the reserve. Now you need to throw away the remaining pieces and allow for development.

Fallow land does not create income for the County. Consider purchasing the land from South Florida Water Management west of 441.

I believe you should restore the property rights of the Ag reserve owners.

Issues facing the Industry

- 1) Labor Force-lack of labor-traditionally the ag labor force was seasonal and generally from other countries. Today these individuals are not entering into the Ag Community. They are in demand for construction, restaurants, cleaning, factories, etc.
- 2) Foreign Competition- free trade agreements
- 3) New government regulations (BMPs)
- 4) Profitability - Lower and lower prices/increased cost due to lack of demand
- 5) Health Care Act - 2015 it will be enforced at that time many companies will close that meet the requirements of mandated health care.
- 6) Aging Owners - Next generation not interested in the highs and lows of agriculture. Unwilling to be on the job 52 weeks a year!!!
- 7) Surrounding area developed - This has been a huge issue for us. We have kids from neighborhoods breaking in, stealing, etc. The parents blame us. How are we supposed to protect what is ours when we are surrounded by development? Who will be responsible??? 56% has been reserved. Consider exchanging land to the east for Parks/natural areas, etc. in exchange for ag reserve land.

As a resident and nursery (landlord) I believe that all land owned by an individual(s) should have the rights and options of their properties as everyone else in the entire south Florida (e.g.) area has, etc.

Ag Reserve property put in an "ag reserve" for the entire County should be owned by the County therefore not encroaching on individual owners' rights. That said, all counties and places should have an "ag reserve" owned by the County, etc. Individual homeowners/property owners should have all their rights restored, however.

Therefore restore property rights to owners. In 30 years of course I would like to see an Ag Reserve here and anywhere else in Florida & nation capable of having "Ag owned by the County/City, etc.

	<p>Is this correct? (A) These whole <u>meetings, discussion, etc.</u> as far as remaining property owners is really only about a <u>basic 1,000 acres</u> or <u>50%</u> of the Ag Reserve, (<u>1000 acres of 2776/13%</u>)? (B) The developers want TDRs to buy from the County at a reduced price of \$25,000 rather than buy elsewhere at \$80,000 to \$100,000?</p> <p><u>County needs to buy</u> and control and own a new "Ag Reserve." You cannot get <u>down to 5%</u> of property owners remaining and then decide to discuss what you should have done as 1/3 (29-30%) developed. Since <u>28% ag + 28% preserve=56%</u> you should go west and <u>pick up</u> 44%.</p> <p>#1 This is an ill-conceived plan to mix farm/agricultural use with 10,000 residences. The traffic, the spraying, the schools, the churches, the fertilizing --all a recipe for disaster. Like disco, this 80's atrocity needs to be completely abandoned and hopefully forgotten.</p> <p>#2 10,000 homes x 2-4 people per home. There is no room for services & service providers for all these people. If they all get on the road to find stores, etc., the traffic will be horrendous.</p> <p>#3 60/40 <u>Arbitrary, unfair</u>, will cause remainder of Ag reserve to become an ag ghetto. By all means lower minimum development & eliminate frontage and location requirements. All these rules were the result of powerful lobby efforts on the part of large farmer landowners so they could cash out first... and as planned... they did. Highly unfair thank you Rangeline Coalition.</p> <p>#4 Absolutely eliminate minimum size requirement. This is again arbitrary, elitist, grossly unfair in 2014. Continuation of these policies will yield an unworkable situation - need to eliminate the Ag Reserve.</p> <p>#5 Preserve area uses need to be widened to reflect the uses allowed in the rest of the United States of America. We need some medical, some light industrial, some support to 20-40,000 residents. Dentists, vets, pizza delivery, recreation...</p> <p>#6 Current caretaker home guarantees "slums of the future" to be neatly tucked between ritzy developments. Great planning for future criminals. Need to go to 1 per 5. Restore property rights to the property owners.</p>
Topic 2:	Commercial Land Uses
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to those which serve the needs of the farmworker community, existing residents, and future residents of an AgR-PDD • In the form of an AgR-TMD • Within 1/4 mile of the intersections of Lyons Road with either Boynton Beach Boulevard or Atlantic Avenue. • Maximum of 80 acres and 750,000 square feet for the entire tier • County TDR program is limited to residential development rights • Ag Reserve is a Sending area for TDRs (one unit per acre) • Receiving areas within the Urban/Suburban Tier
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional 200 acres along main corridors • Require one TDR per acre of development area • Make necessary changes to TDR program

Comments:	<p>All landowners should have TDR's otherwise small landowners get treated unfairly by the County. Additional commercial is needed, especially at major intersections. (Boynton/SR7 and Atlantic/SR7). Current zoning has kicked out a chemical company and tractor dealership with no ability to relocate in Ag Reserve. Does this sound very Ag friendly? Not! Commercial nodes, at least small ones, should be allowed west of SR7</p>
	<p>Currently the Ag Reserve has two TMD Zones which are already overcrowded - There needs to be more commercial in the area to support the developed residential areas - not to mention there are still almost 5, 000 homes that are to be built. These home owners need services. We need to add/build the services in order to support the pre-approved residential developments.</p>
	<p>Everything should be the same on the East and West side of the road. The 200 acres needs to be split amongst many properties and I do not believe this is enough property. Please consider sea level rise and global warming. Allow the proper development in the <u>Ag Res</u></p>
	<p>Need to designate the area and then determine the acres - 200 acres is not enough to add for. The county needs to allow more commercial development for services for the 10,000 new home that are being built. One bank on west Atlantic Ave is not enough. At some point, these home-owners are going to start complaining and maybe then, changes will be made. I hope it is before then.</p>
	<p>Yes: Delray Market Place is already overcrowded. Have to drive 15 miles to get to Home Depot or Lowes. 2 schools and church by me. I am sure spraying of my crops will be a problem soon. Tractor dealership bought out by hospital: No light industrial or very little in Ag Reserve. Helena Chemical had to move away from Ag Reserve - would not allow them back in. We have a lot of landscaping and maintenance companies - are they supposed to be there? By 441 and Boynton - 6 or 7 commercial business not suppose to be there?</p>
	<p>Both sides of 411 east and west should be treated the same. Other areas along 441 in Palm Beach County have commercial along both sides. Why does the west side not have right to do civic.</p>
	<p>Farmers in the Ag Reserve should be able to purchase the supplies and equipment required for their farms from commercial locations within the reserve</p>
	<p>Need more commercial property along major roads in Ag Reserve.</p>
	<p>When the rest of the home are built, the ones that are permitted there will be a need for more commercial and light industrial. The quadrant of the turnpike was recommended in the original study that was done (page 76) This area would have no impact on Row Crop farming</p>
	<p>Yes, more commercial. For example, Bethesda Hospital could use a CVS or Walgreens close by it. Flavor Pict Road is going thru. The intersection of Flavor Pict and Lyons roads could possibly have commercial. 441 + Boynton Bch Blvd and 441+ Atlantic Avenue: More commercial</p>
	<p>Restore property rights! I bought my farm 1986 and never had any input presented to me. This Ag. Res. really damaged my interest, as a small owner.</p>
	<p>I support the addition of 200 acres of commercial in the Ag Reserve. There is already a large demand for additional commercial and will only increase with the future developments that are already approved without changing any of the current development zoning laws.</p>

	Additional commercial development would help alleviate congestion. Residents could stay in their local community.
	You'll need the extra 200 acres to support the housing plus schools that are already in the Ag Reserve. New hotels, Home Depot, Lowes, Tractor supply, Fertilizer.
	Make necessary changes to TDR program
	I agree that changes need to be made to the TDR program. As with so many other matters, the small farmer and/or property owner has been overlooked. "If you're small, you're screwed"!!
	I agree with additional commercial acreage. However, I think it should be more than 200 acres because we have many corridors that could and should handle commercial property.
	In the normal course of events, as population grows, the need for businesses to serve that population grows. Limiting businesses imposes inconvenience on the residents, and denies revenue to the County. The proposed changes should be adopted except for the required TDR purchase. If TDR's are on land, must they be purchased?
	I don't think 200 acres additional is adequate. But I don't have a problem with the property owner having to purchase additional TDRs to develop property. Why did the property on Atlantic Ave (market place or whatever) get approval and be allowed to take up so much of the original 200 acres. As a landowner, we were not notified who gets to make all these decisions? As in previous page you need infrastructure to support local residents and nursery people.
	I don't really know where to start with my comments. Like most everyone here I have a lot to say and strong feelings. I love our County. I would never want to move from where I am. I love going out to the Parks and Green Cay is my favorite place to go just to refill my spirit if you will. I have watched farmers and nursery owners (growers) for 30 years plus. They give 100% to the land. They have to love being growers or there is no way you could handle the lifestyle. It is 24/7. A lot of the time nature dictates your day. We have had to come back from storms and freezes both. I still remember my husband calling me to tell me it's snowing!
	Since the 80 acres original has already been used up and we are still in process of building the 29% (6290) therefore, it would seem that <u>AT LEAST 200+ acres</u> is needed to accommodate the area. <u>e.g. Hotel (near Hospital); various commercial to support Ag Reserve, restaurants, etc, etc.</u> <u>Schools, walk-in clinics, doctors, dentists, baby boomers, seniors</u> Yes on changes to TDR...only because this is how the County set up our land - with <u>60/40 + TDRs!</u>
	Need more services for residents such as walk-in clinic, Drs. offices, dentists. Hotels/restaurants. Probably should need about 500 more acres for commercial use. Re: young families schools are very important - independent living (baby boomers) - assisted living - senior day(s) schools also

	<p>I would ask the question, what is the percentage of commercial versus residential currently in non-Ag reserve Areas?</p> <p>200 acres will not support what will be needed upon the dissolution of the remaining ag reserve lands. Will these 200 meet the same percentage as the rest of Palm Beach County? Additionally, you have 4900 new homes - <u>4900</u> - that have been approved.</p>
Topic 3:	60/40 PUD Development Area Size, Location and Density
Adopted Comprehensive Plan:	<p>Development area must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have a minimum of 100 acres • be located east of State Road 7 • have frontage on either State Road 7, State Road 806 (Atlantic Avenue), State Road 804 (Boynton Beach Boulevard), Clint Moore Road, Lyons Road extending north of Boynton Beach Boulevard or Lyons Road extending south of Atlantic Avenue and Acme Dairy Road extending south of Boynton Beach Boulevard to the L-28 canal. (Other roadways may be added by Plan amendment)
As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce development area from 100 acres to 35 acres • Allow 60/40 PUDs anywhere in the Ag Reserve • Eliminate frontage requirement
Comments:	<p>I <u>agree</u> that the size of development should include parcels that are smaller. 35 acres makes sense, but I think it is also possible to create smart development on tracts even smaller than that. Also, development should <u>not</u> be limited to east of SR7</p>
	<p>Not sure this will help at this point. You should not have a min. acreage specification. It's not fair for each land owner. I do feel that we don't need any more homes. We still have almost 5, 000 homes still to be built "pre approved" residential. We need more services in the Ag Reserve to support the recently developed property and the "pre approved" neighborhoods. Where are the "pre approved" commercial properties to support this?</p>
	<p>The Ag Reserve is one of the few areas with open space. Please consider proper planning and development in this area. Consider Eastern Swaps. Tax incentives. Government needs to meet the needs of our citizens. You have large developments in the Western portion of the county. Many of these people are aging and will not be able to travel far distances. Please consider this and do not forget 441 is the evacuation route for our area. Thank you</p>
	<p>I think we have enough homes being built. The focus needs to be on commercial development for the 10,000 that are being built and allowing private property owners the right to sell their land and not be limited by the Ag Reserve. I propose that property owners in the Ag Reserve have the same development rights as someone outside the Ag Reserve. <u>I also propose that the 13% remaining are no longer a part of the Ag Reserve</u> (The private owners property) Release the liens on the property owners on Atlantic Ave for the water line.</p>
	<p>Yes, our area Acme Dairy Road north of Boynton, we are surrounded by developments, schools etc but cannot get development rights or sell for a development.</p>
	<p>No real thoughts, but it is not fair east side of 441 only what about west side of the road?</p>

	<p>The minimum should be less. Location should be considered on the west side of 441 as well. Why hurt some farmers who happen to have bought on the wrong side of the street. They paid the same prices as the east side.</p>
	<p>I think changing to 35 acres is a great idea. It would make it more fair to the smaller land owners.</p>
	<p>This seems good for small land owners that seem to be left out of the original plan.</p>
	<p>Good idea. (Regarding location of 60/40 PUDs anywhere in the Ag Reserve): Do not allow close to R Marshall/Loxahatchee Area or near very western boundary of the Ag Reserve</p>
	<p>I like both ideas (first two bullets of the proposal) from March 2014 also allow County to sell TDR from County bank to Ag Reserve. Allow development south of Atlantic Avenue on Lyons Road. Nurseries on Lyons Rd south of Atlantic have Mizner CC on the south, Church to the north and Delray Lake Estates to my east. Nurseries should clump (move) on sites west of 441 (St. Rd. 7) away from homes</p>
	<p>I support the reduction from 100 acres to 35 acres, the change for 60/40 PUDS anywhere in the Ag Reserve, and elimination of frontage requirement.</p>
	<p>The proposal is more fair for most landowners. It does not penalize you if you are in a smaller land area. All landowners should have <u>EQUAL</u> opportunity. WE should have the same rights to develop our property as a landowner east of I-95</p>
	<p>That's a fix-</p>
	<p>Allow 60/40 PUD's anywhere in the Ag Reserve</p>
	<p>I am all for reducing the development area from 100 acres to 35 acres.</p>
	<p>We need to allow this change because they aren't a lot of 100 acre parcels left that can be developed. I also think on smaller parcels - the 60/40 be adjusted down by size.</p>
	<p>Changes as presented at the Workshop are obvious and logical. Removing all restrictions would be even better.</p>
	<p>I think lowering acreage requirements would help some of the landowners. Also raising density to a minimum of 1 unit per acre. If not land cost are prohibitive for development for the small developer. As the lady stated in the meeting, maybe soon assisted living facilities should be allowed to take care of the older population that</p>

	needs those facilities right now.
	<p>There are more numbers of nights that he, and when our children were old enough or we had care for them, we, were out all night praying that the temperature would not drop. Should we water or wait? What's going to happen next? And the government came in telling us you can't burn tires, you can't do this or whatever to save our crop. It has been somewhat of a challenge to say the least. It has also been great. Our kids were raised almost daily at the farm. Plants and animals that they would never have seen if not for being west of Military Trail. My husband and I are both in our 60's. We started farming in 71 out on Lantana road. We have been around here a long time. He is ready to retire. He is not able physically to work anymore. He <u>cannot</u> do it. Our children have watched their dad and do not want to go into the business. They have gone to school and are in business of their own. We just want to be like everyone else. We have worked hard. We want to be able to retire. We can't do that. We are just asking to have the right to do with our land what we want. We need our farms and we need our parks and there has to be room for growth also. But if I buy land and worked 30 years, it should be my right to move on to something else at this age. I am just asking for the same respect as larger land owners. Our land is a piece that has been jumped over and is being built up around. Please look at the map. Where is the best place to farm? Do we have farmers to farm it? Please think of the lives here that need to have choices with their land. Thank you.</p>
	<p>Yes <u>35</u> of course - at least, if not lower Yes (<i>allow 60/40 PUDs anywhere in the Ag Reserve</i>) of course Yes (<i>eliminate frontage requirements</i>) of course <u>However, I believe that 100% of property should be developable (not 60/40).</u> Again I refer to page 1.</p>
	<p>Agree especially with allow 60/40. Not 35 acres <u>but 5 acres & up.</u></p>
	<p>I would increase it to 20 acres needed only, or completely dissolve the Ag reserve. You cannot restrict development to individuals especially smaller land owners you are all discriminating against them. You should be allowed the same rights for <u>all</u>. What exactly does this area need? What are owners to do when surrounded by development? We have break-ins. People who decide they want to walk by the farms, they get all upset when we spray. They want to enter and ride their bicycles around. When they get hurt who will be responsible? Us! How are we to protect our rights and how are we to coexist with development that has surrounded us???</p>
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:	I agree with the March workshop - eliminate minimum size and contiguity requirement
	I believe the preserve areas should be west of 441 and provided by the County.
	Leave as is
	I propose more commercial development. We have 10,000 homes being built now and not enough services for the existing property owners. Provided more commercial development is allowed. Then I agree in the proposal to eliminate minimum size/contiguity requirements
	Please Do This!! We as small land owners that are zoned Ag Reserve did not get to participate in development rights. I am next to turnpike and would like development rights, or zone commercial so we can sell.
	Leave as is
	Yes as long as it stays Ag and the county enforces it
	This is useful for the smaller land owners. I think this can work.
	This would create a patchwork of preserve areas. Preserve areas should have a minimum limit. TDR sales should be contiguous or be a minimum size.
	Right this wrong! Harms small farmers. Eliminate minimum size
	I support the minimum size and contiguity requirement to allow the smaller parcels to be part of the TDR program.
	This again is fair for the small landowners who may be able to combine land with other owners and maybe develop it as a service for the surrounding community.
	No 60/40 1 per 1 same as east of Turnpike
	Eliminate minimum size/contiguity requirement
	I am totally in favor of eliminating minimum size/contiguity requirement.
	Should be allowed
	This ruling of the Ag Reserve favors corporations such as GL/ Homes over small landowners and should be eliminated.
	Again this would help some of the landowners tremendously. The right thing to do is give the landowners the use of the 100% of their property if they owned prior to the Ag Reserve being created.
	<u>Yes please.</u> See Topic 1.
	Yes of course.
Eliminate Ag reserve. See other page-topic 3.	
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

	<p>the 60/40 AgR-PDD if approved by the Department of Environmental Resources Management, managed for environmental resource values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
<p>As presented at March 2014 BCC Workshop:</p>	<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
<p>Comments:</p>	<p>Perhaps the <u>County</u> should take note of what <u>they</u> have done with the preserve pieces the <u>tax payer</u> has already purchased! A transfer station is <u>not</u> in the "approved" uses, yet there it is. The landowner is getting restricted in ways that the County isn't. Double Standard? Allow parks, trails, etc. west of SR7, this could create a <u>wonderful resource</u> for all residents of PBCO.</p> <p>My property sits on west Atlantic Ave. I would like to do more with my land than farm. My property is between The Delray Market Place and 441. I am paying for a "fresh water" main line to support the neighborhood down the road. Currently the allowed uses on my property would not benefit from the "fresh water" line I am paying for. I would like to be allowed a use that could benefit from the water line I have invested in. When the motion was passed to build the water main, the property owners were promised a "special benefit". I would like my special benefit to be the rights to develop my property. As mentioned, this property was purchased by my family before 1980 - before the Ag Reserve. I would like to have the same rights that my grandfather purchased.</p> <p>There are so many additional uses for property within the reserve which would be of benefit to the community. I believe the County needs to recognize the true threat of sea level rise and start planning for a western migration. There is no doubt the population is moving and aging. Even with the AR it is obvious that citizens want to reside west. Properties need to be property planned and available when the need arises. Grocery stores, rehabs, doctor's offices, schools, hospitals, nursing homes, ALFs - the list goes on. What exists East needs to be available in the Western section of the County.</p> <p>Agree with proposal. Horse trails west of 441</p> <p>Yes, All these companies are out here already and have been there for years. Mulching companies is a real problem if in a residential area even on 5 acres. Needs to have a large buffer zone due to chance of fire and noise. Size restriction for packing houses need to be equivalent to federal regulations</p> <p>Allow more uses but broader than just Ag related businesses. Thing bigger. Stop having tunnel vision. What about truck dealer don't farmer use truck? Food stores don't farmers eat? Health care, service care, vets</p> <p>With limitations to not disturb homeowners on the same street. Mulching, grinding, hauling in and out can cause havoc on any homeowners street.</p> <p>Yes there should be more uses of land in the Ag Reserve.</p> <p>If you want to save the Ag Reserve, this should be done</p>

	Good idea. No smokestacks or smoke/burning emissions. Maintain Air Quality.
	Yes
	Parks and recreational areas for the residents
	Hotels, Restaurants, Home Depot, Lowes. Need support
	Give increase variety of uses for agricultural <u>land which would help us keep our land.</u>
	I am for both of the above suggested changes. Why would you want to encourage agriculture and not allow the production of products that serve as accessory to the agricultural industry?
	Changes are needed if we are to preserve agriculture. Waste and vegetative transfer should be permitted. Equestrian parks and trails
	Well, of course!
	I assume you mean light industrial, if so I think it is very important to continue to support the nurserymen that want to continue to farm.
	1) This seems to be a 20 year old plan that has <u>not kept up</u> with the developing in and around it especially " <u>in</u> " the ag reserve! <u>Yes</u> of course we need to allow <u>much more uses</u> but I again refer to topic 1- <u>Restore property rights to owners</u> . Whether it is 13% or 33% (i.e. 13% + possible 20% 4,500 unbuilt) these should be 'our rights'. 'our' being property owners. 2) Not familiar with info on packing houses
	Increase <u>variety of uses for our land</u> so we can <u>increase revenue</u> to pay property taxes and maintenance. <u>Many!</u>
	Eliminate Ag reserve. Currently you allow land owners to store mulch, etc.--garbage. Our neighbor has huge piles of Organic Waste including horse manure. Because it is not on a cement pad--the runoff is entering the water table. No one will do anything about it. How is this a preservation? When it rains all his contaminated fill runs into the canals, into the ocean when South Florida pumps it out. The County says because it is Ag Reserve land they cannot do anything about it!!! Really how does this reflect the <u>unique</u> land? How is this reflective of sensitive water management? Why is this considered an enhancement of agriculture?
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:	<p>Definitely allow farm residences. It makes <u>total</u> sense. If the County is "Pro-Ag", they need to make this change. Overall, there should be 1 unit per acre development right throughout the Ag Reserve. If TDR's are already sold off and no homes exist, you should be able to <u>buy</u> a TDR and place a home on 1 unit/5 acres</p> <p>Agree with this. However I believe the current contiguity requirement should remain.</p> <p>Eliminate the restriction on the 13% of land that is remaining - release it from the Ag Reserve please. Being next to developments and the Delray Market Place and near a transfer station that the county built "IN" the Ag Reserve, shows it is <u>NOT</u> an Ag Reserve. Besides the fact that property owners on W Atlantic Ave and paying for a water line on W. Atlantic Ave that <u>ONLY</u> the Delray Market Place benefits from. Release these property owners from the Ag Reserve and give them the same rights as the Delray Market Place has (particularly on W. Atlantic Ave) - or other use from properties in other areas of the Ag Reserve.</p> <p>Yes, House to 1 acre and if another structure is used as an office it is not penalized for its development right. Would get 9 development rights to sell.</p> <p>This is ok with the changes.</p> <p>Absolutely! If a farmer lives on site they are the care taker!</p> <p>Limit size for homes to 3000 sq ft and have them follow rules</p> <p>You should be allowed to live on your property.</p> <p>This is probably one of the worse rules in Ag Reserve and the new presented should put through</p> <p>Yes, this would enable someone who bought/wants to buy/ already own land without TDR's to <u>build</u> a house on land they are farming. However, 5 acres that <u>already</u> has a home on it should not be able to <u>sell</u> TDR's off the 4 acres. Cap the house size to 2,500 sqf. Allow someone with no TDRs to purchase a TDR to build a farm residence on 5 acres with no TDR's</p> <p>Yes. Allow it! Owner/Farmer needs a larger home</p> <p>I support the change of allowing a farm residence on preserve parcels. IT is important to have a full time residence on a farm due to the fact that there is a large amount of crops and expensive equipment used on a farm. A residence allows an individual to live on the property and protect his or her investment.</p> <p>You should not be penalized for working and maintaining the land in the reserve. The house should not be considered at all for density</p> <p>This is good</p> <p>1- My home is approximately 1,200 sq. ft. I maintain the land -- septic, well, dirt road, property taxes, etc. Fits definition of "CARETAKER"? 2- One unit per five acres does not allow for my daughter and family to build home on my land.</p> <p>Once again, why make it difficult to conduct what you're trying to encourage? In order to once again "encourage agriculture" don't have so many road blocks in the way of that happening.</p> <p>Should be allowed - especially in a nursery or equestrian center where residence is</p>

	required for caretakers.
	Yes!
	I should have listened at Farm & Food Meeting. I need more information on this to write coherently and with knowledge. I will read all online.
	I have no problem with this
	Agree with all of the above. Because of the zoning restrictions and the fact that we receive few services (<u>NO CITY WATER, NO CITY SEWER, NO MAINTENANCE OF ROADS</u>) for our property taxes (try calling the police at night-they can't find or do not know where our residence is-can't find even with GPS) Although we would love to continue living in Ag reserve over 35 years. Too restrictive with zoning. Cannot build another family home so 2 generations can live and grow together.
	That majority of property allows for fallow land. One home on less than five acres is <u>not</u> acceptable. <u>Or</u> dissolve the Ag Reserve. A caretaker's home does not need to be larger than 1,000 sq. ft. A home where the individual resides should be allowed to be larger. Additionally, land with no TDRs now as preservation allow 1 <u>home</u> on 5 acres. (not caretaker)

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
	<p>Overlay options should be available for properties within the reserve. Overlay options such as: medical, schools, elderly housing, low density commercial, low density industrial, civic uses. Politicians need to realize there will be no one in their district as global warming and sea level rise become a more obvious problems in our world. The 441 corridor must be allowed to develop ethically with our citizen's needs realized.</p> <p>Allow more commercial development in the Ag Reserve - particularly on W. Atlantic Avenue where the Delray Marketplace is - to make it easier for nearby home owners to <u>shop</u>. Agree with proposal</p> <p>No</p> <p>TDR should not be given to land that does not have it. That would cause the land w/ TDR to lose value causing a hardship by lowering the TDR value.</p> <p>TDR's should stay within the Ag Reserve bought or sold. The County should not use these issues to unload their development rights. That price of approximately 20,000 per right hurts those who would like to sell as their neighbors did @ \$80,000+. There are necessary changes that need to be made. Don't lose sight of what the small land owners need in the big picture.</p>

	<p>Allow someone who has sold TDR's to repurchase TDR's and take their land off preserve status.</p> <p>YES! I'm on Lyons Rd south of Atlantic. There's is a church to the North, Mizner CC to the South. Delray lakes estates to the East. Nurseries and residential don't mix. Banks will not loan on our property because of the zoning. If the nursery want they would move west of 441. Allow developers to buy TDR's from county bank.</p> <p>I support the proposed changes to allow smaller land owners to participate in the changes that are taking place in the Ag Reserve.</p> <p>If the goal is to preserve the Ag Reserve create a scale so the small owner gets more TDRs per acre than say the 100 acre landowner. This way they can realize the value of their property and possibly keep the area agricultural for years to come.</p> <p>Agree with all of the above, especially a base potential density of 1 du/acre. Agree with one of the participants today that a <u>CLASS ACTION SUIT</u> be brought against the County government for telling us we may or may not use our land.</p> <p>I whole heartedly agree that changes need to be made to the TDR program. I think with the remaining 13% of remaining lands, consideration should be given to allowing development as it is east of the Turnpike.</p> <p>A well needed change - This will allow easier development with Plan to coexist with agriculture if done properly between County, land owners, equine owners and developers.</p> <p>A windfall for land planners, but it's an improvement to the "Comprehensive Plan"</p> <p>The overlay would be a great idea. We have a piece of land that was purchased by 3 gentlemen who are no longer living. They purchased this and before the Ag Reserve was created. It does not seem fair that at one point our taxes went up because we were not farming and they took away our agricultural exemption even though we are in the Ag Reserve and can't do anything else. WE did get it back after leasing land to other farmers. I believe everyone is seeking some relief. The County bought their land with the bond issue. Other people who do not own property should not be allowed to tell property owners what they have to do with their land.</p> <p>This is the overall of all others. <u>Yes. ABSOLUTELY 3 units</u> per acre development. Therefore 3 TDRs per acre?</p> <p>Agree with above especially increase <u>density at least of 1 du/ac</u> and 3 du/ac development. The individual homeowners should have the first right of refusal of <u>TDRs before developers</u>. <u>FREE ENTERPRISE</u>.</p> <p>Dissolve the Ag Reserve overall. Allow the TDRs to be applied to the land even if it is in preserve. 28,000.00 per TDR from the County for a max of 3 units per acre--</p>
Topic 8:	Other Ag Reserve Concepts, Ideas, Issues
	<p>Remember property rights! The Commissioner's desire to be "politically correct" and "support" Agriculture cannot come at the expense of individual property owners!</p> <p>I would like to address that my property is located on W. Atlantic Ave. I am currently paying for a fresh water main that has no use for my current allowed uses of my property. I would like to be granted a use on my property that I can take advantage of the fresh water line that runs across my property. When the Commission approved the water line a "special benefit" was promised to land owners. I would like to know what the special benefit is. Also - I would like to state that my property has been in my family since before the Ag Reserve existed. I inherited the property in 1997 when my father died. I graduated college in 2008. I feel like the county is forcing me to farm. I would like to have the rights that were on my property when it was purchased by my family in the 1970's. I don't feel the County should be</p>

allowed to tell me that I need to be a farmer. Thank you for your consideration.

W. Atlantic Ave has an interchange on the Turnpike and there has been intent from Target, Walgreens and other corporations to be located there. 10,000 homes have been allowed in the Ag Reserve - but other than the Delray Market Place and Boynton Market Place, NO additional commercial development has been allowed. This does not make sense. I propose allowing commercial development on the corridors. As for the properties that have been "left out" - the 13%, they should have their rights restored & be released from the Ag Reserve. And back to W. Atlantic, the prior commission envisioned commercial development and taxed these property owners in a water line. Each of these property owners have lines on their property. Please be fair as the developers are ready to build and support the needs of the community. A class action law suit is likely if these 13% don't get their rights restored

The Ag Reserve is a joke. It was originally meant to preserve Row Crops - The vast majority of land developed was Row Crop area where as all the small owners get screwed. If you had 250 acres, you hit the jackpot otherwise we small nurseries didn't get a thing.

The Ag Reserve was for winter crop and Row Crop but most of the farmer's sold their TDR's and or land "good for them" But the 13% still being of land owner are mostly made up of Nursery's and they would like to be able to maximize the value they are in declining industry.

The Ag Reserve should keep all of the land the tax payers of the county bought. All the other land should be developed responsibly if do so it will be a great asset for Palm Beach County

Draw the line on 441. Right the wrong let the small nursery owner have the same rights the large owner received. Let the land be developed south of Atlantic on Lyons Rd. Nursery biz needs to be moved west of 441. Clump together to save the nurseries with sale of current location it would fund upgrade needed.

The Ag Reserve has created an environment of unfair commerce. We are forced to be a nursery or a farm.

The small landowner been sold out by County commissioners

1- Vision of the Ag Reserve 10, 20, 30 years

Since nurseries and farms have difficulty making a profit (most other businesses would be sold or closed by now) I do not envision Ag being viable in the future. My friends are getting approximately the same wholesale price as we (were) charged in the 80's!!!! Costs have gone up on pots, labor; all overhead but the selling cost has (increased) by only 50 cents a pot!!! You can't pay your property taxes and maintenance without a profit!!!

2- Commercial - more services for people living in the Ag Reserve

I know there are ways to successfully bring about changes that that are needed to the Ag. Reserve. This can happen if all involved can work together with open minds and with the intent to make changes that will be good for the greatest numbers. I think we all have to try not to think in extremes. Asking for changes in the Ag Reserve does not mean asking for thoughtless, and uncaring changes. It means realizing we all have a stake in how this unfolds- we all do care! Polarizing statements don't help! To hear a member of the commission state that he is not responsible for any retirement is hurtful and insulting. I'm not asking him to be responsible for my retirement. I'm asking him to be responsible for allowing me to retire by keeping unnecessary restrictions in play. I think that comparing my right to sell my land to walking into a 7-11 and plunking down a dollar for a lottery ticket is unconscionable. The right to sell my land represents years of work, planning, sweat, care of the environment, and yes, even life. --a far cry from a lottery ticket!

Safety and traffic control will be very important when developing the Ag Reserve and preserving the Ag Reserve. Ag related businesses like hardware, chemical companies, should be allowed. Outdoor theaters and entertainment areas need to be added as they would make beautiful venues for shows and concerts in a rural setting.

This ruling, which sounded good enough that the citizens of Palm Beach County fell for it and were willing to vote for it and pay for it, has proven unworkable. Many residential neighborhoods have been built which are incompatible with agriculture. The plan is unpopular with farmers because it actually interferes with them. It is unpopular with small landowners because it arbitrarily limits the use and value of their land.

It is popular with large corporations who have been able to profit from real estate permitted on their land holdings and denied smaller holdings. It is popular with some of the residents of that real estate because they like the illusion that they live in a bucolic setting and feel virtuous about preserving "nature" now that they have their piece of it. It is popular with land planners for the extra business it brings to them.

Those who seek change are presented as wanting to pave over paradise. Not True! In my case the land was acquired before the Ag Reserve was imposed. It was loved, maintained, cultivated, and paid taxes upon many years. Now that it is unsustainable as a nursery, it is encumbered with so many restrictions that its value is greatly reduced.

I haven't seen all parts of the Ag Reserve, but what I have seen in no way looks agricultural. It contains a school, a hospital, a shopping center, and hundreds of residences. The only agriculture is on small plots like mine which are rented to large farmers at no profit in order to maintain an agricultural exemption for the property.

Parks, farms, shopping, care places-nursery, adult, schools, libraries, theaters, safe places, for kids to go. Lots of uses for the space. Nice hotels.

It's a very unusual CIRCUMSTANCE here that I am arguing for my basic property rights which were snatched from us all in 1997-1999 as 'good for the world' at that time. "We" (meaning the County) proceeded to put through 29-30% = 6290+ acres for development. The "Remaining" we are discussing is 13% or 2776 acres but of that only about 1000 acres is in reality desirable-1000 of 2776 acres = 5% of property owners rights

County needs to buy and control and own a new "Ag Reserve." You cannot get down to 5% of property owners remaining and then decide to discuss what you should have done as 1/3 (29-30%) developed. Since 28% ag + 28% preserve=56% you should go west and pick up 44%.

Sustainability of Agriculture in the Ag Reserve not possible.

Need for increased tax base to support the needs of Palm Beach County.

Additionally, land purchased by the County was rented at such low rates it created unfair balance of production/(illegible): many land owners who purchased property beyond 1986 were forced to pay "development" prices to get into business. Those of us who have done so have huge mortgage payments that these individuals who are renting have not had to absorb into their production costs. It has created a biased network.